Oklahoma State University
America's Brightest ORANGE

Assessment Report 2014-2015

Prepared for
The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education

October 17, 2015

Sarah Gordon, Ph.D.
Director, University Assessment & Testing

Lisa Cota, M.S.
Assistant Director, Assessment & Analysis

Abdul Shareef Shaik
Graduate Research Assistant

University Assessment and Testing
104 UAT Building
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK 74078-6043
405-744-3463
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.

I-1. Three methods are used to assess students' readiness for college level coursework: the ACT (or converted SAT scores), the Entry-Level Placement Analysis (ELPA, developed by OSU), and secondary testing. Secondary testing includes the Computer Adaptive Placement and Support System (COMPASS) test published by ACT for reading, English, and science; and the Assessment of Learning in Knowledge Spaces (ALEKS) for mathematics.

I-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.

I-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

Students with ACT subscores in Reading, English, Mathematics, and Science Reasoning of 19 or above (or SAT equivalent where available) are not required to complete remedial or developmental coursework in those subject areas. Retesting for the national ACT is permitted on any national ACT test date (six are available per year). OSU offers a Residual ACT exam for students who are unable to take the ACT on a normal exam date; scores for the residual exam are only valid at OSU and NOC – Stillwater. Retesting for the Residual ACT follows the OSRHE policy of one ACT Residual exam per year (November 1 through October 31). Students may also take the SAT exam. However, the SAT exam does not produce scores for sciences.

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 students' 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 19 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 remedial or developmental courses are not required. 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 remedial or developmental courses are not required. If the student's ACT is less than 19 and the PGI is below 2.0, then UNIV 0113 is required. Students required to complete remedial or developmental sciences courses may clear this requirement 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 remedial or developmental courses are not required. If the PGI is below 2.0 then UNIV 0143 is required.
There is no retesting available for the ELPA since it is based on high school grades, class rank, and ACT composite. The PGI is created nightly and is printed for each student on the day he or she enrolls at OSU.

Secondary Testing
ACT COMPASS

Students identified as having academic or curricular deficiencies in English, reading, or science may choose to take the ACT COMPASS placement tests to clear a remedial or developmental course requirement. The ACT COMPASS tests are provided free of charge to students at the OSU Testing Center or the University College Advising office and can also be completed at NOC-Stillwater, NOC-Tonkawa, NOC-Enid, OSU-OKC, and OSU-Tulsa. Cut scores for the ACT COMPASS tests are shown in Table I.1.

Students may take an ACT COMPASS exam twice. Additional ACT COMPASS testing requires approval of the Director of University Assessment and Testing.

Table I.1. Cut Scores for the ACT COMPASS Placement Tests

Subject Area	ACT COMPASS Score	Course Placement
English	English 0-55	UNIV 0133 required
	English 56-100	No remedial or developmental course required
Reading (or related	Reading 0-70	UNIV 0143 required

courses)	Reading 71-100	No remedial or developmental course required
Science Reading	Science 0-70	UNIV 0113 required
	Science 71-100	No remedial or developmental course required

OSU Math Placement Exam (ALEKS)

Students with curricular deficiencies or academic skills deficiencies in mathematics may meet the remediation requirement by earning a minimum score of 20 on the OSU Math Placement Exam (OSU uses McGraw Hill Education's *Assessment and Learning in Knowledge Spaces (ALEKS) Higher Education: Mathematics* system). This score was established by the Instruction Council with input from the OSU Mathematics Department. Students are allowed 5 attempts on the OSU Math Placement Exam in a 12-month period. Students who need attempts beyond the 5 permitted must make a request to the OSU Math Department. Table I.2. below shows the cut scores and prerequisites for math placement at OSU for 2014-15:

Table I.2. Math Cut Scores for the OSU Math Placement Exam

To be placed in:	Minimum OSU MATH Placement Exam Score	OR	Minimum Grade of 'C' in:
MATH 1493	20 (also clears remediation)	OR	MATH 1483 or MATH 1513
MATH 1483	25	OR	MATH 1513
MATH 1513	30	OR	MATH 1483
MATH 1583	40	OR	MATH 1483 or MATH 1513
MATH 1715	40		
MATH 1613	50	OR	MATH 1513
MATH 2103	50	OR	MATH 1483 or MATH 1513 or MATH 1715
MATH 2123	60	OR	MATH 1715 or MATH 1613
MATH 2144	70	OR	MATH 1715 or MATH 1613
PHYS 1114	70	OR	MATH 1715 or MATH 1613
MATH 2153			MATH 2144
MATH 2163			MATH 2153
MATH 2233			MATH 2153

The Instruction Council, with input from the OSU Physics Department, also established the use of prerequisite courses or cut score on the OSU Math Placement Exam for enrollment in PHYS 1114. Table I.3. below shows the cut score and prerequisites for physics placement at OSU for 2014-15:

Table I.3. Physics Cut Scores for the OSU Math Placement Exam			
To be placed in:	Minimum OSU MATH Placement Exam Score	OR	Minimum Grade of 'C' in:
PHYS 1114	70	OR	MATH 1613 or MATH 1715

Resources

Many resources are available to students for academic support. *Learning And Student Support Opportunities Center* (LASSO) offers free tutoring services. The *Math Learning Success 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, transition programs, and other academic resources.

The OSU Math Placement Exam (ALEKS) includes 6-weeks of access to learning modules that target the areas where students were not able to show mastery. Students can use the modules to improve their exam score or to prepare for their math courses. The *Math Learning Success Center* also provides additional tutoring for the ALEKS exam.

I-4. In 2014-2015, a total of 4380 admitted and enrolled students with fewer than 24 credit hours were assessed using the entry-level assessment process. Table I.4 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.4. 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 2013-2014.

Subject Area	# of Students with ACT sub-scores <191	# of Students cleared for college-level coursework by ELPA
English	387	328
Mathematics	591	328
Reading	280	204
Science	167	41

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: 110, mathematics: 110, reading: 110, science: 447.

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.5.

Table I.5. Number of students who took COMPASS tests for 2014-2015 placement.

Subject Area	# of Enrolled Students who took a COMPASS test1	# of Students who passed COMPASS and were cleared for college-level coursework
English	47	25
Reading	54	34
Science Reading	30	25

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.

In mathematics, the OSU Math Placement Exam (ALEKS) is used to clear remediation requirements. 45 students with ACT Math scores below 19 cleared remediation requirements using the OSU Math Placement Exam (ALEKS).

After all entry-level assessment was completed, 258 students (5.9% of the total new enrolled) were required to take at least one remedial course. Of the 4,380 new students in 2014-2015, 48 (1.1%) were required to enroll in remedial English classes, 176 (4.0%) in remedial math classes, 67 (1.5%) in remedial science classes, and 28 (0.6%) in remedial reading classes. Some students who were required to complete remedial classes satisfied the requirement with transfer courses or may later pass a secondary assessment. For this reason, the number of students who complete remedial courses may differ from the number of students required to do so.

I-5. Annual trends in grades, drops, withdrawals, and failure rates in common freshmen courses are monitored by Institutional Research and Information Management and the University College. 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.

I-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.

Effective Spring 2013, the ALEKS cut-off score for MATH 1493 was lowered from 25 to 20; since 25 was previously the lowest acceptable score enabling students to enroll in OSU math courses, this effectively lowered the requirement for remediation. After the introduction of the ALEKS placement test, the enrollment in MATH 1493 increased drastically (125 students enrolled in the course in Fall 2013; the course has a maximum capacity of 125) even though the course overall had good outcomes. The class instructor, an Associate Dean in the College of Arts & Sciences, the Interim Provost, the Director of Student Academic Services, and the Academic Instruction Council agreed that reducing the cut-off score was appropriate.

I-7. Detailed results from the BCSSE will be posted on the OSU Survey Results website (http://tinyurl.com/osusurveys) when they are available.
In general, students reported (most common response):

- Graduating in 2014 from a public high school
- Mostly earning grades of 'A,'
- Passing Algebra II and Pre-calculus / Trigonometry
- Spending 1-5 hours per week preparing for class (studying, homework, rehearsing, etc.) and spending 1-5 hours a week in co circular activities (organizations, school publications, student government, sports, etc.)
- Sometimes making class presentations
- Very often asking questions in class or contributing to class discussions
- Sometimes or often preparing two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in.
- Scoring between 1101 and 1200 on the SAT (or converted ACT score)

During the coming school year, students expected to spend (most common response):

- 16-20 hours per week preparing for class
- 0 hours per week working for pay on- or off-campus
- 6-10 hours per week participating in co-curricular activities, and
- 6-10 hours per week relaxing and socializing.

Students expect to (most common response):

- spend 21 or more hours per week preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, doing homework or lab work, analyzing data, rehearsing, and other academic activities)
- Discuss their academic performance with a faculty member often or very often.
- respondents expected to discuss course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class often or very often
- Respondents expected to ask instructors for help when they struggle with course

assignments (4 or higher on a 6-point scale).

96% of students said they intend to graduate from this college (<1% 'no,' 3% 'Uncertain').

The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) was administered in the spring of 2015 to first-year students and seniors. At the time of this report, results are still being compiled. Results of the NSSE and comparisons to the BCSSE will be provided in next year's annual assessment report.

I-8. *NSSE*

An executive summary of the results of the NSSE administered in 2012 is available on the University Assessment and Testing website (https://uat.okstate.edu/images/NSSE/2012%20nsse%20executive%20summary.pdf). The level of engagement in the benchmarks of educationally purposeful activities reported by first-year students was similar or slightly higher than what was reported by first-year students at similar institutions. Other highlights for first year students at OSU in comparison to first year students at peer institutions include:

- More likely to report that they would go to the same institution they are now attending if they could start over again.
- More likely to report positive relationships with other students and faculty members.
- More likely to have participated in community service or volunteer work.
- Reported a higher quality of academic advising.
- Reported a more favorable opinion of their entire educational experience at this institution.

Areas where OSU's scores were significantly lower than peer institutions included:

- Made a class presentation.
- Foreign language coursework.
- Working for pay off campus.
- Had serious conversations with students who are very different from you in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values.
- Attended an art exhibit, play, dance, music, theater, or other performance.

I-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. In 2011-2012, mathematics and chemistry received additional attention as a result of entry-level assessment during those years. The most significant change was the use of the ALEKS placement exam. The focus for 2012-2013 remained on math in order to evaluate the effects of the changes resultant from the introduction of the ALEKS exam.

Instructional Changes in Mathematics

The ALEKS exam includes subscale scores for a variety of mathematical topics, such as trigonometry, calculus, and logarithmic functions. Instructors in introductory math courses are provided with the ALEKS subscale scores of students enrolled in those classes, so the instructor can be aware that certain content areas may require more instructional time than others. Instructors are then able to spend additional time on areas in which students may need extra help.

The OSU Department of Mathematics, which has used ALEKS since Summer 2012, plans to continue using ALEKS for math placement. The department will also use data from ALEKS and Institutional Research to target at-risk students for additional assistance and outreach. This will be achieved by having clinical faculty coordinate most lower-division classes, ensuring high-quality, uniform instruction. Also, the Mathematics Learning Success Center will continue to support the in-class instruction by offering tutoring that is already used by thousands of students, including those working to refresh their mathematics knowledge and avoid remediation. The MLSC also tutors students taking math classes at Northern Oklahoma College. Finally, Department of Mathematics faculty will meet with campus units to discuss degree plans and determine whether alternative math course pathways would better serve students. The Department of Mathematics evaluates its courses on a continuing basis and adjusts pedagogy and personnel accordingly. Currently, DFW rates in lower-division math courses are at historic lows, and enrollments are at historic highs. In Fall 2015, the department will measure the success of students in the pilot College Algebra against those taking remedial classes and against the overall course success rates

Starting in Fall 2014, students must complete prerequisite courses or a score of 70+ on the ALEKS math placement exam for enrollment in PHYS 1114. Students who plan to take PHYS 1114 now must pass either MATH 1613 or 1715 with a grade of “C” or better or score a 70+ on the ALEKS math placement exam. UAT and IRIM will continue to monitor grades of students who placed into science courses using placement exams test.

The one other major overall change for mathematics instruction is the introduction of pilot sections of College Algebra (1513) for students who qualify for lower-level OSU math classes but not College Algebra itself. Students who qualify for 1483 or 1493 but who need 1513 for their degree plan may now enroll in a pilot section of 1513 that meets five days a week, three days in a traditional classroom, and two days in supplemental instruction activities led by an undergraduate learning assistant. This fall, we have 87 students in our three pilot sections.

II. General Education Assessment

II-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 every year 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. Each portfolio is assessed by a panel of faculty members using rubrics. Institutional portfolios have been developed in four areas that represent the overall goals of the general education program: written communication, critical thinking, science reasoning, and diversity. 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 these 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 patient 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.

II-2. *Institutional Portfolios*

Per OSU policy, instructors teaching a course with general education designation are expected to participate in general education assessment by providing samples of student work for inclusion in the Institutional Portfolio. Since 2001, OSU has collected samples of student work that represent students' achievement of the general education goals from courses across campus. These student work samples are then assessed by panels 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.

T able 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, 2011, 2014
Scientific inquiry	2003, 2004, 2005, 2007, 2009, 2013, 2015
Critical thinking	2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2012, 2014
Diversity	2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2013

A new rotational schedule was designed by the Committee for the Assessment of General Education (CAGE) in 2011. The purpose of this new rotational schedule was to allow for a larger number of samples of student work to be assessed in a single year, thus increasing the power of the statistical analyses performed on those data. Each institutional portfolio will be assessed every three years, allowing for long-term trends to be examined for groups of students.

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 by the General Education Advisory Council 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.

II-3. *Institutional Portfolios*
The samples of student work used in the Institutional Portfolios are assignments generated as part of the existing classroom process. 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 and grades on that work from the course instructor as part of the classroom instructional process.

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.

II-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 participants are paid a small stipend. In 2014-2015, the workshop series was again available in the areas of writing, critical thinking, and diversity. In 2014, based upon initial analyses of 2013-2014 general education assessment data, CAGE determined that more resources to assist faculty with teaching and assessing critical thinking would be beneficial. As such, the Provost's Initiative: Focus on General Education workshops (offered through UAT) in 2015-2016 will focus exclusively on critical thinking (instead of on three subjects as they have in the past).

Second, the General Education Task Force, formed in 2011, continues its work to provide recommendations on improving the general education program. The Task Force has examined data from general education assessment to inform its discussions.

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 has now ended 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 both internally and publicly 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 (Committee for the Assessment of General Education, General Education Advisory Council, and Assessment and Academic Improvement Council) to discuss assessment results, consider needed changes, and provide recommendations for improvement.

In addition, the General Education Task force is considering a large number of possible program improvement initiatives.

II-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. Additional details on OSU's analysis and interpretation of general education assessment results are available in the annual General Education Assessment Report.

II-5. *Institutional Portfolios*

A. *Science Reasoning*.

Given the difficulty in finding writing samples in science classes that lend themselves well to being evaluated through a rubric, a subcommittee was formed to investigate a different approach to assessing this learning outcome. Currently, faculty serving on this subcommittee are in the process of designing a multiple-choice test that can be used to assess students' science reasoning skills across the curriculum. Currently, the faculty plan to propose that this test either supplement or replace the artifact reviews that are currently conducted for assessing science reasoning.

Use of Findings

A joint meeting between the Committee for the Assessment of General Education, the General Education Advisory Council, and the Assessment and Academic Improvement Council will be held in March 2016. The purpose of the meeting is to review the general education assessment results and develop recommendations for improving the general education program. Findings from the general education assessment report will also be shared with the General Education Task Force, which is also working on identifying strategies for improving the general education program

III. Program Outcomes Assessment

III-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://tinyurl.com/osureports). 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[1]

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Agribusiness	BS	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Oral presentation	92	92	92
Agricultural Economics	BS	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Oral presentation	92	92	92
Agricultural Communications	BS	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics	Course project	Visual collection (photos, videos, etc.)	37	37	37
Agricultural Education	BS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)			27		
Agricultural Leadership	BS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Internship	Survey	16	N/A	12
Animal Science	BS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)			23		
Food Science	BS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)			13		
Biochemistry & Molecular Biology	BS	Survey	Capstone project		72	72	
Entomology	BS	Rating of skills(e.g., rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Capstone project	6	6	6

[1] Only the first three assessment methods and uses are listed. Some programs reported additional assessment methods and uses. For details, see the complete reports at http://tinyurl.com/osureports.

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Horticulture	BS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)			10		
Landscape Architecture	BLA	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Oral presentation	Course project	23	23	23
Landscape Management	BS	Rating of skills(e.g., rubrics)	Survey	Internship	6	6	6
Environmental Science	BS	Analysis of written artifacts	Capstone project		12	12	
Natural Resource Ecology & Management	BS	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts		252	252	
Plant & Soil Science	BS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)			22		

Table III.1. Undergraduate Program Outcomes Assessment
College of Arts and Sciences[2]

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Art History	BA	Other (please specify):Outside Program Evaluator			2		
Graphic Design	BFA	Capstone Courses			18		
Studio Art	BA	Capstone courses			12		
Studio Art	BFA	Capstone courses			18		
Botany	BS	Other (please specify):Selected questions on selected course final exams			20		
Chemistry	BS(ACS)	Analysis of written artifacts	Analysis of written artifacts	Analysis of written artifacts	33	24	54
Chemistry	BS	Analysis of written artifacts	Analysis of written artifacts	Analysis of written artifacts	33	24	54

[2] Only the first three assessment methods and uses are listed. Some programs reported additional assessment methods and uses. For details, see the complete reports at http://tinyurl.com/osureports.

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Communication Sciences & Disorders	BS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Other (please specify): Nationally-benchmarked assessment exam.	Written artifacts	84	84	84
Computer Science	BS	Other (please specify):Samples of Class work			962		
English	BA	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Survey	56	25	67
French	BA	Capstone courses	Survey		18	2	
German	BA	Capstone courses	Survey		11	2	
Spanish	BA	Capstone courses	Survey		91	2	
Geography	BA	Other (please specify):Transcript analysis			8		
Geography	BS	Other (please specify):Transcript analysis			8		
Geology	BS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	capstone course	Oral presentation	29	29	18
American Studies	BA	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts		42	5	

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
History	BA	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Review of student research	10	10	10
Liberal Studies	BA	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)			4		
Mathematics	BA						
Multimedia Journalism	BA	Internship	Analysis of written artifacts		5	34	
Multimedia Journalism	BS	Internship	Analysis of written artifacts		5	34	
Sports Media	BS	Internship	capstone course		5	64	
Sports Media	BA	Internship	capstone course		5	64	
Strategic Communications	BS	Internship	capstone course		5	64	
Microbiology, Cell & Molecular Biology	BS	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	22	22	22
Music	BA	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards	Performance or ju	40	40	17

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Music Performance	BM	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards	Performance or ju	Reported concurrently with Music BA		
Music Business	BM	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards	Performance or ju	Reported concurrently with Music BA		
Music Education	BM	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards	Performance or ju	Reported concurrently with Music BA		
Philosophy	BA	Elected to not report			Elected to not report		
Physics	BS	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Survey	25	6	N/A
Political Science	BA	Capstone project	N/A	N/A	21	N/A	N/A
Political Science	BS	Capstone project			21		
Psychology	BA	Other: Exam Questions	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)		983	65	
Psychology	BS	Other: Exam Questions	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	N/A	Reported concurrently with BA		
Sociology	BS	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)		24	29	

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Statistics	BS	Analysis of written artifacts	capstone course		N/A	N/A	
Theater	BA	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Review of student research	5	5	5
Biological Science	BS	Other (please specify): transcript data	Other (please specify): Conceptual Inventory	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	42	48	34
Physiology	BS	Other (please specify): transcript data	Other (please specify): Conceptual Inventory	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	24	48	34
Zoology	BS	Other (please specify): transcript data	Other (please specify): Conceptual Inventory	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	32	48	34

Table III.1. Undergraduate Program Outcomes Assessment (continued)
College of Education[43]

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Athletic Training	BS	other: Portfolio	Other (please specify):Case Study	Benchmarking	26	4	
Health Education & Promotion	BS	Analysis of written artifacts	Analysis of written artifacts	Capstone project	45	45	45
Physical Education	BS	Analysis of written artifacts	Capstone project	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	42	42	10
Recreation Management And Therapeutic Recreation	BS	Survey	Rating of skills(e.g., rubrics)	Internship	67	67	109
Aerospace Administration And Operations	BS	Analysis of written artifacts	Other (please specify):Case Study	Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards	39	39	39
Career & Technical Education	BS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)			61		

[3] Only the first three assessment methods and uses are listed. Some programs reported additional assessment methods and uses. For details, see the complete reports at http://tinyurl.com/osureports.

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Elementary Education	BS	Analysis of written artifacts	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards	119	119	119
Secondary Education	BS	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards	62	62	62

Table III.1. Undergraduate Program Outcomes Assessment (continued)
College of Engineering, Architecture, and Technology[4]

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Architectural Engineering	BEN	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Survey	Course project	14	14	14
Architecture	BAR	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Survey	Course project	110	110	110
Bio Systems Engineering	BS	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Oral presentation	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	24	24	24
Chemical Engineering	BS	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	150	150	150
Civil Engineering	BS	Survey	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	43	43	43
Electrical Engineering	BS	Other: Embedded Exams	Survey	Capstone Project	N/A	N/A	N/A
Computer Engineering	BS	Other: Embedded Exams	Survey	Capstone Project	N/A	N/A	N/A

[4] Only the first three assessment methods and uses are listed. Some programs reported additional assessment methods and uses. For details, see the complete reports at http://tinyurl.com/osureports. The College of Engineering, Architecture, and Technology underwent numerous changes in key personnel in AY 2012, including a new Associate Dean, several Department Heads, and several Assessment Coordinators. Many programs in this College are using this time of transition as an opportunity to evaluate and revise their assessment plans.

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Construction Management Technology	BS	internships	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	N/A	N/A	42	N/A
Electrical Engineering Technology	BS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Capstone Project	Oral Presentation	31	22	22
Fire Protection & Safety Technology	BS	Course project	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards	25	43	47
Mechanical Engineering Technology	BS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Course project	Other (please specify):Upper Division Courses	63	63	67
Industrial Engineering & Management	BS	Survey	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	>150	>150	>150
Aerospace Engineering	BS	Reported every other year per department assessment plan					
Mechanical Engineering	BS	Reported every other year per department assessment plan					

Table III.1. Undergraduate Program Outcomes Assessment (continued)
College of Human Sciences[5]

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Design, Housing & Merchandising	BS	Survey	Internship	N/A	105	105	N/A
Hotel & Restaurant Administration	BS	Analysis of written artifacts	Capstone project	Satisfaction Survey	54	54	54
Human Development & Family Science	BS	Survey	Internship	Analysis of written artifacts	36	141	
Nutritional Sciences	BS	Other (please specify): Comprehensive test questions	Course project		Not reported	Not reported	

[5] Only the first three assessment methods and uses are listed. Some programs reported additional assessment methods and uses. For details, see the complete reports at http://tinyurl.com/osureports.

Table III.1. Undergraduate Program Outcomes Assessment (continued)
William S. Spears School of Business[6,7]

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Business Administration (Accounting)	BS	Other (please specify): Nationally-benchmarked assessment exam.	N/A	N/A	483	N/A	N/A
Business Administration (Entrepreneurship)	BS	Other (please specify): Nationally-benchmarked assessment exam.	N/A	N/A	483	N/A	N/A
Economics Business Administration (Finance)	BA						
Business Administration (General Business)	BS	Other (please specify): Nationally-benchmarked assessment exam.	N/A	N/A	483	N/A	N/A

[6] Only the first four assessment methods and uses are listed. Some programs reported additional assessment methods and uses. For details, see the complete reports at http://tinyurl.com/osureports.
[7] These degree programs reported together due to accreditation requirements for the college.

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Business Administration (International Business)	BS	Other (please specify): Nationally-benchmarked assessment exam.	N/A	N/A	483	N/A	N/A
Business Administration (Management)	BS	Other (please specify): Nationally-benchmarked assessment exam.	N/A	N/A	483	N/A	N/A
Business Administration (Mgmt Info Sys)	BS	Other (please specify): Nationally-benchmarked assessment exam.	N/A	N/A	483	N/A	N/A
Business Administration (Marketing)	BS	Other (please specify): Nationally-benchmarked assessment exam.	N/A	N/A	483	N/A	N/A
Accounting	BS						

III-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://tinyurl.com/osureports).

OSU awards more than $100,000 in assessment funds (http://tinyurl.com/osureport) each year for program outcomes assessment. 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.

In 2014-2015, the office of University Assessment & Testing introduced a new Assessment Report Template as a means of improving the quality of assessment data reported annually. This template provided programs with pre-defined categories of assessment activities from which they could choose.
Undergraduate degree programs reported 120 assessment methods implemented for program outcomes assessment (presented in the tables on the preceding pages). The most commonly reported assessment methods were:

- Analysis of written artifacts -specific) (26 reports, 22% of the total)
- Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics) (25 reports, 21% of the total)
- Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s) (20 reports, 17% of the total)
- Survey (13 reports, 11% of the total)
- Capstone project (11 reports, 9% of the total)

Other methods used included internship evaluations, course projects, and oral presentations.

III-3. Undergraduate degree programs reported 91 unique 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 for undergraduate degree programs was to continually monitor and ensure student achievement of the learning outcome. Other common uses for undergraduate degree programs included:

- Modify the assessment process (i.e., collect data from different courses) (25 uses, 27% of the total)
- Develop new tools for use in the assessment process (i.e., design new rubrics) (6 uses, 17% of the total
- Modify course curriculum (15 uses, 16% of the total)

Other uses include writing new assessment plans, making changes to the student advising process, changing course content, and hiring new faculty.

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
IV-1. Surveys of alumni are conducted every year: surveys of alumni from undergraduate programs are conducted in even numbered years (last completed in 2014) and surveys of alumni from graduate programs are conducted in odd numbered years (last completed in 2015).

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 institution 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.

2015 Survey of Alumni of Graduate Programs
All alumni who graduated in 2008 and 2012 from an undergraduate degree program were contacted for participation in the survey. Contact information was collected from the Office of Institutional Research and Information Management. Alumni were contacted through email (when a current email address was available) and over the phone.
A total of 1066 alumni completed the survey, resulting in a response rate of 40.9%. After removing alumni who were considered unreachable due to invalid contact information, the response rate to the survey was 64.9%.

IV-2.
2015 Survey of Alumni of Graduate Programs
The full report is available here: https://uat.okstate.edu/images/alumni/sagp2015.pdf

- Over 93% of alumni respondents were employed and only 5.9% of respondents were currently seeking employment.
- The most frequently reported annual salary range was $75,000 to $100,000

(21.1% reported this income range). 14.9% of respondents who were employed full time reported salaries above $100,000. 13.5% of respondents who were employed full time reported a salary range of $45,000 to $55,000.

Each graduate 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. Results of the program-specific questions are available on the web: http://tinyurl.com/osureports

IV-3. The results from the *2015 Survey of Alumni of Graduate Programs* were distributed widely on campus and shared publicly online. Overall, the results continue to be very positive and show alumni and current graduate students are satisfied with their educational experience at OSU.

Although there continue to be conversations about the data from the 2015 surveys at the institution level, programs are the primary users of these data. One way all programs use the alumni survey data is in the development of their 5-year Academic Program Review (APR) reports. The APR reports require programs to 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.

Results from these surveys were 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

V-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[8]

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number assessed #1	Number assessed #2	Number assessed #3
AGEC/AGBUS	MAG	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative	Oral presentation	17	17	17
Agricultural Economics	MS	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative		17	17	
Agricultural Economics	PHD	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)			59		
AGED/AGLE	MAG	Rating of skills(e.g., rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Oral Presentation	4	4	4

[8] Only the first three assessment methods and uses are listed. Some programs reported additional assessment methods and uses. For details, see the complete reports at http://tinyurl.com/osureports.

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number assessed #1	Number assessed #2	Number assessed #3
Agricultural Communications	MS	Rating of skills(e.g., rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Oral Presentation	7	7	7
Agricultural Education	MS	Rating of skills(e.g., rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Oral Presentation	7	7	7
Agricultural Education	PHD	Rating of skills(e.g., rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Oral Presentation	4	4	4
Animal Science	MS	Rating of skills(e.g., rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Oral Presentation	12	12	12
Animal Science	PHD	Rating of skills(e.g., rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Oral Presentation	12	12	12
Animal Science	MAG	Due low enrolment no report was submitted.					
Biochemistry & Molecular Biology	MS	Oral Presentation	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	Review of student research	9	9	9
Biochemistry & Molecular Biology	PHD	Survey	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	22	22	22
International Agriculture	MAG	Portfolio	Employment statistics		26	16	
ENTO & PLP	MAG	Low enrollment					
Entomology	PHD	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Oral Presentation		4	4	4
Entomology and Plant Pathology	MS	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Oral Presentation		7	7	

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number assessed #1	Number assessed #2	Number assessed #3
Plant Pathology	PHD	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Oral Presentation		1	1	
Horticulture	MAG	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	Oral Presentation	Reported concurrently with the MS degree		
Horticulture	MS	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	Oral Presentation	7	7	7
Food Science	MS	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	7	7	7
Food Science	PHD	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	16	16	16
Natural Resource Ecology & Management	MS	Oral presentation	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	Review of student research	12	12	12
Natural Resource Ecology & Management	PHD	Review of student research			1		
Crop Science	PHD	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component		5	5	
Plant And Soil Science	MS	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)			8		
Plant & Soil Sciences	MAG	No students were enrolled during this academic year					

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number assessed #1	Number assessed #2	Number assessed #3
Soil Science	PHD	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)			5		

Table V.1. Graduate Program Outcomes Assessment (continued)

College of Arts and Sciences[9]

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Art History	MA	Performance or jury	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component		2	2	
Botany	MS	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts		0	0	
Chemistry	MS	Oral presentation			8		
Chemistry	PHD	Oral presentation			8		
Communication Science & Disorders	MS	Other-Portfolio	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Benchmarking	28	27	5
Computer Science	MS	Other (please specify): Master of Science Assessment Rubric			19		
Computer Science	PHD	Other (please specify): Doctorate			3		

[9] Only the first three assessment methods and uses are listed. Some programs reported additional assessment methods and uses. For details, see the complete reports at http://tinyurl.com/osureports.

		Assessment Rubric					
English	MA	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	51	43	7
English	PHD	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Reported concurrently with MS		
Geography	MS	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Oral presentation	5	5	5
Geography	PHD	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Oral presentation	5	5	5
Geology	MS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Oral presentation	39	21	21
Geology	PHD	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Oral presentation	9	0	4
History	MA	Analysis of written artifacts	Course project	Review of student research	10	10	10
History	PHD	Analysis of written artifacts	Course project	Review of student research	10	10	10
Mathematics	MS	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	11	11	11
Mathematics	PHD	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	5	5	5

Mass Communications	MS	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	7	7	7
Microbiology	MS						
Microbiology	PHD	Other (please specify): Research publications	oral presentations		22	47	
Plant Science	PHD						
Master of Music	MM	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Other (please specify): Exam	Other (please specify): Exam	8	8	3
Philosophy	MA	New Assessment Plan in Place					
Photonics	PHD	Reported concurrently with Master's program in Physics					
Physics	MS	Other (Please specify): Course Grades	Other (Please specify): Course Grades	"Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative		Other (Please specify): Course Grades	Other (Please specify): Course Grades
Physics	PHD	Reported concurrently with Master's Program					
Fire & Emergency Management	MS	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Course project	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	15	15	15
Fire & Emergency Management	PHD	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Course project	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	2	2	2
Political Science	MA	Other (please specify): Take home examination	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	8	5	5

Psychology	MS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	Review of student research	58	58	58
Psychology	PHD	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	Review of student research	Reported concurrently with MS		
Sociology	MS	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)			7		
Sociology	PHD	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)		1	2	
Statistics	MS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Analysis of written artifacts		N/A	N/A	
Statistics	PHD	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Analysis of written artifacts		N/A	N/A	
Theatre	MA	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	6	1	1
Zoology	MS	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Review of student research		6	10	

Zoology	PHD	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Review of student research		8	3

Table V.1. Graduate Program Outcomes Assessment (continued)

College of Education[10]

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number assessed #1	Number assessed #2	Number assessed #3
Counseling	MS	Rating of skills(e.g., rubrics)	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Satisfaction Survey	97	3	11
Counseling Psychology	PHD	class grade	Oral exams	Written exam / qualification exam	24	8	9
Educational Psychology	MS	Rating of skills(e.g., rubrics)	Rating of skills(e.g., rubrics)	Rating of skills(e.g., rubrics)	7	7	7
Educational Psychology	PHD	Rating of skills(e.g., rubrics)	Rating of skills(e.g., rubrics)	Rating of skills(e.g., rubrics)	2	2	2
Health & Human Performance	MS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Oral presentation	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	13	13	13
Health & Human Performance	PHD	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Oral presentation	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	6	6	6
Health, Leisure and Human Performance	PHD	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Other (please specify): Qualifying Examinations		3	3	

[10] Only the first three assessment methods and uses are listed. Some programs reported additional assessment methods and uses. For details, see the complete reports at http://tinyurl.com/osureports.

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number assessed #1	Number assessed #2	Number assessed #3
Leisure Studies	MS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Interviews	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	17	17	17
School Psychology	PHD	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Other: Portfolio Review	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	6	N/A	6
School Psychology	EdS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Other: Portfolio Review	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	4	N/A	4
Aviation and Space	EDD	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	Rating of skills(e.g., rubrics)		3	9	
Aviation and Space	MS	Rating of skills(e.g., rubrics)	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component		10	7	
Educational Leadership Studies	MS	Analysis of written artifacts	Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative \component	9	9	9
Educational Technology	MS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)			8		

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number assessed #1	Number assessed #2	Number assessed #3
Educational Leadership Studies	MS	Analysis of written artifacts	Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	9	3	9
Higher Education	PHD	Internship	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component		4	4	
School Administration	EDD	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	6	6	6
School Administration	PHD	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	1		1
Education	PHD	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)			30		
Teaching, Learning and Leadership	MS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)			78		

Table V.1. Graduate Program Outcomes Assessment

College of Engineering, Architecture, and Technology[11]

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number assessed #1	Number assessed #2	Number assessed #3
Biosystems Engineering	MS	Survey	Oral presentation	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	4	4	4
Biosystems Engineering	PHD	Survey	Oral presentation	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	4	4	4
Chemical Engineering	MS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Oral presentation	Course project	13	13	13
Chemical Engineering	PHD	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Oral presentation	Course project	13	13	13
Civil Engineering	MS	Survey	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	26	26	26
Civil Engineering	PHD	Survey	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	6	6	6
Environmental Engineering	MS	Survey	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	26	26	26

[11] Only the first three assessment methods and uses are listed. Some programs reported additional assessment methods and uses. For details, see the complete reports at http://tinyurl.com/osureports.
The College of Engineering, Architecture, and Technology underwent numerous changes in key personnel in AY 2012, including a new Associate Dean, several Department Heads, and several Assessment Coordinators. Many programs in this College are using this time of transition as an opportunity to evaluate and revise their assessment plans.

Electrical Engineering	MS	Analysis of written artifacts	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	Survey	42	42	59
Electrical Engineering	PHD	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Survey	18	14	3
Engineering & Technology Management	MS	Capstone Project	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)		52	52	
Industrial Engineering & Management	MS	Survey	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Satisfaction Survey	18	18	18
Industrial Engineering & Management	PHD	Survey	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Satisfaction Survey	18	18	18
Mechanical Engineering	MS	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	Survey		43		
Mechanical Engineering	PHD	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component			10		

Table V.1. Graduate Program Outcomes Assessment (continued)

College of Human Sciences[12]

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number assessed #1	Number assessed #2	Number assessed #3
Human Sciences option in Family Financial Planning	MS	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Course project	Capstone Project	27	27	27
Design, Housing & Merchandising	MS	Oral presentation			5		
Hospitality Administration	MS	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Course project	14	14	14
Human Development & Family Science	MS	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Course project	30	30	30
Nutritional Sciences	MS	Oral presentation	Analysis of written artifacts		17	14	
Human Sciences	PHD	Analysis of written artifacts			1		

[12] Only the first three assessment methods and uses are listed. Some programs reported additional assessment methods and uses. For details, see the complete reports at http://tinyurl.com/osureports.

Table V.1. Graduate Program Outcomes Assessment (continued)

William S. Spears School of Business[13]

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number assessed #1	Number assessed #2	Number assessed #3
Accounting	MS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)			33		
Business administration (Accounting)	PHD	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)			10		
Business Administration	MBA	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts		127	127	
Business Administration (Executive Research)	PHD	Oral presentation	Review of student research	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	33	33	33
Economics	MS	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Not available	0	0	0
Economics	PHD	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	4	4	4
Entrepreneurship		Survey			23		
Business administration (Entrepreneurship)	PHD	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)			10		

[13] Only the first three assessment methods and uses are listed. Some programs reported additional assessment methods and uses. For details, see the complete reports at http://tinyurl.com/osureports.

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number assessed #1	Number assessed #2	Number assessed #3
Business Administration (Finance)	PHD	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)			10		
Quantitative Financial Economics	MS	Analysis of written artifacts			7		
Business Administration (Marketing)	PHD	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)			10		
Business administration (Management)	PHD	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)			10		
Management Information Systems	MS	Course project			74		
Business administration (Mmgt Info Sys)	PHD	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)			10		
Telecommunication Management	MS	Course project			23		

V-2
In 2014-2015, the office of University Assessment & Testing introduced a new Assessment Report Template as a means of improving the quality of assessment data reported annually. This template provided programs with pre-defined categories of assessment activities from which they could choose.

Graduate degree programs reported 188 assessment methods implemented for program outcomes assessment (presented in the tables later in this document). The most commonly reported assessment methods were:

- Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics) (58 reports, 31% of the total)
- Evaluation of an oral presentation (31 reports, 16% of the total)
- Analysis of written artifacts) (30 reports, 16% of the total)

Other methods used included reviews of theses/dissertations/creative components, comprehensive or professional exam scores, reviews of student research, surveys, and portfolios.

V-3. Graduate program outcomes assessments are implemented at the degree program level. Full details on each program's analysis of student learning and findings thereof are available on the UAT website (http://tinyurl.com/osureports).

Graduate degree programs reported 99 unique uses of program 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 for graduate degree programs was to continually monitor and ensure student achievement of the learning outcome. Other common uses for graduate degree programs included:

- Changing the curriculum (12 uses, 12% of the total)
- Changing the assessment process (10 uses, 10% of the total)
- Engaging faculty participation in assessment (7 uses, 7% of the total)
- Bringing department requirements in line with national standards (2 uses, 2% of the total)

OSU awards more than $100,000 in assessment funds for annual program outcomes assessments each year. Program outcome assessment is a critical component of each program's five-year Academic Program Review. As reported in section III-3, annual program outcome assessment has resulted in numerous program improvements.

V-4. In 2014-2015, 220 students were provisionally admitted to OSU graduate programs and enrolled at OSU. 178 (81%) of the 220 students who were provisionally admitted and enrolled in 2014-2015 were enrolled in the fall of 2015.

- 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 post-secondary institutions may be admitted provisionally on recommendation of the major department and with approval from the Dean of the Graduate College. Failure to meet required academic standards and benchmarks set for progress and grade point average results 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 2014-2015 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.