

Oklahoma State University

Assessment Report 2008-2009



Submitted to
The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
December 4th, 2009

Jeremy Penn, Ph.D.
Director
University Assessment and Testing
107 UAT Building
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK 74078-6043
405-744-6687
jeremy.penn@okstate.edu
<http://uat.okstate.edu>

I. 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.

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

2. All enrolled new students (new freshmen and transfer students with fewer than 24 credit hours) are assessed using a combination of the measures described in I-1. Each student receives a Student Assessment Report that summarizes:

- The student's academic summary (ACT scores, high school GPA, high school class rank)
- The student's ELPA results
- The curricular and performance deficiencies that require remediation, and
- The recommendations and requirements for course placement based on OSU's guidelines as approved by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

Reports are produced by the Office of Institutional Research and Information Management and are distributed to students by the New Student Orientation Office. Reports are also included in each student's file and are available to advisors. The assessment process is implemented immediately prior to the spring and fall enrollment periods.

3. The process and measures used in entry-level testing are described in detail. Students identified with skill deficiencies through this process are required to complete remedial courses within the first 24 hours of college credit.

ACT Scores

ACT subscores in Reading, English, Mathematics, and Science Reasoning of 19 or above (or SAT equivalent where available) automatically qualify students for college-level coursework (1000-level) in that subject area. The ACT subscore in Reading is also used to indicate readiness for introductory college courses that require extensive reading (Sociology, Political Science, Psychology, History, Economics, and Philosophy).

ELPA

ELPA is a multiple regression model that uses high school grades (overall and by subject), high school class rank, and ACT composite and subject area scores to predict student grades in selected entry-level OSU courses. The ELPA model is based on the success of past OSU freshmen with similar academic records and is updated regularly.



ELPA produces a predicted grade index (PGI) for each student that represents the grade the student is predicted to obtain in selected entry-level courses. A PGI of 2.0 or higher indicates that the student has a 70% chance of making a 'C' or better. PGI scores are used in combination with ACT score (when the ACT score is below 19) and students' grades to make decisions about appropriate course placement.

English. UNIV 0133 is required when the English ACT is below 14 or the English ACT is between 14 and 18 and the English PGI is below 2.0.

Math. If the student's PGI is 2.0 or above and high school math grade point average is 3.0 or above, then there are no enrollment restrictions. If the student's PGI is below 2.0 and high school grade point average is below 3.0, then UNIV 0023 or UNIV 0123 is required.

Science. If the student's ACT is less than 19 and the PGI is greater than 2.0, then there are no enrollment restrictions. If the student's ACT is less than 19 and the PGI is below 2.0, then UNIV 0113 is required. Students may have the science deficiency removed by completing remedial math and/or reading courses (if required).

Reading. For courses that require extensive reading, if the student's ACT is below 19 but the PGI is greater than 2.0, then there are no enrollment restrictions. If the PGI is below 2.0 then UNIV 0143 is required.

COMPASS

Students identified as having curricular deficiencies in a particular subject area may choose to take the ACT COMPASS placement test to qualify for college-level courses. The COMPASS tests are provided free of charge to students at the OSU Testing Center and can also be completed at NOC-Stillwater, NOC-Tonkawa, NOC-Enid, OSU-OKC, and OSU-Tulsa. COMPASS tests are available in Mathematics, Reading and English. Qualification for 1000-level science courses is obtained through receipt of passing scores on both the Reading and Mathematics subject tests. Cut scores for the COMPASS test 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 (or related courses)	Reading 0-70	UNIV 0143 or CIED 1230 required
	Reading 71-100	No restrictions
Science (Biology, Chemistry, Geography, Geology, and Physics)	Reading 0-70 <i>or</i> Algebra 0-54	UNIV 0113 required
	Reading 71-100 <i>and</i> Algebra 55-100	No restrictions

Educational Readiness

Other elements of entry-level assessment, including evaluation of educational readiness, educational goals, study skills, values, self-concept and motivation are managed through the advising process.

Resources

Many resources are available to students for academic support. *University Academic Services (UAS)* offers free tutoring services. The *Math Learning Resource Center* provides individual tutoring in mathematics. The *Writing Center* provides tutors, writing coaches, a grammar hotline, and other assistance. *University Counseling* provides services to help students improve their study habits, deal with test anxiety, develop better time management skills, and explore careers. Many colleges offer additional resources such as tutoring in science, technology, and math courses, transition programs, and other academic resources.

4. In 2008-2009, a total of 3,470 admitted and enrolled students with fewer than 24 credit hours were assessed using the entry-level assessment process. Table I.2 shows the number of enrolled students who had performance deficiencies in each subject area based on ACT scores and the number of students who were cleared for college-level coursework using ELPA.



Table I.2. Number of enrolled new students with ACT scores below 19 in each subject area and the number of students who were cleared for college-level coursework by ELPA in 2008-2009.

Subject Area	# of Students with ACT sub-scores <19*	# of Students cleared for college-level coursework by ELPA
English	269	215
Mathematics	470	267
Reading	238	193
Science	143	80

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

*The following numbers of students were missing ACT subscores in these subject areas:

English: 58, mathematics: 57, reading: 58, science: 281.

Students who were not cleared for college-level coursework using ELPA could choose to take a COMPASS placement exam in the area(s) of deficiency. The number of students who took the COMPASS test in each subject area and the number of students who passed are shown in Table I.3.

Table I.3. Number of students who took COMPASS tests for 2008-2009 placement.

Subject Area	# of Enrolled Students who took a COMPASS test*	# of Students who passed COMPASS and were cleared for college-level coursework
English	9	8
Mathematics	21	1
Reading	12	11

*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 assessment was completed, 235 students (6.8% of the total new enrolled) were required to take at least one remedial course. Of the 3,470 new students in 2008-2009, 39 (1.1%) were required to enroll in remedial English classes, 180 (5.2%) in remedial math classes, 56 (1.6%) in remedial science classes, and 30 (0.9%) in remedial reading classes. Some students who were required to complete remedial classes satisfied the requirement with transfer courses. For this reason the number of students who completed remedial courses may differ from the number of students required to do so.

5. Annual trends in grades, drops, withdrawals, and failure rates in common freshmen courses are monitored by Institutional Research and Information Management and University Academic Services. Results from the tracking process are shared each semester with the Directors of Student Academic Services and the Instruction Council.



The Office of University Assessment and Testing and the Office of Institutional Research and Information Management work cooperatively to evaluate the entry-level assessment process and to track student success in remedial and college-level courses.

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

The Directors of Student Academic Services reviewed the cut-scores and determined that no changes were needed in 2008-2009. No changes were made to the entry-level assessment procedures or to COMPASS testing in 2008-2009. For 2009-2010, students who have an ACT MATH score below 19 and who score less than 55 on the Algebra score in COMPASS will be required to take UNIV 0023 or 0123 based on their ACT Math score (17 or below will be required to take UNIV 0023).

7. Two additional studies of entry-level students were performed in 2008-2009: the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) and the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). The NSSE, while not a traditional entry-level measure, does ask first-year students questions about their level of engagement in educationally enriching activities.

8. Detailed information about the CIRP results can be located on the UAT website (<http://uat.okstate.edu/assessment/surveys/student/cirp/2008/index.html>). OSU freshmen were more likely than freshmen students at peer institutions to predict a “very good chance” of participating in student government, student clubs or groups, and volunteer or community service work. OSU freshmen were also more likely than freshmen students at peer institutions to take notes during class, vote in student elections, perform community service as part of class, attend school within 100 miles of their hometown, have higher high school grades, and be attending their first choice of college.

Detailed information about the NSSE results can be located on the UAT website (<http://uat.okstate.edu/assessment/surveys/student/nsse/2009/index.html>). All five of OSU’s NSSE benchmarks for first-year students were significantly higher than they were in 2005 and two of the benchmarks (Student-Faculty Interaction and Supportive Campus Environment) were significantly higher than the average score at participating doctoral / research institutions.

9. The primary purpose of entry-level assessment is to place students in the courses that are most likely to lead to student success. Entry-level assessment data are monitored to ensure these course placement decisions are accurate and appropriate. The NSSE and CIRP data are being discussed and shared with colleges and departments throughout this year and may lead to additional instructional changes.



II. General Education Assessment

1. General education at Oklahoma State University is intended to:

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

Three approaches are used to evaluate the general education program: Institutional Portfolios, Review of General Education Course Database, and college-, department-, and program-level approaches.

Institutional Portfolios

Institutional portfolios provide direct evidence of student achievement of the overall goals of general education. Institutional portfolios have been developed in five areas that represent the overall goals of the general education program: written communication (B and C), critical thinking (D), math problem solving (D), science problem solving (D), and diversity (E and F). Goal A is not directly assessed through the use of institutional portfolios but is included as a component of program outcomes assessment. Although these rubrics can be directly linked to each of the overall goals, it is recognized that these goals cannot be achieved independently of each other or through completion of only courses with general education designations. For this reason the Institutional Portfolios contain artifacts from general education designated courses and other courses across campus that address one or more of the general education goals.

Review of General Education Course Database

The General Education Advisory Council (GEAC) periodically evaluates every general education course to ensure alignment with the goals of the general education program. As part of this certification process instructors identify which general education goals are associated with the course, describe the course activities that provide students the opportunity to achieve the goals, and explain how student achievement of the goals is assessed within the course. This process provides oversight for courses receiving the general education designations and ensures students have sufficient opportunity to achieve the goals of the general education program.

College-, Department-, and Program-level Approaches

Many colleges, departments, and programs include elements from the general education goals in their own assessment efforts. For example, a program may assess students' ability to write a research paper relevant to the discipline. This integrates



elements from the general education program (e.g., written communication) with elements from the discipline and provides additional information on student achievement of this important goal. Colleges and departments may also incorporate elements of the general education goals into their ongoing assessment processes.

2. Institutional Portfolios

Since 2001 OSU has collected samples of student work that represent student achievement of the general education goals from courses across campus. These student work samples are then assessed by a panel of faculty members using rubrics. The results from this process provide direct evidence of student achievement of the general education goals.

To make the best use of limited resources institutional portfolios are not collected in every area every year. Table II.1 shows the years each area was assessed (four were assessed in 2009: written communication, critical thinking, science problem solving, and diversity).

Portfolio area	Years assessed
Written communication	2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2008, 2009
Math problem solving	2002, 2003, 2005
Science problem solving	2003, 2004, 2005, 2007, 2009
Critical thinking	2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009
Diversity	2007, 2008, 2009

Once courses with suitable assignments are identified, student papers are sampled randomly. Since the purpose of general education assessment is to improve the general education program and not to evaluate individual students, all identifying information is removed to protect student anonymity.

Review of General Education Course Database

Each course with a general education designation is reviewed every three years.

College-, Department-, and Program-level Approaches

College-, department-, and program-approaches to assessing general education goals are included in the program outcomes assessment portion of this report.

3. Institutional Portfolios

Since the institutional portfolio process is integrated within existing courses, students are motivated to provide their best work as required by the demands of the course. Students receive feedback on that work from the course instructor.

Review of General Education Course Database



The database review process does not directly involve students. Instructors are motivated to provide accurate and complete information since failure to do so could result in loss of the general education designation.

College-, Department-, and Program-level Approaches

College-, department-, and program-approaches to assessing general education goals are reported in the program outcomes assessment portion of this report.

4. Assessment data from the general education assessment process are used in three ways:

- A. To implement improvement initiatives
- B. To monitor recent curricular changes
- C. To consider and discuss additional modifications to the general education program

A. In response to data on student achievement of the general education goals, in the spring of 2008 faculty members Rebecca Damron and Karen High proposed the development of a series of workshops for faculty members on teaching and assessing critical thinking. Recognizing a need to improve in multiple areas, the Provost's Office, the Office of University Assessment, the General Education Assessment Committee, and the Institute for Teaching and Learning Excellence collaborated to implement the *Provost's Faculty Development Initiative: Focus on General Education*.

The purpose of the initiative is to develop faculty members' expertise in teaching and assessing the general education learning goal, in integrating the general education learning goal into existing courses, and in creating high quality assignments that demonstrate students' achievement of the general education goal.

The initiative is implemented by trained facilitators who run two workshops for participants in the fall and a follow-up workshop in the spring semester. Upon successful completion of the workshop series and submission of artifacts from the improved course, faculty members are paid a small stipend. In 2008-2009 workshop series were available in the areas of writing, critical thinking, and diversity. The initiative is underway in 2009-2010 with workshop series available in the same three general education goal areas.

Discussions on implementation of a phase-2 initiative, which would encourage additional participation from faculty members across campus and develop even higher level assignments, are underway.

B. Assessment data from the general education assessment process are used to monitor recent changes to the general education program. For a number of years data from the general education process highlighted a need to improve student writing. In response the general education designation requirements were changed to increase the amount of writing required in courses receiving general education designations. The



phase-in period for the change in writing requirements is now ending and general education assessment data are used to monitor the success of that curricular change.

C. Assessment data from the general education assessment process are shared broadly internally and publicly (http://uat.okstate.edu/assessment/assessment_at_osu/gened/genedreports.htm) to encourage discussion and consideration of additional curricular changes that may result in improvement to the general education assessment program and to student achievement of the general education goals. One example of a local process to discuss possible changes is the joint meeting of three committees (General Education Assessment Committee, General Education Advisory Council, and Assessment and Academic Improvement Council) to discuss assessment results, consider needed changes, and provide recommendations for improvement.

4 (Analyses and Findings). Individual student progress is not tracked as part of the general education assessment process. The purpose of general education assessment process is to assess and improve the general education program – not to evaluate individual students, faculty members, or courses. However, because institutional portfolios are collected regularly the process does allow OSU to detect changes in student achievement of the general education goals over time.

5. Institutional Portfolios – Critical Thinking

155 samples of student work were assessed by a panel of faculty members using a rubric developed and approved by OSU faculty members. The critical thinking rubric has four required characteristics (identification of the problem, presentation of the student's own perspective and position, use of supporting data / evidence, and discussion of conclusions, implications and consequences) and three optional characteristics (consideration of other salient perspectives, assessment of assumptions and validity of supporting / background information, and consideration of context of the issue). Each characteristic is scored on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is low and 5 is high (the rubric is available online:

http://uat.okstate.edu/assessment/assessment_at_osu/gened/rubrics/documents/5-9-08CriticalThinkingRubric.pdf).

119 samples (77%) were scored as a '3' or above and only 1 sample (0.6%) received a score of '1.' The average of all scores was 2.94 which is the highest average score obtained on the critical thinking portfolio to date.

Institutional Portfolios – Written Communication

146 samples of student work were assessed by a panel of faculty members using a rubric developed and approved by OSU faculty members. The writing rubric has four required characteristics (content, organization, style and mechanics, and documentation). Each characteristic is scored on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is low and 5 is high (the rubric is available online:



http://uat.okstate.edu/assessment/assessment_at_osu/gened/rubrics/documents/5-14-08_writing_rubric.pdf).

87 samples (60%) were scored as a '3' or above and 2 samples (1.4%) received a score of '1.' The average was 2.77 which is higher than the 2008 average of 2.43 but lower than the 2006 average of 3.03.

Institutional Portfolios – Science Problem Solving

88 samples of student work were assessed by a panel of faculty members using a rubric developed and approved by OSU faculty members. The science problem solving rubric has six characteristics (understanding the problem, use of terms and symbols, calculations and data presentation, solution and graphical data interpretation, answers and conclusions, and evidence of higher level thinking). Each characteristic is scored on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is low and 5 is high (the rubric is available online: http://uat.okstate.edu/assessment/assessment_at_osu/gened/rubrics/12-7-07_Science_rubric.pdf).

46 samples (52%) were scored as a '3' or above and 9 samples (10.2%) received a score of '1.' The average was 2.59 which is lower than the overall average for 2003-2005 and 2007 of 2.74.

Institutional Portfolios – Diversity

71 samples of student work were assessed by a panel of faculty members using a rubric developed and approved by OSU faculty members. The diversity rubric has four characteristics (conceptual understanding, values diversity, knowledge of historical context, and sources of understanding, value, and knowledge). Each characteristic is scored on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is low and 5 is high (the rubric is available online: http://uat.okstate.edu/assessment/assessment_at_osu/gened/rubrics/Diversity_Rubric_Dec_2007.pdf).

42 samples (59%) were scored as a '3' or above and 12 samples (17%) received a score of '1.' The average was 2.66 which is larger than the 2007 average of 2.33 but smaller than the 2008 average of 3.16.

Use of Findings

In response to these findings, the institution has decided to continue to fund the *Provost's Faculty Development Initiative: Focus on General Education* in 2009-2010. In addition, a small group of faculty and staff members is being formed to further study the critical thinking findings and to identify possible approaches the institution may use to improve the results. OSU is also engaged in a number of initiatives to improve students' diversity scores (<http://diversity.okstate.edu/>).

All results will be shared with faculty members and relevant councils and committees at OSU and publicly on the OSU general education assessment website



(http://uat.okstate.edu/assessment/assessment_at_osu/gened/index.html). Additional discussions about how to respond to results and take steps to improve will be held during the sharing of results.



III. Program Outcomes Assessment

1. Table III.1 summarizes the assessment methods and number of individuals who participated in each assessment method for undergraduate degree programs at OSU. Detailed reports for each program can be obtained on the program outcomes assessment website

(http://uat.okstate.edu/assessment/annual_reports/annual_report_instructions.html).

Note that students may have participated in more than one assessment method and some assessment methods may overlap between two degree programs.



Table III.1. Undergraduate Program Outcomes Assessment
College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources

Degree Program	Assessment Methods	Number Assessed
<i>Department of Agricultural Economics</i>		
Agribusiness, B.S.	Student assignments	18
	Student assignments	18
	Exit interview	18
Agricultural Economics, B.S.	Student assignments	18
	Student assignments	18
	Exit interview	18
<i>Department of Agricultural Education, Communication, and Leadership</i>		
Agricultural Communications, B.S.	Portfolios	23
	Portfolios	23
	Internship evaluations	21
Agricultural Education, B.S.	Licensure test	29
	Licensure test	31
	Portfolios	24
Agricultural Leadership, B.S.	Focus group	8
	External review of portfolios	10
	Internship evaluations	8
<i>Department of Animal Science</i>		
Animal Science, B.S.	Subject matter exam	69
	Student projects	29
	Oral and written research reports	168
Food Science, B.S.	Subject matter exam	69
	Student projects	29
	Oral and written research reports	168
<i>Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology</i>		
Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, B.S.	Course term paper	22
	Course term paper	22
	Standardized exam	46
	Alumni survey	30
<i>Department of Entomology and Plant Pathology</i>		
Entomology, B.S.	Student assignments	1
	Exit interview and survey	1
	Content area test	1
<i>Department of Horticulture and Landscape Architecture</i>		
Horticulture, B.S.	Grade point average	9
	Exit interviews	5
	Internship evaluations	5
Landscape Architecture, BLA	Professional portfolio	All 5th-year
	Capstone course project	14



Degree Program	Assessment Methods	Number Assessed
	Course projects	All in course
Landscape Contracting, B.S.	Internship evaluation	11
	Student self-evaluation	10
	Alumni survey	10
<i>Department of Plant and Soil Science</i>		
Plant and Soil Science, B.S.	Student exam	8
	Student assignments	15
	Student writing samples	20



Table III.1. Undergraduate Program Outcomes Assessment (continued)
College of Arts and Sciences

Degree Program	Assessment Methods	Number Assessed
<i>Department of Computer Science</i>		
Computer Science, B.S.	Rubric evaluation of student projects	272
	Internship evaluations	6
	Student portfolios	113
	Rubric evaluation of student papers	186
	Rubric evaluation of student papers	356
<i>Department of Art</i>		
Art, BFA	External review of portfolios	11
<i>Department of English</i>		
English, B.A.	Faculty evaluation of students w/ rubric	31
	Assessment of student papers	22
	Senior survey	34
<i>Department of Foreign Languages and Literature</i>		
French, B.A.	Final projects	17
	Standardized test	2
	Alumni survey	Not reported
German, B.A.	Final projects	10
	Standardized test	Not reported
	Alumni survey	Not reported
Russian Language and Literature, B.A.	Final projects	3
	Standardized test	Not reported
	Alumni survey	Not reported
Spanish, B.A.	Final projects	116
	Licensure test	6
	Alumni survey	Not reported
<i>Department of Geography</i>		
Geography, B.A., B.S.	Transcript analysis	22
	Faculty evaluation of students w/ rubric	62
	Exit survey	22
<i>Department of History</i>		
American Studies, B.S.	Panel review of Student papers	11
	Panel review of student papers	11
	Panel review of student papers	11
History, B.A.	Panel review of Student papers	20
	Panel review of Student papers	20
	Panel review of student papers	20
<i>Department of Mathematics</i>		
Mathematics, B.A., B.S.	Panel review of student papers	20
	Panel review of student papers	20
	Panel review of student papers	20



<i>Department of Music</i>		
Music, B.A., B.M.	Student exam	Not reported
	Juried performance	Not reported
	Internships	Not reported
<i>Department of Political Science</i>		
Political Science, B.A., B.S.	Capstone project	Not reported
	Standardized test	Not reported
	Student research paper	Not reported
<i>Department of Sociology</i>		
Sociology, B.S.	Panel review of student papers	19
	Panel review of student papers	19
	Panel review of student papers	19
<i>Department of Statistics</i>		
Statistics, B.S.	Student survey	19
<i>Department of Zoology</i>		
Physiology, B.S.	Student exam	79
	Panel review of student projects	31
	Panel review of student projects	14
Zoology, B.S.	Student exam	79
	Panel review of student projects	31
	Panel review of student projects	14



Table III.1. Undergraduate Program Outcomes Assessment (continued)

College of Education

Degree Program	Assessment Methods	Number Assessed
<i>School of Applied Health and Educational Psychology</i>		
Athletic Training, B.S.	Portfolio	16
	Clinical experience	16
	Exit interview	16
	Oral presentation	16
	Licensure examination	8
Health Education and Promotion, B.S.	Internship evaluation survey	27
Leisure Studies, B.S.	Alumni survey	16
	Exit interviews	9
	Internship evaluations	14
	Certification exam	Not reported
Physical Education, B.S.	Licensure test	18
	Portfolio	25
<i>Department of Educational Studies</i>		
Aviation Sciences, B.S.	Licensure test	21
	Oral presentations	33
<i>Department of Teaching and Curriculum Leadership</i>		
Career and Technical Education, B.S.	Portfolio	4
	Student reports	4
Elementary Education, B.S.	Portfolio	111
Secondary Education, B.S.	Portfolio	84



Table III.1. Undergraduate Program Outcomes Assessment (continued)
College of Engineering, Architecture, and Technology

Degree Program	Assessment Methods	Number Assessed
<i>Department of Architecture</i>		
Architecture, BAR	Exit interview	19
	Oral presentations	30
	Student projects	28
<i>Department of Biosystems and Ag Engineering</i>		
Biosystems Engineering, B.S.	Licensure test	9
	Panel review of student projects	6
	Panel review of student projects	6
<i>Department of Chemical Engineering</i>		
Chemical Engineering, B.S.	Licensure test	Not reported
	Student projects	Not reported
	Student papers	Not reported
<i>Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering</i>		
Civil Engineering, B.S.	Licensure test	23
	Exit survey	33
	Oral presentation	30
	Employer survey	30
	Faculty review of student achievement	40
<i>Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering</i>		
Electrical Engineering, B.S.	Licensure test	18
	Student project	7
	Student project	26
	Oral presentations	16
	Capstone project	18
<i>Department of Engineering Technology</i>		
Construction Management Technology, B.S.	Licensure test	41
	Internship evaluation	38
	Practicum evaluation	38
Electrical Engineering Technology, B.S.	Panel review of Student papers	20
	Panel review of student projects	20
	Student project	20
Fire Protection and Safety Technology, B.S.	Alumni survey	36
	Student projects	Not reported
	Exit interview	22
Mechanical Engineering Technology, B.S.	Student exam	39
	Oral presentations	39
	Student exam	39
<i>Department of Industrial Engineering and Management</i>		
Industrial Engineering and	Student exam	73



Degree Program	Assessment Methods	Number Assessed
Management, B.S.	Student projects	23
	Student projects	17
<i>Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering</i>		
Aerospace Engineering, B.S.	Student project	185
	Licensure exam	48
	Exit survey	96
Mechanical Engineering, B.S.	Student project	185
	Licensure exam	48
	Exit survey	96



Table III.1. Undergraduate Program Outcomes Assessment (continued)
College of Human Environmental Sciences

Degree Program	Assessment Methods	Number Assessed
<i>Department of Design, Housing and Merchandising</i>		
Design, Housing and Merchandising, B.S.	Admissions portfolio	21
	Exit survey	77
	Internship evaluation	67
<i>Department of Hotel and Restaurant Administration</i>		
Hotel and Restaurant Administration, B.S.	Internship evaluation	23
	Student paper	23
	Student projects	23
<i>Department of Human Development and Family Sciences</i>		
Human Development and Family Sciences, B.S.	Exit survey	68
	Internship evaluation	90
	Internship evaluation	90
	Student paper	81
	Survey	39



Table III.1. Undergraduate Program Outcomes Assessment (continued)
William S. Spears School of Business

Degree Program	Assessment Methods	Number Assessed
<i>Department of Business Administration</i>		
Business Administration, B.S., B.A.	Student exam	197
	Standardized test	46
	Capstone project	40
	Panel review of student papers	40

2. Undergraduate program outcomes assessment is implemented at the program level. Full details on each program’s analysis of student learning and findings are available online (http://uat.okstate.edu/assessment/annual_reports/annual_report_instructions.html).

OSU, through the process for awarding of more than \$100,000 in assessment funds (http://uat.okstate.edu/assessment/budget_requests/index.html) for program outcomes assessment and through feedback provided to programs by the College Assessment Coordinators and the Director of Assessment and Testing, has been working to move programs toward direct measures of student learning and toward assessment processes with a high likelihood of resulting in program improvement. Program outcomes assessment is also a critical component of each program’s 5-year Academic Program Review. As reported in III-3, program outcomes assessment has resulted in numerous program improvements.

Undergraduate and graduate programs reported 439 assessment methods implemented for program outcomes assessment. The most commonly reported assessment methods were:

- Faculty or external review of student projects (72 reports, 16% of the total)
- Standardized, licensure, certification, or local exams (60 reports, 14% of the total)
- Faculty or external review of student papers (58 reports, 13% of the total)
- Faculty or external review of oral presentations (38 reports, 9% of the total)

Other methods used included portfolios, comprehensive or qualifying exams, review of theses, dissertations, and creative components, surveys of alumni and employers, internship evaluation, and other performance assessments.

3. Undergraduate and graduate programs reported 348 uses of program outcomes assessment data (uses may represent more than one assessment method).

The most common use of program outcomes assessment data was to monitor and ensure student achievement of the learning outcome. Other common uses include:

- Improvements to the assessment process (76 uses, 22% of the total)
- Changes to courses (53 uses, 15% of the total)
- Discussion and consideration of improvements (53 uses, 15% of the total)



- Changes to the curriculum (35 uses, 10% of the total)
- Creation of new courses (10 uses, 3% of the total)
- Various other uses including changes to advising, hiring decisions, communication with students, facilities and labs, and examination of program resources (38 uses, 10% of the total)

The large number of uses of program outcomes assessment demonstrates that it is an integral and essential element of OSU's commitment to improving student learning.



IV. Student Satisfaction

1. Surveys of alumni are conducted every year – surveys of alumni from undergraduate programs are conducted in even numbered years and surveys of alumni from graduate programs are conducted in odd numbered years. Current graduate students' satisfaction is surveyed in even numbered years (last completed in spring, 2008).

Alumni surveys are intended to identify institutional strengths and areas for improvement, to track careers and continuing education of recent graduates, and to provide programs with specific information about their alumni. Each undergraduate and graduate program is asked to submit a list of program-specific questions to be included in the alumni surveys. Participants for the alumni surveys are all students who graduated 1- and 5- years ago. The surveys are conducted online and through use of a phone bank staffed by current undergraduate students.

All alumni who graduated 1- and 5-years ago are contacted for participation in the survey. Contact information is collected from the Alumni Association, the Office of Institutional Research and Information Management, and the OSU Foundation. Alumni are contacted through the mail, through email (when a current email address is available), and over the phone.

The 2009 Survey of Alumni of Graduate Programs targeted individuals who graduated from a graduate degree program in 2003 and 2007. 2,176 alumni were contacted for participation and 989 surveys were completed for a response rate of 45%.

OSU also administered the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) in 2009. 6,466 OSU first-year and senior students were contacted for participation in the 2009 NSSE. A total of 1,414 first-year or senior students completed the NSSE for a response rate of 22%.

2. 88% of respondents on the 2009 Survey of Alumni of Graduate Programs reported they were “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with their overall educational experience at OSU. Only 4% of respondents were “dissatisfied” or “very dissatisfied” with their overall educational experience at OSU.

55% of the respondents were residents of Oklahoma.

92% of respondents reported current employment. Educational institutions (37%) were the largest employer of graduates. The most frequently reported salary was in the range of \$75,000-\$99,000 per year. 93% of respondents found their OSU education had prepared them “very well” or “adequately” for their current position.



Of the alumni who pursued additional education, 53% of them enrolled at OSU. 89% of respondents found their OSU education had prepared them “very well” or “adequately” for their continued education.

Each graduate program was asked to submit a set of questions in addition to those described above. The program-specific questions covered many topics, depending on the interest area of each program, including advising, student learning outcomes, teaching skills, time-to-degree, satisfaction with specific courses or program components, strengths and weaknesses of the program, suggested curricular changes, and other satisfaction topics. Results of the program-specific questions were summarized and shared with programs. It is not possible to summarize the results of the program-specific questions here because the questions were different for each program.

Detailed information on the 2009 NSSE results can be located on the UAT website (<http://uat.okstate.edu/assessment/surveys/student/nsse/2009/index.html>). Items related to student satisfaction showed 94% of first-year respondents and 86% of senior respondents rated their entire educational experience at OSU as “good” or “excellent.” 90% of first-year respondents and 86% of senior respondents would “probably” or “definitely” attend OSU again if they could start over – a result that was significantly higher than the average score for participating doctoral / research extensive universities.

3. The results from the 2009 Survey of Alumni from Graduate Programs were distributed widely on campus and shared publicly online (<http://uat.okstate.edu/assessment/surveys/alumni/2009/index.html>). Overall, the results continue to be very positive and show graduate alumni are generally very satisfied with their educational experience at OSU.

Although there continue to be conversations about the data from the 2009 Survey of Alumni from Graduate Programs at the institution level, programs are the primary users of the data. One way all programs use the alumni survey data is in the development of their 5-year Academic Program Review (APR) report. The APR reports require programs consider and reflect upon results from alumni surveys when developing recommendations for improvement and future plans.

Although programs are encouraged to use direct measures of student achievement as the primary source of information in program outcomes assessment, graduate and undergraduate programs may also use the alumni survey data as an element of their program outcomes assessment process. Uses of the alumni survey data for program outcomes assessment purposes are described in the undergraduate and graduate program outcomes assessment sections respectively.



The NSSE results were shared with faculty and staff members across campus and were shared publicly on the UAT website and as part of *USA Today's* NSSE report. A workshop open to the campus community on the results was held in November. College-level results will be shared with representatives from each college to discuss possible improvement strategies.

Continuation of the *Provost's Faculty Development Initiative: Focus on General Education* and the planned formation of a critical thinking study group are two approaches OSU is taking to respond to assessment data (these two activities were described in the General Education Assessment section).



V. Graduate Student Assessment

1. The primary method for assessing graduate students' achievement of learning outcomes is program outcomes assessment. Table V.1 reports the measures used and the number of students assessed with each measure for the graduate programs.

Table V.1. Graduate Program Outcomes Assessment
College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources

Degree Program	Assessment Methods	Number Assessed
<i>Department of Agricultural Economics</i>		
Ag Education / Ag Business, MAG	Course rubric	Not reported
	Course rubric	Not reported
	Exit interview	Not reported
Agricultural Economics, M.S.	Course rubric	Not reported
	Course rubric	Not reported
	Exit interview	Not reported
Agricultural Economics, Ph.D.	Preliminary examination	2
	Dissertation defense rubric	2
	Exit interview	2
<i>Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology</i>		
Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, M.S.	Faculty evaluation of students	5
	Thesis defense evaluations	5
	Faculty evaluation of students	5
Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Ph.D.	Faculty evaluation of students	5
	Thesis defense evaluations	5
	Qualifying examinations	3
<i>Department of Entomology and Plant Pathology</i>		
Entomology and Plant Pathology, MAG	Seminar projects	3
	Thesis defense	1
	Exit interviews and survey	1
Entomology, Ph.D.	Seminar projects	3
	Dissertation defense rubric	2
	Exit interview survey	1
Entomology and Plant Pathology, M.S.	Seminar projects	3
	Thesis defense	1
	Exit interview survey	Not reported
<i>Department of Horticulture and Landscape Architecture</i>		
Horticulture and Landscape Architecture, M.S.	Oral seminar presentations	2
	Thesis evaluation	2
	Alumni survey	0
<i>Department of Plant and Soil Science</i>		
Crop Science, Ph.D.	Dissertation defense	2



Degree Program	Assessment Methods	Number Assessed
Plant and Soil Science, M.S.	Dissertation evaluation	2
	Oral presentation	2
	Thesis evaluation	6
	Oral presentations	6
	Faculty evaluation of students	6
<i>Multidisciplinary</i>		
Plant Science, Ph.D.	Dissertation proposal defense	3
	Qualifying exam	3
	Dissertation defense	3
<i>Department of Natural Resources, Ecology, and Management</i>		
Natural Resources, Ecology, and Management, M.S.	Thesis evaluation	8
	Alumni survey	Not reported



Table V.1. Graduate Program Outcomes Assessment (continued)**College of Arts and Sciences**

Degree Program	Assessment Methods	Number Assessed
<i>Department of English</i>		
English, M.A.	Faculty evaluation of students	11
	Faculty evaluation of students	9
	Exit survey	12
English, Ph.D.	Faculty evaluation of students	11 (includes M.S.)
	Faculty evaluation of students	9 (includes M.S.)
	Dissertation defense	4
<i>Department of Geography</i>		
Geography, M.S., Ph.D.	Rubric evaluation of student papers	9
	Course projects	9
	Course projects	9
<i>Department of History</i>		
History, M.A.	Panel review of student papers	25
	Panel review of student papers	25
	Panel review of student papers	25
History, Ph.D.	Panel review of student papers	25 (includes M.A.)
	Panel review of student papers	25 (includes M.A.)
	Comprehensive exams	5
<i>Department of Mathematics</i>		
Mathematics, M.S.	Master's thesis	6
	Master's thesis	6
	Oral presentation	6
Mathematics, Ph.D.	Comprehensive exams	10
	Dissertation	2
	Oral presentation	2
<i>Department of Music</i>		
Pedagogy and Performance, M.M.	Placement exam	2
	Qualifying exam	11
	Final oral exam	4
	Student recital	4
	Final degree paper	4
<i>Department of Political Science</i>		
Political Science, M.A.	Comprehensive exams	7
	Thesis review	4
<i>Department of Sociology</i>		
Sociology, M.S.	Panel review of student papers	3
	Panel review of student papers	3
Sociology, Ph.D.	Preliminary examination	8
	Preliminary examination	8



	Preliminary examination	8
<i>Department of Statistics</i>		
Statistics, M.S.	Comprehensive exam	5
	Oral presentations	2
	Student projects	3
Statistics, Ph.D.	Preliminary examination	2
	Oral presentations	2
	Qualifying examinations	2
<i>Department of Zoology</i>		
Zoology, M.S.	Comprehensive exam	2
	Thesis defense	2
	Submission of articles	9
Zoology, Ph.D.	Comprehensive exam	3
	Dissertation defense rubric	1
	Submission of articles	2



Table V.1. Graduate Program Outcomes Assessment (continued)**College of Education**

Degree Program	Assessment Methods	Number Assessed
<i>School of Applied Health and Educational Psychology</i>		
Counseling, M.S.	Faculty evaluation of students	87
	Certification exam	2
	Alumni survey	10
Education Specialist, Ed.S.	Licensure test	5
	Portfolios	11
	Student projects	3
Educational Psychology, M.S.	Alumni survey	7
	Portfolio	6
Educational Psychology, Ph.D.	Portfolio	4
	Portfolio	4
	Student exam	12
Health and Human Performance, M.S.	Master's thesis	3
	Oral presentations	3
	Student exam	22
Health, Leisure, and Human Performance, Ph.D.	Dissertation	4
	Oral presentations	4
	Student exam	8
<i>Department of Educational Studies</i>		
Educational Leadership Studies, M.S.	Student paper	37
	Student project	Not reported
	Comprehensive exam	11
Educational Technology, M.S.	Comprehensive exam	7
	Portfolio	7
	Student projects	6
Higher Education, Ed.D. School Administration, Ed.D.	Comprehensive exam	11
	Qualifying exam	20
	Dissertation defense	11
<i>Multidisciplinary</i>		
Applied Educational Studies, Ed.D.	Dissertation defense	Not reported
	Student reports	Not reported
Natural and Applied Science, M.S.	Oral presentations	9
	Student reports	6
<i>Department of Teaching and Curriculum Leadership</i>		
Education, Ph.D.	Qualifying exam	9
Teaching, Learning, and Leadership, M.S.	Comprehensive exam	34



Table V.1. Graduate Program Outcomes Assessment
College of Engineering, Architecture, and Technology

Degree Program	Assessment Methods	Number Assessed
<i>Department of Chemical Engineering</i>		
Chemical Engineering, M.S.	Thesis defense	Not reported
	Faculty review of student achievement	Not reported
	Qualifying exams	Not reported
Chemical Engineering, Ph.D.	Dissertation defense	Not reported
	Faculty review of student achievement	Not reported
	Qualifying exams	Not reported
<i>Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering</i>		
Civil Engineering, M.S.	Master's thesis	11
	Oral presentations	11
	Alumni survey	12
Civil Engineering, Ph.D.	Dissertation defense	3
	Oral presentations	3
	Alumni survey	2
Environmental Engineering, M.S.	Master's thesis	4
	Oral presentations	4
	Alumni survey	3
<i>Department of Industrial Engineering and Management</i>		
Industrial Engineering and Management, M.S., Ph.D.	Student exam	19
	Student projects	9
	Student projects	41
<i>Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering</i>		
Mechanical Engineering	Thesis defense	33
	Alumni survey	23
Mechanical Engineering, Ph.D.	Dissertation defense	4



Table V.1. Graduate Program Outcomes Assessment (continued)
 College of Human Environmental Sciences

Degree Program	Assessment Methods	Number Assessed
<i>Department of Hotel and Restaurant Administration</i>		
Hotel and Restaurant Administration, M.S.	Alumni survey	4
	Student paper	4
Hotel and Restaurant Administration, Ph.D.	Alumni survey	5
	Dissertation	5
<i>Department of Human Development and Family Sciences</i>		
Human Development and Family Sciences, M.S.	Student papers	15
	Theses	7
	Student papers	40



Table V.1. Graduate Program Outcomes Assessment (continued)
William S. Spears School of Business

Degree Program	Assessment Methods	Number Assessed
<i>Department of Accounting</i>		
Accounting, M.S.	Transcript review	37
	Licensure exam	28
	Oral presentation	12
Business Administration, Ph.D.	Dissertation proposal	3
	Oral presentations	3
	Participation in prof. meetings	Not reported
<i>Department of Business Administration</i>		
M.B.A.	Oral presentations	Not reported
	Student papers	20
	Student papers	20
	Standardized exam	70
	Student survey	55
Business Administration, Ph.D.	Dissertation proposal	3
	Oral presentations	3
	Participation in prof. meetings	Not reported
<i>Department of Economics and Legal Studies</i>		
Economics, M.S.	Student exam	6
	Student exam	6
	Creative component	4
Economics, Ph.D.	Dissertation proposal	0
	Oral presentations	0
	Participation in prof. meetings	Not reported
<i>Department of Finance</i>		
Business Administration, Ph.D.	Dissertation proposal	2
	Oral presentations	4
	Participation in prof. meetings	Not reported
Quantitative Financial Economics, M.S.	Student projects	8
	Creative components	6
	Oral presentation	6
<i>Department of Management Sciences and Information Systems</i>		
Business Administration, Ph.D.	Dissertation proposal	1
	Oral presentations	8
	Participation in prof. meetings	Not reported
Management Information Systems, M.S.	Panel review of student projects	19
	Panel review of student projects	15
<i>Department of Marketing</i>		
Business Administration, Ph.D.	Dissertation proposal	0
	Oral presentations	4



Degree Program	Assessment Methods	Number Assessed
	Participation in prof. meetings	Not reported
<i>Multidisciplinary</i>		
Telecommunications Management, M.S.	Panel review of Student papers	9

2. Graduate program outcomes assessment is implemented at the program level. Full details on each program's analysis of student learning and findings are available online (http://uat.okstate.edu/assessment/annual_reports/annual_report_instructions.html).

OSU, through the process for awarding of more than \$100,000 in assessment funds (http://uat.okstate.edu/assessment/budget_requests/index.html) for program outcomes assessment and through feedback provided to programs by the College Assessment Coordinators and the Director of Assessment and Testing, has been working to move graduate programs toward direct measures of student learning and toward assessment processes with a high likelihood of resulting in program improvement. Program outcomes assessment is also a critical component of each program's 5-year Academic Program Review. As reported in section III-3, program outcomes assessment has resulted in numerous program improvements.

3. See section III-3 for a full description of the use of results from undergraduate and graduate program outcomes assessment.

4. In 2008-2009, 383 students were provisionally admitted to OSU graduate programs and enrolled at OSU. 208 (75%) of the 277 students who were provisionally admitted and enrolled in 2007-2008 were enrolled in the fall of 2008. Provisional admission may be granted to students in situations where students:

- Fail to meet the minimum score on an admissions test
- Fail to achieve a minimum grade point average in prior coursework
- Have not completed required prerequisite coursework
- Cannot be admitted under the normal admissions standards

Students who are graduates of accredited postsecondary institutions may be admitted provisionally on recommendation of the major department and by concurrence from the Dean of the Graduate College. Failure to meet required academic standards and benchmarks set for progress and grade point average will result in dismissal from the Graduate College.



Summary

OSU is highly committed to improving student learning through entry-level assessment, general education assessment, program outcomes assessment, and student satisfaction assessment. Assessment activity in 2008-2009 resulted in numerous improvements to courses, programs, departments, and colleges and supported OSU's vision for advancing the quality of life in Oklahoma by fulfilling the instructional, research, and outreach obligations of a first-class, land-grant educational system.

