Oklahoma State University

Assessment Report
2007 - 2008

Submitted to
The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
December 2008

University Assessment and Testing
107 UAT Building
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK 74078-6043
405-744-6687
chris.ray@okstate.edu
http://uat.okstate.edu/

Oklahoma State University
Annual Student Assessment Report of 2007-08 Activity

prepared by

Chris Ray
Interim Director, University Assessment & Testing
405.744.6687
Chris.Ray@okstate.edu

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

Three methods are used at OSU to assess students' readiness for college level coursework: the ACT (consisting of four subtests in English, Reading, Mathematics, and Science Reasoning), results of the Entry-Level Placement Analysis (ELPA; developed by OSU), and the COMPASS placement test (Computer Adaptive Placement and Support System, produced by ACT).

Each enrolled new student (new freshmen and transfer students with fewer than 24 credit hours) receives a Student Assessment Report that summarizes information used for entry-level assessment:

- 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 as per OSU guidelines that have been approved by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

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

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

COMPASS. Students with ACT subscores below 19 and with predicted grades of less than 2.0 in a particular subject area (from ELPA) may take the ACT COMPASS placement test to qualify for college-level courses. COMPASS placement tests are available in the subject areas of Mathematics, Reading, and English. Students may also take a science placement test that combines elements from the COMPASS mathematics and reading subject tests.
The cut-scores for the COMPASS tests in each subject area are shown in Table I.1

Table I.1. Cut-scores for the COMPASS placement test.

Subject Area:	Compass Score	Course Placement
Mathematics	Algebra 0-54	UNIV 0023 or UNIV 0123 required
	Algebra 55-71	UNIV 0123 recommended
	Algebra 72-100	No restrictions
English	English 0-55	UNIV 0133 required
	English 56-100	No restrictions
Reading (Sociology, History, Political Science, Psychology, Economics, and Philosophy)	Reading 0-70	UNIV 0143 or CIED 1230 required
	Reading 71-100	No restrictions
Science (Biology, Chemistry, Geography, Geology, and Physics)	Reading 0-70 *or* Algebra 0-54	UNIV 0111 required
	Reading 71-100 *and* Algebra 55-100	No restrictions

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

In 2007-2008, a total of 3,642 admitted and enrolled new freshmen and transfer students with fewer than 24 credit hours were assessed via entry-level placement analysis.

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, free of charge, at the OSU Testing Center. Students may prepare for the COMPASS placement test by visiting the ACT COMPASS website and viewing sample questions and information on COMPASS test content.

Entry-level assessment also includes evaluation of educational readiness, educational goals, study skills, values, self-concept, and motivation, as per the State Regents' Assessment Policy. These important aspects of the entry-level are included in the assessment process when each student meets with her advisor prior to enrollment.

Many resources are available to OSU students for academic support. *University Academic Services (UAS)* offers free tutoring services to all OSU students. 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 tutoring in entry-level calculus, physics, chemistry, and engineering science courses for all students enrolled in these classes. The *College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources* also offers a special program, Freshman in Transition (FIT), aimed at providing new students with academic support services to facilitate their first year experience.

4. What were the analyses and findings from the 2007-08 entry-level assessment?

In 2007-2008, Student Assessment Reports were produced for all admitted and enrolled new freshmen and new transfers with fewer than 24 credit hours (n=3,642). Each Student Assessment Report contained the student's high school data, ACT scores, results of Entry-Level Placement Analysis (ELPA), and course placement recommendations and requirements. Table I.2 shows the number of enrolled students who had performance deficiencies in each subject area based on ACT scores (i.e., ACT subscores <19) and the number of these deficiencies that were cleared using ELPA (i.e., cleared based on high school performance in particular core curriculum areas).

Table I.2. Number of enrolled new students with ACT scores below 19 in each subject area and number of these students who were cleared for college-level coursework by Entry-Level Placement Analysis (ELPA) in 2007-2008.

Subject Area	# of Students with ACT sub-scores <19*	# of Students cleared for college-level coursework by ELPA
English	263	215
Mathematics	465	174
Reading	244	185
Science	163	50

*Some students had ACT subscores <19 in more than one subject area. The following numbers of students were missing ACT subscores in these subject areas: English – 145, mathematics – 145, reading – 147, science – 343.

Students who were not cleared for college-level courses via ELPA 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 and the number who passed are described in Table I.3.

Table I.3. Number of students who took COMPASS tests for 2007-2008 placement.

Subject Area	# of Enrolled Students who took a COMPASS test*	# of Students who passed COMPASS and were cleared for college-level coursework
English	11	7
Mathematics	21	1
Reading	28	23

*Some students took COMPASS tests in more than one area
*cut-scores are shown in Table I.1.
*some students took COMPASS test(s) although they were not required by ELPA to take remedial courses

After all entry-level assessments were completed, 349 new students (9.6% of the total number enrolled) were recommended to take at least one remedial course.

Of the 3,642 enrolled new students in 2007-2008, 35 (1.0%) were recommended to enroll in remedial English classes; 289 (7.9%) in remedial math classes; 113 (3.1%) in remedial science classes, and 33 (0.9%) in remedial reading classes. Note that some of the students who are recommended for remedial classes are students with less than 24 hours of transfer credit (i.e., considered as new, first-time freshmen for the purpose of entry-level assessment) who have satisfied their remedial course requirement with transfer courses. For this reason, the number of students who are recommended to enroll in remedial classes may differ from the number of students enrolled in those classes in their first year at OSU.

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

Tracking of student success in remedial and college-level courses. Annual trends in grades, drops, withdraws, and failure rates in common freshman courses are monitored each semester by Institutional Research and Information Management and University Academic Services. Results of this tracking are shared each semester with the Directors of Student Academic Services and the Instruction Council. The offices of University Assessment and Testing, and Institutional Research and Information Management, work cooperatively to evaluate the entry-level assessment and track student success in remedial and college-level courses.

An analysis of new freshman who matriculated in 2001-2003 showed that students who received an ACT subscore below 19 but were cleared by ELPA performed as well in college-level courses as students who scored 19 or above.

Evaluation of cut-scores. The Directors of Student Academic Services reviewed the cut-scores and determined that no changes in cut-scores were necessary in 2007-2008.

Changes in entry-level assessment. No changes were made to entry-level assessment procedures, the Entry-Level Placement Analysis program, or COMPASS testing procedures in 2006-2007.

7. **What other studies of entry-level assessment have been conducted at the institution?**
8. **Describe results.**

The CIRP Freshman Survey. The CIRP Freshman Survey is conducted in alternate years at OSU as part of a nationwide study conducted jointly by the American Council on Education and the University of California at Los Angeles' Higher Education Research Institute. The study provides information about the expectations, attitudes, and experiences of OSU freshmen and college freshmen nationwide. The survey results help identify areas that may become problems for students during their first year, and these areas can then be addressed in orientation classes and by academic advisors. Results of the study also help 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 hope to become involved in campus life. The Office of University Assessment and Testing conducted the CIRP Freshman Survey in Fall 2008; results will be available in Spring 2009.

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

Entry-level assessment information is used in a variety of ways in OSU colleges. Continued demand for the entry-level Student Assessment Reports and information on entry-level assessment processes indicates that results of entry-level assessment are integral to the process of advising new students for enrollment. Colleges use the results of the CIRP Freshman Survey in freshmen orientation courses to stimulate discussion about student expectations for college and common problems new students often face.

II. General Education Assessment

1. Describe how assessment activities were linked to the institutional general education program competencies.

OSU's assessment program uses three tools to evaluate student achievement of the general education program competencies and the effectiveness of the general education curriculum:

(1) Institutional Portfolios. The General Education Assessment Committee has developed institutional portfolios to assess students' written communication skills (data collection in 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, and 2008), math problem solving skills (data collection in 2002, 2003 and 2005), science problem solving skills (data collection in 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2007), and critical thinking skills (data collection in 2005, 2006, 2007, and 2008), and knowledge, skills and attitudes about diversity (data collection in 2007 and 2008). Details about the portfolios developed in 2008 (to evaluate students' critical thinking skills, written communication skills, and knowledge, skills and attitudes about diversity) are described in the General Education Assessment report, available on the UAT website at uat.okstate.edu/assessment. Separate portfolios are developed to evaluate each general education learner goal, and each portfolio includes students' work from course assignments collected throughout the undergraduate curriculum. Faculty members (including assessment committee members and additional faculty members involved in undergraduate teaching) work in groups to evaluate the work in each portfolio and assess student achievement of relative to the learner goal that is being assessed by using standardized scoring rubrics. The results provide a measure of the extent to which students are achieving OSU's general education competencies.

Institutional portfolios represent a holistic approach to general education assessment. The assessment is not aimed at individual courses, departments, or faculty. Rather, it utilizes work produced by students in their OSU courses and evaluates those 'artifacts' to gauge how successful students are in achieving the institution's general education learner goals. The student work that is included in the portfolios has no identifying information, so the process protects student anonymity. The process is minimally intrusive to faculty, invisible to students, and utilizes work that is already produced in general education courses and other courses throughout the curriculum.

(2) General Education Course Database. The General Education Course Database is a tool for evaluating how each general education course is aligned with the expected learning outcomes for the general education program as a whole. Instructors are asked to submit course information online via a web-based form, and the General Education Advisory Council reviews the submitted information during regular course reviews. Instructors identify which general education learning goals are associated with the course and discuss the course activities that provide students with opportunities to achieve those learning goals. Instructors are also asked to describe how student achievement of those goals is assessed within the course. The database provides a useful tool for holistically evaluating general education course offerings and the extent to which the overall general education goals are achieved across the curriculum.

(3) University-wide surveys. Surveys such as the Alumni Survey provide indirect measures of the extent to which students have achieved general education competencies and information that helps corroborate evidence collected from the institutional portfolios.

In addition to the aforementioned assessment methods, OSU has elected to participate in the Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) beginning with the 2007-2008 academic year. The VSA was developed to promote accountability and stewardship, measure educational outcomes, and provide assessable and comparable information using the College Portrait online reporting template. As a VSA participating institution, the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) was administered to first-year freshmen and graduating seniors to assess the written communication and critical thinking skills of current OSU students.

Beyond these university-level assessments of general education learner goals described in this section of the report, many individual academic programs incorporate general education or mid-level assessment of writing, mathematic, science, problem solving, and critical thinking skills into their program outcomes assessment efforts. These are described in the program outcomes assessment reports for individual academic programs.

2. Describe how the instruments were administered and how students were selected.
3. Describe strategies to motivate students to participate meaningfully.

In 2007-08, institutional portfolios were developed to evaluate students' critical thinking skills, written communication skills, and knowledge, skills and attitudes about diversity. The portfolios included student work from 380 students from all classes (freshmen through seniors) and disciplines. Work from 152 students was contributed to the critical thinking portfolio and work from 181 students was included in the written communications skills portfolio. In its second year, work from 47 students was included in the diversity portfolio. The work in the portfolios was randomly selected from 22 OSU courses, including general education courses and upper division courses from across the curriculum. The courses represented a convenience sample because faculty members volunteered course assignments. A fixed number of 'artifacts' of student work from each course assignment was randomly selected.

The development of institutional portfolios is invisible to students; students are not aware when their work is randomly selected for inclusion in an institutional portfolio. Therefore, motivating students to participate is not an issue. The artifacts are coded immediately after they are collected, and information that identifies individual students is removed after minimal demographic information is obtained from institutional records for analysis purposes (e.g., major, class, gpa, and transfer credit hours). This protects student anonymity in the process, but also prohibits the use of the resulting data for tracking students into future semesters.

In accordance with the Voluntary System of Accountability, the CLA was administered as a computer-based test at the OSU Testing Center during the 2007-2008 academic year to evaluate students' critical thinking and written communication skills. Randomly sampled students, stratified by college, received an e-mail invitation to participate. Students were paid $30 to participate and were informed that the top ten freshmen and top ten seniors would receive and addition $100 to increase the incentive to perform well. 136 first-year freshman completed the instrument during the Fall, 2007 semester and 110 graduating seniors completed the instrument during the Spring, 2008 semester. Results of the CLA will be reported in the 2008-2009 annual report.

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

OSU's General Education Assessment program is aimed at holistically evaluating student achievement of the expected learning outcomes for general education. Institutional portfolios essentially give a 'snapshot' of students' competencies at the time the portfolio is assembled, and university-wide surveys provide an overview of student achievement of general education outcomes. Because individual student information is not captured and recorded in either of these methods, the processes do not permit tracking students into future semesters. However, because portfolios are assembled each year, the process does allow us to detect changes in student general education competencies over time.

5. What were the analyses and findings from the 2007-08 general education assessment?

Institutional portfolio – critical thinking assessment. Results of this year's assessment of students' critical thinking skills build on data collected in 2005, 2006, and 2007. Each sample of student work was scored using a rubric with a 5-point scale. About 69% of samples produced by seniors received a score of 3 or higher, and about 65% of work produced by freshmen received scores of 3 or higher. When only regularly admitted students are evaluated (excluding transfer students, international students, and students admitted to the institution under alternative admission policies), 83% of work produced by seniors received scores of 3 or higher.

Institutional portfolio – written communication skills assessment. Results of this year's assessment of students' written communication skills build on data collected in 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006. Each sample of student work was scored using a rubric with a 5-point scale. About 42% of artifacts produced by seniors received a score of 3 or higher, and 24% of work produced by freshmen received scores of 3 or higher. When only regularly admitted students are evaluated (excluding transfer students, international students, and students admitted to the institution under alternative admission policies), 49% of work produced by seniors received scores of 3 or higher.

Institutional portfolio – diversity assessment. Results of this year's assessment of students' knowledge, skills and attitudes regarding diversity build on data collected in 2007. Each sample of student work was scored using a rubric with a 5-point scale. About 75% of samples produced by seniors received a score of 3 or higher; no samples were produced by freshmen. When only regularly admitted students are evaluated (excluding transfer students, international students, and students admitted to the institution under alternative admission policies), 91% of work produced by seniors received scores of 3 or higher. Too few artifacts have been evaluated for results to be useful for generalizations about student learning; the committee will continue to increase the number of artifacts in this portfolio next year.

Information from the General Education Assessment Program is shared annually with the faculty who serve on the Assessment Council, Instruction Council, Faculty Council, and the General Education Advisory Council. The latter group is charged with the development and review of the general education curriculum; they consider general education assessment information in their review and approval of general education courses and in developing the criteria for those courses.

A joint meeting of the General Education Assessment Committee, the Assessment Council and the General Education Advisory Council is held each year to conduct a review of General Education Assessment. The purpose of this annual meeting is to review the assessment process and results of assessments, and recommend action for improvement, if warranted.

Faculty who conduct general education assessment are encouraging their colleagues to consider creating and/or revising a class assignment to include a diversity component, in order to provide more opportunities for students to develop knowledge and practice skills regarding diversity and to provide samples of student work for the assessment. They encourage wide participation by suggesting that classes do not have to be primarily focused on diversity to include such an assignment, but may include an

opportunity to consider the relevance of diversity to an issue discussed in the course. For example, an assignment used in the assessment last year was part of an Environmental Engineering course and asked students to write an analysis of the social justice/diversity aspects of environmental quality policy decisions.

In all assessments for general education learning goals, faculty are beginning to recognize the importance of creating assignments more intentionally focused on helping students achieve institutional learning goals as well as the goals of the specific class in which they are created. For example, to help students achieve higher levels of performance in writing, faculty in many disciplines now share the rubric for writing assessment with their students to help students understand the characteristics of effective written communication and how their writing will be evaluated – even though writing is not the focus of the assignment. As with the writing learning goal, the responsibility for helping students achieve the learning goals for diversity and for critical thinking are shared across the university.

One of the advantages of this type of authentic assessment is that the intervention for program improvement begins with the development of the assessment tool. Expectations for student learning about writing, critical thinking, diversity and other general education goals have been spelled out through the creation of rubrics for these assessments, and are open for discussion. The rubrics are being used in some individual courses to explain to students what is expected of them in class assignments.

III. Program Learning Outcomes Assessment

1. List, in table format, assessment measures and number of individuals assessed for major field of study.

Table III.1 summarizes the assessment methods and number of individuals that participate in each method for each undergraduate and graduate degree program at OSU. Details about assessment methods and numbers of individuals assessed are provided in the individual assessment reports or summaries submitted by each college, department, or degree program, and are available on the UAT website at uat.okstate.edu/assessment.

The number of individuals who participate in each outcomes assessment method within each academic unit is shown in Table III.1 and is described in detail in the individual assessment reports submitted by each academic unit. These reports are available on the UAT website at uat.okstate.edu/assessment.

Table III.1. Assessment methods and numbers of individuals assessed for each college, department, and degree program at OSU, including graduate degrees, reported for 2007-08. Details about assessment methods and individuals assessed are described in the individual assessment reports posted on the University Assessment and Testing website at uat.okstate.edu/assessment.

College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources

Academic Unit / Degree Program Assessed	Assessment Methods	Numbers of Individuals Assessed
Ag Education, Communication, and Leadership		
B.S., Ag Communication	• Senior Portfolios • Writing Assessment • OSU Alumni Survey • Supervised Internships	• 36 • 36 • 0 • 39
B.S., Ag Education, Ag Leadership option	• 3 AGLE 3303 hourly examinations • AGLE 2303 midterm exam	• 31 • 45
B.S., Ag Education, Teaching option	• Results from State Licensure exam – OSAT • Results from State Licensure exam – OPTE • Portfolio Submission III o Ratings of Student Teachers' Second Teaching Philosophy o Scoring of Artifact Selections for OCTP Competencies • Results from State Licensure exam – OGET	• 27 • 19 • 16 • 16 • 43
Agricultural Economics		
B.S., Agricultural Economics B.S., Agribusiness	• Academic Quiz Bowls • Case study competitions • Exit Interview	• • 3 •
M.S., Agricultural Economics	• Exit interview	•
Ph.D., Agricultural Economics	• Written preliminary examination • Exit interview	• •

Animal Science		
B.S., Animal Science	• Problem solving exercises in 4000-level production courses • Oral and Written reports in Capstone class ANSI 4863	• 38 • 71 oral reports • 91 papers
Biochemistry & Molecular Biology		
B.S., Biochemistry (through the College of Arts & Sciences) B.S., Biochemistry & Molecular Biology	• BIOC 4113 term paper • BIOC 4113 group presentations	• 27 • ~20
M.S., Biochemistry & Molecular Biology	Biennial assessment (05-07) • Thesis proposal presentation • Thesis and oral defense • Graduate Program Alumni Survey	 • 3 • 3 • 1
PhD., Biochemistry & Molecular Biology	Biennial assessment (05-07) • Thesis and oral defense • Candidacy examinations • Thesis proposal presentation • Graduate Program Alumni Survey	 • 3 • 3 • 4 • 4
Horticulture and Landscape Architecture		
B.S., Horticulture (Hort., Public Hort, & Turf Management options)	• GPA as part of the graduation check • Intercollegiate competitions • Exit Interview • HORT 2010 Internship	• 18 • 28 • 6 • 18
B.S., Landscape Contracting	• LA 4034 Capstone final presentation • Internship evaluation • Self-evaluation • Alumni survey	• 11 • 12 • 14 •

M.Ag., Horticulture M.S., Horticulture Ph.D., Crop Science, Environmental Science, Food Science, Plant Science	• Oral or poster presentations • Electronic multimedia media presentation • Written manuscripts • Thesis, dissertation or formal report • 2007 Graduate Alumni Survey	• 1 • • 2 • 0 • 6

Plant and Soil Sciences

Ph.D., Plant Science	• Proposal/defense/qualifying exam • Dissertation defense • Alumni surveys	• 2 • 0 • 0

College of Arts and Sciences

Academic Unit / Degree Program Assessed	Assessment Methods	Numbers of Individuals Assessed
Botany Department		
B.S., Botany	• Standardized national exams • Grades in required courses • BIOL 3623 grades • Personal correspondence with alumni • Graduate alumni survey	• 1 • 3 • 1 • 3 •
M.S., Botany Ph.D., Plant Science	• Progress in graduate programs • Written and oral qualifying exams • Successful completion of coursework • Thesis and dissertation defense • Departmental seminar presentation • Presentations at regional or national scientific conferences • Submission of manuscripts to peer-reviewed journals • Personal correspondence with alumni • Graduate alumni survey	• 14 • 1 • 14 • 2 • 6 • 5 • 1 • 2 •
Communication Sciences and Disorders Department		
B.S., Communication Sciences and Disorders	• Course performance • Methods course performance • Course evaluations • Senior surveys • Alumni surveys • Embedded course projects	• 12 to 24 depending on assessment method

M.S., Communication Sciences and Disorders	• Course performance • Course evaluations • Evaluation of students in practicum (internal) • Students' evaluation of practicum experiences • Comprehensive examinations • Portfolios • Exit evaluation • National Certification Exam • Student alumni surveys • Re-accreditation reviews by professional association	• 16-33 depending upon assessment method
Computer Science Department		
B.S., Computer Science	• Program learning outcome rubrics	• 301, 326, 185, 593, or 314 depending upon objective being assessed
	• Evaluations by employers	• 11
M.S., Computer Science	• M.S. milestone rubric	• 12 or 7, depending on objective being assessed
Ph.D., Computer Science	• Ph.D. milestone rubric	• 1
English Department		
B.A., English	• Instructor evaluation of graduating seniors • English Department Senior Survey • Evaluation of writing samples of graduating seniors by faculty evaluators	• 29 • 22 • 19 (academic year 06-07)
M.A., Ph.D., English	• English Dept. Survey of Graduate Student Satisfaction & Engagement • Instructor evaluation of graduate students • Evaluation of completed M.A. theses and/or Ph.D. dissertations	• 11 • 17 • 4

Foreign Languages and Literatures		
B.A. in French, German, Russian, Spanish	• Final projects for upper-division courses	• 120
	• Pass rates for state teacher certification exams	• 6
	• Alumni survey	•
Geography Department		
B.A., B.S., Geography	• Core course evaluation rubric	• 42
	• Transcript analysis of graduates	• 16
	• Undergraduate Alumni Survey	• 11
	• Exit Survey of Graduating Seniors	• 16
	• Graduation and Retention Statistics	• 16
History Department		
B.A., History	• Written artifacts	• 34
M.A. and Ph.D., History	• Written artifacts	• 36 or 19 depending upon objectives being assessed
	• Ph.D. students' written comprehensive examinations	• 4
School of Journalism and Broadcasting		
B.S. and B.A., Journalism and Broadcasting	• Undergraduate portfolios	•
	• Alumni Survey	•
	• Course evaluations	•
	• Internship employer evaluations	• 43
	• Language proficiency exam	•
M.S., Mass Communications	• Original papers	•
	• Theses or capstone projects	•
	• Graduate alumni Survey	•
Mathematics Department		
Ph.D., Math	• Comprehensive exams	• 22
	• Minor thesis	• 4

Philosophy Department		
B.A., Philosophy	• Exit questionnaire	• 6
	• Writing rubric	• 5
	• Critical thinking rubric	• 5
	• Philosophical reasoning rubric	• 5
M.A., Philosophy	• Exit questionnaire	• 2
	• Writing rubric	• 2
	• Philosophical reasoning rubric	• 2
	• Logic rubric	• 2
Psychology Department		
B.A. and B.S., Psychology	• ETS Major Field Test	• 5
	• Written artifacts	• 63
Sociology Department		
B.S., Sociology	• Written communication rubric	• 5
	• Critical thinking rubric	• 5
	• Sociological theory rubric	• 5
Theatre Department		
B.A., Theatre	• Capstone course in Directing	• 12
	• Analytical writing assignments	• 10
	• Design/Technology portfolio reviews	• 17
M.A., Theatre	• Advanced Directing course	•
	• Dramatic Theory, and Advanced Acting I and II courses	•
	• Thesis or creative component defense paper	• 2
Zoology Department		
B.S., in Biological Sciences, Zoology, and Physiology	• Grades in Evolution course	• 65
	• Student research projects	• 6
	• Exit and alumni surveys	• 142
M.S. and Ph.D., Zoology	• Defenses	• 6
	• Presentations, publications	• 33
	• Alumni surveys	• 8

Spears School of Business

Academic Unit / Degree Program Assessed	Assessment Methods	Number of Individuals Assessed
All Departments		
B.S.B.A. (Business Administration), Accounting, Agribusiness, Economics, Finance, General Business, International Business, Management, Management Information Systems, Management Science and Computer Systems, Marketing	• Ethics assessment quiz • ETS Major Field Test in Business • Individual presentations of case analyses • Written case analyses	• 86 • 74 • 56 • 56
M.S., Accounting	• Completed specialization • Completed research course • CPA Review Course "practice" exam • Oral presentations in graduate classes • Writing projects in graduate classes • Measure graduate assistantships • Measure participation as officers in Beta Alpha Psi • Evaluate performance in group/team settings • Evaluate curriculum for group/team assignments	• • • 9 • 46 • 44 • 33 • 27 • 46 •
M.B.A., Master of Business Administration	• Oral strategic analysis cases • Written case analyses • MBA 5303 comprehensive business case analysis • Educational Testing Service MBA Major Field Exam • Ethics assessment quiz • SSB satisfaction survey of current students • SSB Associates discussion and evaluation	• 26 • 20 • 20 • 83 • 50 • •

Ph.D., Business Administration	• Rating of written communication skills in dissertation proposals • Rating of oral communication skills in dissertation proposals • Documentation of professional meeting attendance • Graduate placement and advancement • Alumni satisfaction surveys • Critical success factors • Written preliminary examinations • Research methodology and quantitative methods courses • Doctoral seminars • Instructional Effectiveness Training Program • Dissertation	• 28 • 25 • 34 • • • • • • • •
M.S., Economics	• ECON 5123 Final Exam • ECON 5133 Final Exam • Creative component	• 4 • 2 • 5
Ph.D., Economics	• Dissertation proposal or defense • Analysis and reporting process for SSB strategic plan goals • Course objectives and preliminary examinations	• 1 • •
M.S., Management Information Systems	• MSIS 5653 term projects • MSIS 5643 term projects	• 24 • 27
M.S., Quantitative Financial Economics	• FIN 5883 Capstone project • FIN5223 project reports • Oral presentations	• 17 • 7 •
M.S., Telecommunications Management	• TCOM 5123 exam • Final exam from TCOM5123 • Paper from TCOM5113 and one other significant writing artifact	• • 11 • 11

College of Education

Academic Unit / Degree Program Assessed	Assessment Methods	Numbers of Individuals Assessed
School of Applied Health and Educational Psychology		
B.S., Athletic Training	• Student Clinical Education Experience and Portfolio	• 41
	• Senior Exit Interview/Survey	• 9
	• Program Practical Assessments	• 92
	• Student Clinical Self-Assessments	• 41
	• BOC Certification Exam	• 8
B.S., Physical Education	• Oklahoma General Education Test (OGET)	• 24
	• Oklahoma Subject Area Test (OSAT)	•
	• Oklahoma Professional Teaching Exam (OPTE)	• 15
	• Professional Education Portfolio	• 12
B.S. Health Promotion	• Internship Exit Interview/Survey	• 45
B.S. Leisure Studies	• Written artifacts (LEIS 2413 and 4933)	• 17
	• Class presentations (LEIS 2473 and 4480)	• 12
	• NCTRC Certification Exam (past three years)	• 23
M.S., Leisure Studies	• NCTRC or CLP examination	•
	• Student resume or portfolio	•
	• Exit interview	•
	• Post graduation survey	•
	• Courses on plan of study	•
	• Creative component	•
	• Thesis	•
Ph.D., Leisure Studies	• NCTRC or CLP examination	•
	• Student resume or portfolio	•
	• Exit interview	•
	• Post graduation survey	•
	• Comprehensive examination	•
	• Research projects and dissertation	•
	• Presentation and publication in professional settings	•
	• Teaching experiences, symposia and seminars	•

M.S., Health and Human Performance	• Thesis	• 7
Ph.D., Health, Leisure, and Human Performance	• Dissertation	• 4

School of Educational Studies

B.S., Professional Pilot, Aviation Management, and Technical Services Management	• Fundamentals of Instructing (FOI) exam	• 24 (Professional Pilot)
	• AVED 3543 oral presentation	• 22 (from 2006)
M.S., Aviation and Space Option	• AVED 5563 oral presentation	• 8
	• Creative components	• 5
Ed.D., Aviation Education	• Oral dissertation defense	•
	• AVED 6413 research reports	• 3
M.S., College Student Development, Higher Education, School Administration	• Leadership platform	• 52
	• Projects related to institutional analysis	• 25
	• Comprehensive examination	• 8 (Student Development)
	• Creative component or portfolio	• 13 (School Administration)
	• Curriculum Examination for Oklahoma Educators	• 14 (School Administration)
Ed.D., Higher Education, School Administration	• Comprehensive exam during Fall of 2nd year	• 8 (School Administration) 13 (Higher Education)
	• Qualifying written exam at end of coursework & before dissertation	• 2 (School Administration) 4 (Higher Education)
	• Prepare and defend dissertation	•

School of Teaching & Curriculum Leadership

B.S., Elementary Education	• Portfolio assessment	• 131
B.S., Secondary Education	• Portfolio assessment	• 73
B.S., Career and Technical Education	• Portfolio assessment	• 12
M.S., Teaching, Learning and Leadership	• Comprehensive exam	• 47
Ph.D., Education	• Qualifying written examinations	• 15

College of Engineering, Architecture, and Technology

Academic Unit / Degree Program Assessed	Assessment Methods	Numbers of Individuals Assessed
School of Architecture		
B.S., Architecture	• Exit interview • ARCH 4216 review • ARCH 5217 review • Alumni surveys (quadrennial) • Employer surveys (quadrennial) • PAC survey (biannual)	• 11 • 30 • 28 • 20 (Spring 06) • 18 (Spring 06) • (Spring 06)
B.S., Architectural Engineering	• Exit interview • ARCH 5226 review • Alumni surveys (quadrennial) • Employer surveys (quadrennial) • PAC survey (biannual)	• 4 • 30 • 7 (Spring 06) • 6 (Spring 06) • (Spring 06)
School of Chemical Engineering		
B.S., M.S., Ph.D., Chemical Engineering	• Exit interviews of graduates and undergraduates each semester • Alumni Survey – alternating years between graduates and undergraduates • End-of-course performance evaluation for each undergraduate CHE course, each offering • Fundamentals of Engineering national exam data • Industrial Advisory Committee annual review • Student performance in national competitions – plant design, reaction powered car, paper presentation • Student honors and awards – individual and organization • Volunteer feedback from alumni and employers • Enrollment trends • Grades in core courses • Assessment of student defense and qualifier exams • Publications quantity and quality on a per PhD basis	• • • • • • • • • • • •

School of Civil and Environmental Engineering

B.S., Civil and Environmental Engineering	• Board of visitors input	•
	• Faculty input	•
	• Student advisory board	•
	• Board of visitors review	•
	• Undergraduate alumni survey	•
	• Employer survey	•
	• Senior exit interview	•
	• Fundamentals of Engineering exam	• 24
	• Various components of student GPAs (pre-professional lab, etc.)	•
	• Capstone course evaluations	•
	• Faculty evaluations	•
	• Individual course evaluations	•
	• External evaluations of extracurricular activities	•
M.S., Civil Engineering M.S., Environmental Engineering Ph.D., Civil and Environmental Engineering	• Oral & written Examination by Committee • Graduate alumni survey	• 18 • 16

School of Electrical & Computer Engineering

B.S., Electrical & Computer Engineering	• Fundamentals of Engineering Exam	•
	• Final exams	•
	• Rubric-based grading of posters from design projects	•
	• Rubric-based evaluation of preliminary design justification presentation	•
	• Electrical & computer engineering concept inventory	•
	• Metacognitive Awareness Index	•
	• Rubric-based evaluation of written reports and oral presentations	•
	• Online validated peer evaluation	•
	• Reflection paper	•
	• Rubric-based evaluation of capstone demonstrations	•
M.S., M.E.E., Ph.D., Electrical & Computer Engineering	• Alumni survey	•

Division of Engineering Technology (B.S. in Engineering Technology)		
Construction Management Technology	• American Institute of Constructors (AIC) Level I – Associate Constructor Certification Examination	•
	• CMT 3332 – Practicum II; Employer Evaluation questions	• 47
	• Construction management competition team participation	• 21
	• 10-20 page term papers	•
Electrical Engineering Technology	• Comprehensive assessment examination in EET 4833	• 16
	• Formal presentation of group projects	• 16
	• Log book and written formal report over group projects	• 16
Fire Protection and Safety Technology		
B.S., Engineering Technology, Fire Protection and Safety	• Graduate survey	• 66
	• Faculty Course Assessment Report	•
School of Industrial Engineering and Management		
B.S., Industrial Engineering and Management	• Written samples from IEM 3103, 4113, 4413, 3503, and 3303	• 89
	• Oral presentation in capstone senior design course, IEM 4913	•
	• Written samples from IEM 2903, 4413, and 4913	•
M.S., Ph.D., Industrial Engineering & Management	• Revised MS plans of study	•
	• Written samples from IEM 5723	•
School of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering		
B.S. in Mechanical Engineering: Mechanical Engineering and Pre-Medical Option; B.S. in Aerospace Engineering	• Direct Assessment of Pos in courses 2007-2008	• 185
	• Grad/Senior Exit Survey 06-07	• 95
	• FE National Exam 06-07	• 47
	• Phone surveys of recent alums (2000 and 2004 grads)	• 90
M.S. in Mechanical Engineering	• Direct assessment by final examining committees of each student	• 27
	• Phone surveys of recent alums (2001 and 2005 grads)	• 16

College of Human Environmental Sciences

Academic Unit / Degree Program Assessed	Assessment Methods	Numbers of Individuals Assessed
College of Human Environmental Sciences		
Ph.D., Human Environmental Sciences	• Writing samples for NSCI 6453, HRAD 5813, and HES 6993 • Graduate program alumni survey • Written artifacts in qualifying exam	• 17 • 12 •
Design, Housing, & Merchandising		
B.S., Design, Housing, & Merchandising Option areas: Interior Design, Apparel Design and Production, Merchandising	• Senior Exit Survey • National Survey of Student Engagement • Design Portfolio Review • Internship Employer/ Supervisor Survey	• • 94 • 54 (Interior design) • 20 (Apparel design) • 16 (Interior design) • 72 (Apparel design)
Human Development and Family Science		
B.S., Human Development and Family Science	• Senior Exit Survey • On-site superior evaluation form	• 113 • 106
M.S., Human Development and Family Science	• HDFS 5133 research proposal • HDFS 5513 course paper • Graduate program alumni survey • HDFS 5253 presentations	• 8 • 10 • 20 • 10
Hotel & Restaurant Administration		
B.S., Hotel and Restaurant Administration	• Course homework assignments related to night audit and reconciliation of accounting activities and transactions • Written assignment related to job analysis, job description, job specification, and developing the interview questionnaire • Case study assignment • Senior Exit surveys	• • • •

2. What were the analyses and findings from the 2007-08 program outcomes assessment?

Analyses and findings are described in the individual assessment reports or report summaries submitted by each college, department, or degree program. These documents are available on the UAT website at uat.okstate.edu/assessment.

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

The uses of assessment results are described in the individual outcomes assessment reports submitted by each college, department, or degree program. The uses of assessment results are unique to each program but can generally be categorized as curricular changes, changes to academic programs or student support services, discussion of assessment information with faculty members in the context of curriculum planning, and using assessment results to evaluate curriculum changes that were recently implemented.

The most commonly cited uses of assessment results in 2007-08 were:

- Changes in course content
- Addition / deletion of courses
- Changes in course sequences
- Justification of past curriculum changes and to show program improvement resulting from those changes
- Refinement of the assessment methods or to implement new assessment methods
- Changes in advising processes
- Facilitate curriculum discussions at faculty meetings, curriculum committee meetings, and faculty retreats
- Changes to student facilities such as computer labs and science labs
- Development of tutorial and academic services for students

IV. Student Satisfaction

1. How were students selected?

Alumni surveys are conducted every year at OSU; undergraduate program alumni and graduate program alumni are surveyed in alternate years. The surveys are intended to identify institutional strengths and areas for improvement as perceived by recent graduates; to track the careers and continuing education of recent OSU graduates; and to evaluate achievement of learning outcomes as perceived by alumni from individual academic programs. The alumni surveys target alumni who are 1- and 5-years post-graduation. The surveys were historically conducted as telephone interviews; beginning in 2008 they are conducted as online surveys and as telephone interviews. The questionnaire covers employment, continued education, and general satisfaction. Also, individual academic programs may include program-specific questions in the questionnaire for their program alumni; these data are used in program outcomes assessment as well as assessing alumni satisfaction. Alumni surveys have become a cornerstone of assessment at the university-, college- and program-level by providing regular feedback from OSU graduates about their perceptions of their educational experiences at OSU and the impact of those experiences on career and personal development.

The 2008 OSU Survey of Alumni of Undergraduate Programs was conducted to provide data to gauge perceptions of various aspects of the undergraduate programs and services and to identify areas where improvements may be needed. The target population for this survey was alumni of undergraduate programs who completed their degrees in calendar years 2002 and 2006. The total of alumni in the target population was 6,861. The survey was administered as an online survey and as a telephone interview. The OSU office of University Assessment and Testing conducted the survey interviews in January through April of 2008, coordinated data collection, summarized data and prepared the reports. A total of 1407 surveys were completed online by alumni, and 1141 additional alumni participated through a telephone interview, resulting in a 37% response rate. The group of respondents included 856 alumni who had received an undergraduate degree in 2002, and 1692 who graduated in 2006.

2. What were the analyses and findings from the 2007-08 student satisfaction assessment?

OSU Alumni Surveys: 2008 Survey of Alumni of Undergraduate Programs

Results of selected survey items indicate that 94% of 2002 and 92% of 2006 undergraduate alumni are very satisfied / satisfied with their overall educational experience at OSU; 92% of both 2002 and 2006 undergraduate alumni said their graduate studies had prepared them very well or adequately for their current position.

Approximately 92% of 2002 and 84% of 2006 undergraduate alumni reported that they are employed. Most 2002 and 2006 alumni reported they are employed by large corporations (33%). Other alumni employers reported are small businesses or corporations (26%), educational institutions or organizations (18%), non-profit organizations (5.9%), federal government (5.2%), state government (4.8%), and local government (2.3%). 3.6% reported being self-employed. The median salary range for 2002 undergraduate alumni was $45,000-$54,999/year and for 2006 undergraduate alumni, $35,000-$44,999/year.

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

OSU Alumni Surveys: 2008 Survey of Alumni of Undergraduate Programs

Results of the undergraduate program alumni survey are widely distributed to faculty and administrators at the college- and university-levels. The alumni survey results have the biggest impact in guiding change at the program level, and specific program changes that have resulted from the alumni surveys are discussed in outcomes assessment reports for individual academic programs. All OSU programs have begun to use results of the annual OSU alumni surveys in the five-year academic program reviews coordinated by Academic Affairs and, where applicable, as part of professional accreditation self-studies and reports. For many academic programs, the alumni surveys coordinated by the Office of University Assessment and Testing provide an indirect method to support outcomes assessment efforts and results are regularly used in curriculum planning.

V. Graduate Student Assessment

1. Describe how many and which students were assessed, the measures used, and how students were selected.
2. What were the analyses and findings from the 2007-08 graduate student assessment?
3. What changes occurred or are planned due to graduate student assessment?

Student outcomes assessment in graduate programs is part of Program Outcomes Assessment and is reported in that section of this report. In addition, the Office of University Assessment and Testing periodically conducts a Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey, and conducts the Survey of Alumni of Graduate Programs in odd-numbered years. These university-wide assessments provide university- and program-level assessment information about graduate students.

In Spring 2008, the Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey (GSSS) was conducted to assess graduate students' satisfaction with, and perceptions about, various aspects of their academic experience - the quality of their academic program, relationships with faculty and advisors, support and resources provided by the department and the university, and interactions with the Graduate College and the Graduate and Professional Student Government Association (GPSGA). The GSSS was administered as an internet-based survey by UAT in March 2008. Surveys were completed by 1,735 of the 3,820 graduate students enrolled at the Stillwater and Tulsa campuses - a response rate of 45%.

More than 90% of students indicated they were very or generally satisfied with computing and library resources available to them. Between 85% and 90% indicated that they were satisfied or very satisfied with availability of their advisor and advisor's willingness to spend the time with them that they need, their relationships and interactions with program faculty, overall program quality, and overall experience as a graduate student. 71% were generally or very satisfied with the availability of course offerings in their program, and 68%, with research facilities, equipment and lab space.

More than 75% of respondents indicated that they were very or generally satisfied with departmental preparation and guidance for their role of teaching assistant (if applicable), and with the helpfulness of Graduate College staff. 67% of students indicated that financial support such as assistantships and scholarships were somewhat or readily available in their department; 73% of students with a graduate assistantship indicated that their financial package was adequate or somewhat adequate in meeting financial needs

4. How many students who enroll in graduate school scored below the minimum admission standard?

In the academic year 2007-08, 277 students who were provisionally admitted enrolled in OSU graduate programs. Students may be provisionally admitted for a variety of reasons including not receiving the minimum score on an admissions test (e.g., GRE), reporting a low grade point average, needing to complete prerequisite courses, etc. Applicants who are graduates of accredited colleges and universities and who have attained less than an acceptable grade-point average in all undergraduate work may be admitted provisionally or on probation on recommendation of the major department at Oklahoma State University and concurrence by the dean of the Graduate College. Alternatively, a student who has been in full graduate standing or special student status may be placed on probation or continued provisionally if academic performance in courses taken in graduate status at Oklahoma State University falls below a "B" average. Students with acceptable academic records but without the background necessary for a particular degree program may also be admitted provisionally. Students admitted provisionally or on a probationary basis may be granted full graduate standing after performing at an acceptable academic level. Failure to meet required academic levels while in a probationary status will result in dismissal from the Graduate College.