create / innovate / educate / GO STATE

Oklahoma State University

Assessment Report
2009-2010

Submitted to
The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education

January 3, 2011

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 below. 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. A new Science Reading subject test is under development that will be used in combination with the mathematics subject test for science course placement. 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 required
	Reading 71-100	No restrictions
Science[1] (Biology, Chemistry, Geography, Geology, and Physics)	Reading 0-70 *or* Algebra 0-54	UNIV 0113 required
	Reading 71-100 *and* Algebra 55-100	No restrictions

1. Science reading subject test under development.

Students may take the COMPASS exams twice. Additional COMPASS testing requires approval of the Director of Assessment and Testing.

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 2009-2010, a total of 3,598 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 2009-2010.

Subject Area	# of Students with ACT sub-scores <19[1]	# of Students cleared for college-level coursework by ELPA
English	306	252
Mathematics	481	251
Reading	241	176
Science	148	31

1. 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: 75, mathematics: 76, reading: 76, science: 314.

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 2009-2010 placement.

Subject Area	# of Enrolled Students who took a COMPASS test[1]	# of Students who passed COMPASS and were cleared for college-level coursework
English	18	13
Mathematics	25	1
Reading	22	18

1. 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, 307 students (8.5% of the total new enrolled) were required to take at least one remedial course. Of the 3,598 new students in 2009-2010, 37 (1.0%) were required to enroll in remedial English classes, 202 (5.6%) in remedial math classes, 109 (3.0%) in remedial science classes, and 54 (1.5%) 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 2009-2010. No changes were made to the entry-level assessment procedures or to COMPASS testing in 2009-2010. A Science Reading COMPASS subject test and related cut scores are under development.

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/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=34&Itemid=31). 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/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=33&Itemid=30). 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 theses course placement decisions are accurate and appropriate. The use of the COMPASS Science Reading subject test is under development.

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 the general education program. 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 rubrics for assessment of general education 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 (three were assessed in 2010: written communication, critical thinking, and diversity).

Table II.1. Dates for assessment of general education learning outcomes

Portfolio area	Years assessed
Written communication	2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2008, 2009, 2010
Math problem solving	2002, 2003, 2005
Science problem solving	2003, 2004, 2005, 2007, 2009
Critical thinking	2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010
Diversity	2007, 2008, 2009, 2010

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 2009-2010 workshop series were available in the areas of writing, critical thinking, and diversity. The initiative is underway in 2010-2011 with workshop series available in the same three general education goal areas.

A phase-2 initiative, to encourage additional participation from faculty members across campus and develop even higher level assignments, is planned for the spring semester of 2011.

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/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=55&Itemid=14) 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 (the 2010 report will be available in early 2011). 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.

Examples of changes discussed include creation of additional capstone courses, modifications to the general education assessment process, and faculty development.

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*
112 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:http://uat.okstate.edu/images/rubrics/critical%20thinking%20rubric%205-1-10.pdf).

79 samples (71%) were scored as a '3' or above and only 2 samples (1.8%) received a score of '1.' The average of all scores was 2.90 which was slightly lower than last year's score of 2.94.

Reviewers also worked on developing strategies for giving faculty members feedback on the attributes of their critical thinking assignments.

Institutional Portfolios – Written Communication
147 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 (http://uat.okstate.edu/images/rubrics/written%20communication%20rubric%206-9-10.pdf).

109 samples (74%) were scored as a '3' or above and only 4 samples (2.7%) received a score of '1.' The average was 3.06 which is the highest average score in this area to date (the 2006 average is second highest at 3.03).

Reviewers also spent time setting a goal score for graduating seniors (note that the full sample includes freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors). This score was established as 3.5. Results comparing seniors' scores to this goal score will be reported in the full general education report in the early spring of 2011.

Institutional Portfolios – Diversity
66 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 (http://uat.okstate.edu/images/rubrics/diversity%20rubric%205-1-10.pdf).

33 samples (50%) were scored as a '3' or above and 20 samples (25%) received a score of '1.' The average was 2.33 which is equal to the 2007 average of 2.33 and smaller than the 2008 average of 3.16 and the 2009 average of 2.66.

The number of artifacts scored in the diversity area is somewhat lower than in past years because each artifact was double scored on the *Association of American Colleges and University's* VALUE rubric for intercultural competence.

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 2010-2011 and further grow the level-2 initiative. The critical thinking study group that formed last year is currently implementing a pilot study on using journaling to enhance students' critical thinking skills and a survey of faculty members' approaches to teaching critical thinking. OSU is engaged in a number of initiatives to improve students' diversity scores (http://diversity.okstate.edu/). Writing continues to be emphasized by GEAC and a number of initiatives are in development to enhance students' development of writing skills.

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/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=10&Itemid=14). 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/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1&Itemid=6). 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
Department of Agricultural Economics		
Agribusiness, B.S.	Review of written assignments	35
	Review of oral presentations	71
	Exit interview and Alumni survey	20
Agricultural Economics, B.S.	Review of written assignments	35
	Review of oral presentations	71
	Exit interview and Alumni survey	20
Department of Agricultural Education, Communication, and Leadership		
Agricultural Communications, B.S.	Portfolio	29
	Alumni survey	35
Agricultural Education, B.S.	Oklahoma Subject Area Test	18
	Oklahoma Professional Teaching Examination	28
	Panel review of student portfolios	37
Agricultural Leadership, B.S.	Course exams	Full class
	Focus groups and Alumni survey	12
	Internship portfolio evaluations	13
Department of Animal Science		
Animal Science, B.S.	Subject area exam	69
	Panel review of Student projects	35
	Panel review of capstone projects	170
Food Science, B.S.	Subject area exam	14
	Oral presentations	35
	Capstone projects	12
Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology		
Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, B.S.	Panel review of student papers	43
	Alumni survey	28
	Faculty evaluation of student achievement	43
Department of Entomology and Plant Pathology		
Entomology, B.S.	Capstone project	No students graduated
	Exit exam and alumni survey	5
	Panel review of student papers	No students graduated
Department of Horticulture and Landscape Architecture		
Horticulture, B.S.	Course exams	9
	Exit interviews	9
	Grade point averages	9
Landscape Architecture, BLA	Portfolio and oral presentation	17
	Internship evaluation	17
	Capstone project	17
Landscape Contracting, B.S.	Capstone project	4

Degree Program	Assessment Methods	Number Assessed
	Internship evaluation	3
	Alumni survey	10
Department of Plant and Soil Science		
Natural Resource Ecology and Management, B.S.	Panel review of student papers	94
	Oral presentations	37
	Course projects	6

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

Degree Program	Assessment Methods	Number Assessed
Department of Computer Science		
Computer Science, B.S.	Rubric evaluation of computer competency	46
	Employer Evaluation	11
	Rubric evaluation of computer theory	142
Department of Art		
Art History, B.A.	Panel review of projects	10
	Panel review of analytic skills	10
	Panel review of written communication	10
Graphic Design, BFA	Capstone project	19
	Portfolio	19
	Portfolio	19
Studio Art, BFA	External review of capstone project	11
	External review of capstone project	11
	External review of capstone project	11
Department of English		
English, B.A.	Faculty review of reading competence	44
	Faculty review of writing competence	25
	Senior Survey	27
Department of Foreign Languages and Literature		
French, B.A.	Final projects	18
	Standardized test	18
	Alumni survey	Not reported
German, B.A.	Final projects	10
	Standardized test	10
	Alumni survey	Not reported
Russian Language and Literature, B.A.	Final projects	6
	Standardized test	6
	Alumni survey	Not reported
Spanish, B.A.	Final projects	102
	Licensure test	102
	Alumni survey	Not reported
Department of Geography		
Geography, B.A., B.S.	Transcript analysis	7
	Faculty evaluation of students w/ rubric	70
	Exit survey	20
Department of History		
American Studies, B.S.	Panel review of student papers	50
	Panel review of student papers	50

	Panel review of student papers	50
History, B.A.	Panel review of student papers	50
	Panel review of student papers	50
	Panel review of student papers	50
Department of Mathematics		
Mathematics, B.A., B.S.	Panel review of student papers	14
	Panel review of student papers	14
	Panel review of student papers	14
Department of Philosophy		
Philosophy, B.A.	Exit exam	11
	Panel review of student papers	8
	Panel review of student papers	8
Department of Political Science		
Political Science, B.A., B.S.	Capstone project	Not reported
	Standardized test	Not reported
	Student research paper	Not reported
Department of Sociology		
Sociology, B.S.	Panel review of student papers	30
	Panel review of student papers	30
	Panel review of student papers	19
Department of Statistics		
Statistics, B.S.	Student survey	2
	Final exam	3
Department of Zoology		
Physiology, B.S.	Student exam	105
	Panel review of student projects	22
	Panel review of student projects	25
Zoology, B.S.	Student exam	105
	Panel review of student projects	22
	Panel review of student projects	25
Department of Theatre		
Theatre, B.A.	External review	All students
	External review	All students
	External review	All students
Department of Botany		
Botany, B.S.	Standardized national exams	1
	Analysis of GPA	3
	Alumni survey	1
Department of Psychology		
Psychology, B.A., B.S.	Department exam	189
	Panel review of student papers	111

Table III.1. Undergraduate Program Outcomes Assessment (continued)
College of Education

Degree Program	Assessment Methods	Number Assessed
School of Applied Health and Educational Psychology		
Athletic Training, B.S.	Clinical evaluation	12
	Clinical portfolio	12
	Board of certification exam	12
Health Education and Promotion, B.S.	Internship evaluation	20
	Exit survey and alumni survey	20
	Portfolios	20
Leisure Studies, B.S.	Exit interviews	20
	Internship evaluation	20
	National certification exams	20
Physical Education, B.S.	Portfolio	62
	Internship evaluation	18
	Oklahoma Subject Area Test and Professional Teaching Exam	10
Department of Educational Studies		
Aviation Sciences, B.S.	Standardized exam	12
	Portfolio	29
	Review of oral presentation	Not reported
Department of Teaching and Curriculum Leadership		
Career and Technical Education, B.S.	Portfolio	8
Elementary Education, B.S.	Portfolio	114
Secondary Education, B.S.	Portfolio	77

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

Degree Program	Assessment Methods	Number Assessed
Department of Architecture		
Architecture, BAR	Exit interview	11
	Oral presentations	11
	Student projects	11
Department of Biosystems and Ag Engineering		
Biosystems Engineering, B.S.	Licensure test	8
	Panel review of student projects	5
	Exit interviews	11
Department of Chemical Engineering		
Chemical Engineering, B.S.	Licensure test	Not reported
	Student projects	Not reported
	Student papers	Not reported
Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering		
Electrical Engineering, B.S.	Alumni survey	51
	Course exams	51
	Capstone exam	51
Department of Engineering Technology		
Construction Management Technology, B.S.	Licensure test	31
	Internship evaluation	37
	Practicum evaluation	37
Electrical Engineering Technology, B.S.	Comprehensive exam	18
	Panel review of capstone projects	18
	Capstone log books	18
Fire Protection and Safety Technology, B.S.	Capstone project	7
	Capstone project	9
	Capstone project	7
Mechanical Engineering Technology, B.S.	Student exam	30
	Oral design presentations	30
	Student exam	30
Department of Industrial Engineering and Management		
Industrial Engineering and Management, B.S.	Student exam	23
	Senior design projects	5
	Collection of student projects	5

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

Degree Program	Assessment Methods	Number Assessed
Department of Design, Housing and Merchandising		
Design, Housing and Merchandising, B.S.	Exit survey	54
	Internship evaluation	54
Department of Hotel and Restaurant Administration		
Hotel and Restaurant Administration, B.S.	Faculty review of course assignments	74
	Internship evaluation	74
	Faculty review of course assignments	74
Department of Human Development and Family Sciences		
Human Development and Family Sciences, B.S.	Exit survey	157
	Internship evaluation	157
	Professional portfolio	157
Nutritional Sciences		
Nutritional Sciences, B.S.	Exit survey	29

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

Degree Program	Assessment Methods	Number Assessed
Department of Business Administration		
Business Administration, B.S., B.A.		

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/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=76&Itemid=52.

OSU, through the process for awarding of more than $100,000 in assessment funds (http://uat.okstate.edu/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=31&Itemid=28) 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 362 assessment methods implemented for program outcomes assessment. The most commonly reported assessment methods were:

- Comprehensive, qualifying, preliminary, standardized, or course exams (84 reports, 23% of the total)
- Faculty panel or faculty review of student work (70 reports, 20% of the total)
- Dissertations, theses, or creative components (46 reports, 13% of the total)
- Surveys of alumni (37 reports, 10% of the total)
- Oral presentations (33 reports, 9% of the total)

Other methods used included portfolios, internship or clinical evaluations, capstone projects, and other performance assessments.

3. Undergraduate and graduate programs reported 335 uses of program outcomes assessment data (each use may represent more than one assessment method and some methods resulted in more than one use).

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

[1] Report from Spears School of Business will be submitted in January

- Improvements to the assessment process (67 uses, 20% of the total)
- Curriculum changes (33 uses, 10% of the total)
- Changes to courses (25 uses, 7% of the total)
- Discussion and consideration of improvements (12 uses, 4% of the total)
- Various other uses including changes to advising, faculty development and instructional improvement, hiring decisions, communication with students, the development of new courses, and student recruitment.

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 (last completed in 2010) and surveys of alumni from graduate programs are conducted in odd numbered years (last completed in 2009). Current graduate students' satisfaction is surveyed in even numbered years (last completed in spring, 2010).

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. In addition to a core set of questions developed at the institutional level, 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.

2010 Survey of Alumni of Undergraduate Programs
All alumni who graduated in 2004 and 2008 were contacted for participation in the survey. Contact information was collected from the Alumni Association and the Office of Institutional Research and Information Management. Alumni were contacted through email (when a current email address was available) and over the phone.

7,256 alumni were contacted for participation and 3,149 surveys were completed for a response rate of 43.4%. When adjusted for alumni deemed 'unreachable,' (e.g., alumni who did not respond to a survey email and for whom no valid U.S. phone number was available) the response rate for the survey was 73.7%.

2010 Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey
All current graduate students were contacted for participation in the survey. Contact information was collected from the Office of Institutional Research and Information Management. Graduate students were contacted through email.

4,260 graduate students were contacted for participation and 2,696 surveys were completed for a response rate of 63%.

2.
2010 Survey of Alumni of Undergraduate Programs
The full report is available here:
http://uat.okstate.edu/images/alumni/2010%20saup%20final%20report%20institution%20only.pdf
91% of respondents reported they were "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with their overall educational experience at OSU. Only 2.3% of respondents were "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" with their overall educational experience at OSU. 87% were "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with the quality of instruction received in their major and 65% were

"satisfied" or "very satisfied" with the quality of the academic advising they received in their major.

64% of the respondents were currently residing in Oklahoma and 11.4% were currently residing in Stillwater.

86% of respondents reported current employment and only 5% of alumni identified themselves as currently seeking employment. Large corporations were the largest employer of graduates. The most frequently reported salary was in the range of $35,000-$45,000 per year for 2004 graduates and $25,000-$35,000 per year for 2008 graduates. 92% of respondents found their OSU education had prepared them "very well" or "adequately" for their current position.

Of the alumni who pursued additional education, 42% of them enrolled at OSU. 92% of alumni who pursued additional education found their OSU education had prepared them "very well" or "adequately" for graduate or professional school programs.

Each undergraduate program was asked to submit a set of questions in addition to those described above. These 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.

2010 Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey
The full results are available here:
http://uat.okstate.edu/images/gss/gsss%202010%20final%20report.pdf
91% of respondents were "very satisfied" or "generally satisfied" with computing and library resources available to them, 88% "agreed" or "agreed somewhat" that their advisor was willing to spend the time with them that they need, and over 89% were "very satisfied" or "generally satisfied" with their overall experience as a graduate student.

Opportunities for financial support such as assistantships and scholarships were readily available in their departments according to 22% of Master's degree students and 36% of doctoral degree students.

75% of Master's degree students and 80% of doctoral degree students "agreed" or "agreed somewhat" that OSU is a supportive campus toward those with diverse backgrounds. 8% of Master's degree students and 15% of doctoral degree students reported they experienced discrimination toward them.

Nearly 60% of Master's degree students and nearly 50% of doctoral degree students reported taking one or more hours of credit in a distance learning format.

3. The results from these two 2010 surveys were distributed widely on campus and shared publicly online (http://uat.okstate.edu/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=8&Itemid=13). Overall, the results continue to be very positive and show undergraduate alumni are generally very satisfied with their educational experience at OSU and current graduate students are very satisfied with their educational experience at OSU.

Although there continue to be conversations about the data from the 2010 surveys at the institution level, programs are the primary users of the Alumni Survey data and the Graduate College is the primary user of the Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey. 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.

Continuation of the *Provost's Faculty Development Initiative: Focus on General Education* and the implementation 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).

Results from these surveys are also shared with the *Assessment and Academic Improvement Council*, the *General Education Advisory Council*, and the *Committee for the Assessment of General Education*.

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
Department of Agricultural Economics		
Ag Education / Ag Business, MAG	Master's thesis / creative component	53
	Oral defense	53
	Oral presentations	26
Agricultural Economics, M.S.	Master's thesis / creative component	53
	Oral defense	53
	Oral presentations	26
Agricultural Economics, Ph.D.	Dissertation	4
	Oral presentation	7
Department of Agricultural Education, Communication, and Leadership		
Ag Education / Ag Leadership, MAG	Creative component	1
	Oral presentation	1
	Alumni survey	18
Agricultural Communications, M.S.	Thesis defense	1
	Thesis writing evaluation	1
	Seminar presentation	1
Agricultural Education, M.S.	Thesis defense	1
	Thesis writing evaluation	1
	Seminar presentation	1
Agricultural Education, Ph.D.	Comprehensive examination	1
	Dissertation	1
	Seminar presentation	1
Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology		
Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, M.S.	Preliminary examination	Not reported
	Oral presentation	Not reported
Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Ph.D.	Preliminary examination	Not reported
	Oral presentation	Not reported
Department of Entomology and Plant Pathology		
Entomology and Plant Pathology, MAG	Seminar presentations	2
	Thesis defense	6
	Exit survey and interviews	6
Entomology, Ph.D.	Seminar presentations	2
	Preliminary examination	2

Degree Program	Assessment Methods	Number Assessed
	Exit survey and interviews	1
Entomology and Plant Pathology, M.S.	Seminar presentations	2
	Thesis defense	6
	Exit survey and interviews	6
Plant Pathology, Ph.D.	Seminar presentations	1
	Preliminary examination	1
	Dissertation defense	1
Department of Horticulture and Landscape Architecture		
Horticulture, M.S.	Preliminary examination	3
	Oral presentation	3
Horticulture, MAG	Research proposal presentation	3
	Thesis	3
	Alumni survey	3
Multidisciplinary		
Plant Science, Ph.D.	Dissertation proposal defense	8
	Qualifying exam	8
	Alumni survey	4
International Agriculture, MAG	Faculty review of performance	21
	Faculty review of placement	19
Food Science, M.S.	Master's thesis	Not reported
	Oral presentation	Not reported
	Alumni survey	Not reported
Food Science, Ph.D.	Dissertation	Not reported
	Alumni survey	Not reported
	Preliminary examination	Not reported
Department of Natural Resources, Ecology, and Management		
Natural Resources, Ecology, and Management, M.S.	Thesis defense	10
	Alumni survey	Not reported
Department of Animal Science		
Animal Science, MAG	Master's thesis	1
	Oral presentation	1
	Alumni survey	1
Animal Science, M.S.	Master's thesis	Not reported
	Oral presentation	Not reported
	Alumni survey	Not reported
Animal Breeding and Reproduction, Ph.D.	Dissertation	Not reported
	Alumni survey	Not reported
	Preliminary examination	Not reported
Animal Nutrition, Ph.D.	Dissertation	Not reported
	Alumni survey	Not reported

Degree Program	Assessment Methods	Number Assessed
	Preliminary examination	Not reported

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

Degree Program	Assessment Methods	Number Assessed
Department of English		
English, M.A.	Faculty evaluation of students	16
	Faculty evaluation of students	17
	Exit survey	4
Department of Geography		
Geography, M.S., Ph.D.	Rubric evaluation of student papers	15
	Course projects	21
	Course projects	18
Department of History		
History, M.A.	Panel review of student papers	12
	Panel review of student papers	12
	Comprehensive exams	12
History, Ph.D.	Panel review of student papers	5
	Panel review of student papers	5
	Comprehensive exams	5
Department of Mathematics		
Mathematics, M.S.	Master's thesis	1
	Master's thesis	1
	Oral presentation	1
Mathematics, Ph.D.	Comprehensive exams	5
	Dissertation	5
	Oral presentation	5
Department of Microbiology and Molecular Genetics		
Microbiology, M.S.	Student Journal Publications	2
	Student Conference presentations	2
Microbiology, Ph.D.	Student Journal Publications	21
	Student Conference presentations	21
Department of Music		
Pedagogy and Performance, M.M.	Placement exam	5
	Qualifying exam	7
	Final oral exam and recital	7
Department of Political Science		
Political Science, M.A.	Comprehensive exams	8
	Thesis review	5
Department of Psychology		
Psychology, M.S.	Thesis	49
	Comprehensive examination	49
	Faculty evaluation of students	49
Psychology, Ph.D.	Dissertation	49
	Comprehensive examination	49

	Faculty evaluation of students	49
Department of Sociology		
Sociology, M.S.	Panel review of student papers	13
	Panel review of student papers	13
	Thesis	7
Sociology, Ph.D.	Comprehensive examination	9
	Comprehensive examination	9
	Methods examination	7
Department of Theatre		
Theatre, M.S.	Thesis	1
Department of Statistics		
Statistics, M.S.	Comprehensive exam	2
	Oral presentations	2
	Student projects	5
Department of Zoology		
Zoology, M.S.	Thesis	4
	Thesis	4
	Submission of articles	3
Zoology, Ph.D.	Comprehensive exam	4
	Panel review of student papers	4
	Submission of articles	4
Department of Botany		
Botany, M.S.	Advisor review of student aptitude	Not reported
	Course Grades	Not reported
	Assessment of scholarly activities	Not reported
Department of Computer Science		
Computer Science, M.S.	Ability to conduct literature reviews	11
	Faculty assessment of research	11
	Faculty assessment of research	10
Computer Science, Ph.D.	Ability to conduct literature reviews	1
	Faculty assessment of research	1
	Faculty assessment of research	1

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

Degree Program	Assessment Methods	Number Assessed
School of Applied Health and Educational Psychology		
Counseling, M.S.	Faculty evaluation of students	87
	Certification exam	3
	Alumni survey	10
Educational Psychology, Ed.S.	Standardized exam	4
	Portfolio	11
	Creative components	4
Educational Psychology, M.S.	Alumni survey	6
	Portfolio	6
Educational Psychology, Ph.D.	Qualifying portfolio	5
	Alumni survey	5
Health and Human Performance, M.S.	Thesis	8
	Creative component	1
	Alumni survey	7
Health, Leisure, and Human Performance, Ph.D.	Dissertation	5
Leisure Studies, M.S.	Academic standing	6
	Comprehensive exam	3
	Alumni survey	Not reported
Department of Educational Studies		
Educational Leadership Studies, M.S.	Faculty review of student papers	16
	Comprehensive exam	9
	Standardized exam	6
Educational Technology, M.S.	Comprehensive exam	33
	Portfolio	33
	Oral presentation	33
Higher Education, Ed.D.	Comprehensive exam	6
	Qualifying exam	1
	Dissertation defense	6
School Administration, Ed.D.	Comprehensive exam	6
	Qualifying exam	9
	Dissertation defense	5
Multidisciplinary		
Applied Educational Studies, Ed.D.	Dissertation defense	4
	Student reports	Not reported
Natural and Applied Science, M.S.	Oral presentations	13
	Creative component	10
Department of Teaching and Curriculum Leadership		
Education, Ph.D.	Qualifying exam	24
Teaching, Learning, & 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
Department of Chemical Engineering		
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
Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering		
Electrical Engineering, M.S.	Thesis defense	Not reported
	Oral presentations	Not reported
	Alumni survey and exit survey	Not reported
Electrical Engineering, Ph.D.	Preliminary exams	Not reported
	Dissertation proposal and defense	Not reported
	Alumni survey and exit survey	Not reported
Department of Industrial Engineering and Management		
Industrial Engineering and Management, M.S.	Thesis	Not reported
	Seminar presentation	Not reported
Industrial Engineering and Management, Ph.D.	Dissertation	Not reported
	Seminar presentation	Not reported

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

Degree Program	Assessment Methods	Number Assessed
Department of Hotel and Restaurant Administration		
Hotel and Restaurant Administration, M.S.	Creative components	5
	Master's thesis	5
Department of Design, Housing, and Merchandising		
Design, Housing, and Merchandising	Panel review of papers	10
	Panel review of presentations	10
Department of Human Development and Family Sciences		
Human Development and Family Sciences, M.S.	Research proposal / thesis	15
	Panel review of work	15
	Review of course projects	15
Department of Nutritional Sciences		
Nutritional Sciences, M.S.	Panel review of papers	6
	Panel review of presentations	6

Table V.1. Graduate Program Outcomes Assessment (continued)
William S. Spears School of Business[2]

Degree Program	Assessment Methods	Number Assessed
Department of Accounting		
Accounting, M.S.		
Business Administration, Ph.D.		
Department of Business Administration		
M.B.A.		
Business Administration, Ph.D.		
Department of Economics and Legal Studies		
Economics, M.S.		
Economics, Ph.D.		
Department of Finance		
Business Administration, Ph.D.		
Quantitative Financial Economics, M.S.	Student projects	10
	Oral contest presentation	1
Department of Management Sciences and Information Systems		
Business Administration, Ph.D.		
Management Information Systems, M.S.		
Department of Marketing		
Business Administration, Ph.D.		
Multidisciplinary		
Telecommunications Management, M.S.		

[2] Report from Spears School of Business will be submitted in January

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/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=76&Itemid=52).

OSU, through the process for awarding of more than $100,000 in assessment funds (http://uat.okstate.edu/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=31&Itemid=28) for program outcomes assessment and through feedback provided to programs, 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. There are no major changes planned to the graduate assessment program at this time.

4. In 2009-2010, 396 students were provisionally admitted to OSU graduate programs and enrolled at OSU. 301 (79%) of the 383 students who were provisionally admitted and enrolled in 2008-2009 were enrolled in the fall of 2009. 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 2009-2010 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.