Oklahoma State University
America's Brightest ORANGE

Assessment Report 2015-2016

Prepared for
The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
June 2017

Ryan Chung
Director, University Assessment and Testing
&
Kelva Hunger
Assistant Director, Assessment & Analysis

James Knecht
Assistant Director, Testing & Technology
&
Lisa Cota, M.S.
Former Assistant Director, Assessment & Analysis

University Assessment and Testing
100 UAT Building
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK 74078-6043
405-744-9650
http://uat.okstate.edu/

Section I – Entry Level Assessment and Course Placement Activities

The purpose of entry-level assessment is to assist academic advisors in making placement decisions that will give students the best possible chance of academic success.

Three methods are used to assess students' readiness for college level coursework in the areas of Reading, English, Mathematics, and Science Reasoning: 1) the ACT (or converted SAT scores), 2) the Entry-Level Placement Assessment (ELPA, developed by OSU), and 3) secondary testing. Most entry-level assessment is conducted at the time a student enrolls for courses at OSU; the OSU Math Placement Exam can be taken any time before a student enrolls in a math course at OSU.

1) **ACT**
   Students with ACT subscores of 19 or above (or SAT equivalent where available) in Reading, English, Mathematics, and Science Reasoning are not required to complete remedial or developmental coursework in those subject areas.

2) **Entry-Level Placement Assessment (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 (or converted SAT 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 scores (when an ACT score is below 19) and students' grades to make decisions about appropriate course placement.

3) **Secondary Testing**
   Secondary testing includes ACCUPLACER tests (published by The College Board) for reading and English, and the Assessment of LEarning in Knowledge Spaces (ALEKS; published by McGraw Hill) for mathematics (see http://placement.okstate.edu for information on cut scores for these exams and corresponding course placement).
   Note that there is no secondary test available for science placement. Science placement is determined by a student's ACT score; students who do not score a 19 or greater on the National ACT or ACT Residual Exams' Science sections, or who do not have a 2.0 or higher on the science PGI coefficient on their ELPA must successfully complete UNIV 0153 or equivalent to satisfy remediation.

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 an ELPA Report that summarizes:

- The student's academic summary (ACT scores, high school GPA, high school class rank)
- The student's PGI 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 (OSRHE).

ELPA 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. This assessment process is implemented immediately prior to the spring and fall enrollment periods.

Scores for the above methods are analyzed to compare number of students with ACT subscores <19, number of students cleared for college-level coursework by ELPA, and number of students cleared for college-level coursework/course placement according to secondary testing scores. The academic performance of students, along with DFW rates of courses, are monitored to provide information about the effectiveness of placement decisions, the need to change cut scores or modify the entry-level assessment process, and to determine how teaching may be modified as a result of findings.

Resources

Many resources are available to students for academic support. The *Learning And Student Success Opportunity Center* (LASSO) offers free tutoring services in a variety of courses and subjects. The *Mathematics Learning Success Center* provides free tutoring in mathematics. The Statistics Learning & Instructional Center provides free tutoring in statistics. The *OSU 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 and departments offer additional resources such as tutoring, transition programs, and other academic resources.

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

In 2015-2016 a total of 4488 admitted and enrolled students with fewer than 24 credit hours were assessed using the entry-level assessment process. Table I-1 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-1. 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 2014-2015.

Subject Area	# of Students with ACT subscores <191	# of Students cleared for college-level coursework by ELPA
English	505	464
Mathematics	672	386
Reading	311	233
Science	213	36

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 each subject area: English: 87, Mathematics: 87, Reading: 87, Science: 421.

Students who are not cleared for college-level coursework using ELPA can choose to take a placement exam in most areas of deficiency for remediation. Historically, students have had the option of taking an ACT COMPASS test for English, reading, and science; in August 2016, these tests were retired. OSU selected to replace the English and reading tests with ACCUPLACER tests. The number of students who took a COMPASS test prior to August 2016 for fall 2016 enrollment in each subject area and the number of students who passed are shown in Table 2; the number of students who took ACCUPLACER tests in each available subject area and the number of students who passed are shown in Table 3.

Table 2. Number of students who took COMPASS tests for 2015-2016 placement.

Subject Area	# of Enrolled Students who took a COMPASS test	# of Students who passed a COMPASS test and were cleared for college-level coursework
English	71	37
Reading	72	45
Science	51	44

1. Some students took COMPASS tests in more than one area. Some students took COMPASS test(s) to assist with placement even though they were not required by ELPA to take remedial courses.

Table 3. Number of students who took ACCUPLACER tests for 2015-2016 placement.

Subject Area	# of Enrolled Students who took an ACCUPLACER test	# of Students who passed an ACCUPLACER test and were cleared for college-level coursework
English	50	11
Reading	24	7

1. Some students took ACCUPLACER tests in more than one area. Some students took ACCUPLACER test(s) to assist with placement even though they were not required by ELPA to take remedial courses. There is no ACCUPLACER test for science.

In mathematics, students had the option of taking the OSU Math Placement Exam to clear remediation requirements. 19 students with ACT Math subscores below 19 cleared remediation requirements using the OSU Math Placement Exam.

After all entry-level assessment was completed, 289 students (6.4% of the total new enrolled) were required to take at least one remedial course. Of the 4,488 new students in 2015-2016, 32 (0.7%) were required to enroll in remedial English classes, 189 (4.2%) in remedial math classes, 100 (2.2%) in remedial science classes, and 16 (0.3%) in remedial reading classes. Some students who were required to complete remedial classes satisfied the requirement with transfer courses, while others may later pass a secondary assessment. For this reason, the number of students who complete remedial courses can differ from the number of students required to do so.

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 this tracking process are shared with the Directors of Student Academic Services (DSAS) and the Instruction Council. The Office of University Assessment and Testing, the Office of Institutional Research and Information Management, and the OSU Mathematics and English Departments work cooperatively to evaluate the entry-level assessment process and to track student success in remedial and college-level courses.

Section II –General Education Assessment

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 at OSU: Institutional Portfolios, Review of General Education Course Database, and college-, department-, and program-level approaches.

1) 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 three areas that represent the overall goals of the general education program: written communication, critical thinking, and diversity. Although rubrics for the assessment of general education could be directly linked to each of the overall goals, it is recognized that these goals cannot be achieved independently of each other or only through the completion of courses with general education designations. For this reason, Institutional Portfolios contain student artifacts from general education-designated courses as well as other courses across campus that address one or more of the university's general education goals.

2) Review of General Education Course Database

The General Education Advisory Council (GEAC) certifies undergraduate courses that instructors/ departments/colleges request to be designated as general education. As part of the 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. Every general education course is aligned with one of four content areas: analytical and quantitative thought (A), humanities (H), social and behavioral sciences (S), and natural sciences (N). In addition, OSU students must participate in a diversity course (D), an international dimension course (I) and in natural sciences courses that include a lab component and have a scientific investigation (L) designation. GEAC periodically evaluates every general education-designated course to ensure alignment with the goals of the general education program. This process provides oversight for courses receiving general education designations and ensures students have sufficient opportunity to achieve the goals of the general education program.

3) College-, Department-, and Program-level Approaches

College-, department-, and program-level approaches to assessing general education goals are collected according to program assessment plans and reports submitted by the respective areas to University Assessment and Testing. These assessment approaches and methods are designed and/or selected by the colleges, departments, and/or programs across the institution according to the general education goals most appropriate to the respective area collecting data.

Analysis and Use of General Education Assessment Data

1) Institutional Portfolios

Institutional portfolios provide direct evidence of student achievement of the overall goals of the undergraduate general education program. In 2011, the Council for the Assessment of General Education (CAGE) established a rotating schedule for the three areas (critical thinking, written communication, and diversity). This schedule allows for each institutional portfolio outcome to be assessed every three years, allowing for long-term trends to be examined across groups of students.

In 2016, OSU evaluated diversity as a general education program outcome. In addition to evaluating written student artifacts by means of the AAC&U's Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric, OSU also administered the Global Perspectives Inventory (GPI) to first- and fourth-year students. Additionally, a qualitative study utilizing Photovoice was also conducted.

Preliminary statistical analysis of written student artifacts indicated no significant difference between freshmen and seniors ($p = 0.3425$). However, it is misleading to conclude from this analysis that students do not grow in their appreciation of diverse others during their time at OSU, as this analysis was a data snapshot, not a longitudinal study.

The results of the Global Perspectives Inventory suggest that students at OSU are reasonably comparable to the national norms of students nationwide who have also taken the GPI. However, the response rate to OSU's administration of the GPI was quite low (less than 200 students of the 2000 who were invited to participate responded); respondents may or may not be representative of the student body as a whole.

Fifteen OSU students participated in a qualitative Photovoice project. They took, wrote about, and discussed in focus groups photos related to their personal experiences with diversity in and out of the classroom. Six themes emerged from the photograph and focus group data: Course Quality, the OSU Experience, Spaces and Places, Grouping, Responsibility, and Hesitation. This project provided rich data concerning what these students learned about diversity during their time as an OSU student. The students described both positive learning experiences and negative experiences connected to diversity, and the results of this project have led to several recommendations for improving the general education assessment of diversity.

The full 2016 General Education Assessment Annual Report, available on the UAT website, provides an expanded explanation of these findings.

2) Review of General Education Course Database

Each OSU undergraduate course with a general education designation is reviewed by the General Education Advisory Council (GEAC) every 3-5 years. Courses that do not continue to meet the general education requirements according to GEAC will be denied general education designation; students will not receive general education credit for courses that do not hold a general education designation. Courses that are certified (or recertified) as having received one or more general education designations are identified in the OSU Course Catalog and the Class Schedule (available on the OSU Registrar's website: https://registrar.okstate.edu/) for the corresponding semesters.

3) College-, Department-, and Program-Level Approaches

College-, department-, and program-level approaches to assessing general education goals are analyzed by faculty and staff in each unit according to the assessment plan developed by that unit. College-, department-, and program-level assessment focused on general education assessment must be included in program outcomes assessment plans and reports and must follow the submission and review process outlined in the Program Outcomes Assessment section below. College-, department-, and program-level results are reported below in the program outcomes assessment portion of this Annual Student Assessment Report to the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

Assessment data collected from the general education assessment process are shared broadly both internally and publicly to encourage discussion and consideration of additional curricular, programmatic, and/or assessment changes that may result in improvement to the general education assessment program and/or to student achievement of the general education goals. Specifically, the General Education Advisory Council (GEAC), the Committee for the Assessment of General Education (CAGE), and the Assessment and Academic Improvement Council (AAIC) meet together once per year to discuss general education assessment results, consider needed changes, and provide recommendations for improvement.

Ultimately, assessment data from the general education assessment process are used in three main ways: 1) to implement improvement initiatives (e.g., faculty, staff, and instructor professional development; modification of assessment processes); 2) to monitor recent curricular changes, and 3) to consider and discuss additional modifications to the general education program (e.g., modifying general education curriculum, syllabi, instructional methodologies, general education course designations, or designation goals/criteria).

Section III – Program Outcomes

Program Outcomes Assessment

Program outcomes assessments for all undergraduate, graduate, and graduate certificate programs are conducted according to the program assessment plans and reports submitted by the respective unit to University Assessment and Testing. These program outcomes assessment approaches and methods are designed and/or selected by the faculty in the departments and/or programs across the institution according to the student learning outcomes developed by each program. Data collection is conducted by the faculty/staff in each respective department/program according to the program assessment plan. Common types of data collection methods for program outcomes assessment include (but are not limited to) analysis of written artifacts; rating of student skills; comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s); surveys; capstone projects; internship evaluations; course projects; and oral presentations.

Assessment plans must be updated every five years, and will be reviewed at least once every five years by a subcommittee of the Assessment and Academic Improvement Council (AAIC). Assessment reports are due to University Assessment and Testing annually in the month of September. Individual program assessment plans and reports are posted on the University Assessment and Testing website (www.uat.okstate.edu).

Data collected for program outcomes assessment are analyzed by faculty and staff in each department/program according to the plan provided by the program. Results from program outcomes assessment data are monitored by program faculty to ensure student achievement of the program learning outcomes. Common uses of program outcomes assessment include modifying the assessment plan/process, developing new tools for use in the assessment process (such as designing new rubrics), modifying course curriculum, making changes to the student advising process, changing course content, and hiring new faculty.

Table III-1 summarizes the assessment methods and number of individuals who participated in each assessment method for undergraduate and graduate degree programs at OSU, listed by college. 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.

In the spring of 2017, the College of Agriculture will use assessment budget funds to bring an external consultant to OSU to head a workshop on assessment. Some programs are using the opportunity to reconsider their assessment methodology and submit new assessment plans after the workshop.

Table III.1. 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	Writing new assessment plan					
Agricultural Economics	BS	Writing new assessment plan					
Agricultural Education	BS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam	39	31	38
Agricultural Communications	BS	Rating of skills (e.g.., rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g.., rubrics)	Survey	22	22	32
Agricultural Leadership	BS	New plan in place; report on new plan due September 2017					
Animal Science	BS	Writing new assessment plan					
Food Science	BS	Writing new assessment plan					
Biochemistry & Molecular Biology	BS	Survey	Survey	Capstone project	98	98	25
Entomology	BS	Capstone project	Analysis of written artifacts	Interviews	8	9	4
Horticulture	BS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam	Course project	Internship	16	17	17
Landscape architecture	BLA	Oral presentation	Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards	Rating of skills (e.g.., rubrics)	40	11	10

[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
Landscape management	BS	Internship	Rating of skills (e.g.., rubrics)	Internship	4	4	4
Environmental Science	BS	Capstone project	Analysis of written artifacts	Oral presentation	Not available	0	0
Natural Resource Ecology & Management	BS	Writing new assessment plan					
Plant and Soil Sciences	BS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam	Analysis of written artifacts	Oral presentation	19	0	0
Agricultural Economics	MS	Writing new assessment plan					
Agricultural Economics	PHD	Writing new assessment plan					
Agricultural Communications	MS	Analysis of written artifacts	Oral presentation	Review of Thesis/ Dissertation/ Creative Component	4	4	4
Agricultural Education	MS	Reported concurrently with Agricultural Communications MS					
Agricultural Education	PHD	Rating of Skills (rubrics)	Oral presentation	Review of student research	10	6	6
Animal Science	MS	Analysis of written artifacts	Oral presentation	Review of Thesis/ Dissertation/ Creative Component	13	13	13
Animal Science	PHD	Analysis of written artifacts	Oral presentation	Review of Thesis/ Dissertation/ Creative Component	3	3	3

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Biochemistry & Molecular Biology	MS	Review of student research	Analysis of written artifacts	Oral presentation	8	8	8
Biochemistry & Molecular Biology	PHD	Survey	Rating of Skills (rubrics)	Oral presentation	25	25	Not Available
Biosystems Engineering	MS	Report not submitted					
Biosystems Engineering	PHD	Report not submitted					
International Agriculture	MS	Rating of Skills (rubrics)	Rating of Skills (rubrics)		26	16	
Entomology	PHD	Rating of Skills (rubrics)	Oral presentation	Analysis of written artifacts	0	1	2
Entomology and Plant Pathology	MS	Oral presentation	Rating of Skills (rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	6	9	9
Plant Pathology	PHD	Rating of Skills (rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Oral presentation	1	4	2
Horticulture	MS	Rating of Skills (rubrics)	Oral presentation	Satisfaction Survey	9	12	2
Food Science	MS	Writing new assessment plan					
Food Science	PHD	Writing new assessment plan					
Natural Resource Ecology & Management	MS	Writing new assessment plan					
Natural Resource Ecology & Management	PHD	Writing new assessment plan					

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Crop Science	PHD	Rating of Skills (rubrics)	Rating of Skills (rubrics)	Oral presentation	1	1	1
Plant & Soil Sciences	MS	Rating of Skills (rubrics)	Rating of Skills (rubrics)	Oral presentation	3	3	4
Soil Science	PHD	Review of Thesis/ Dissertation/ Creative Component	Rating of Skills (rubrics)	Oral presentation	1	1	1

Table III.1. 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	Performance or Jury	Performance or Jury	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	3	3	3
Graphic Design	BFA	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	28	28	28	
Studio Art	BA	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Performance or Jury	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	10	10	10
Chemistry	BS(ACS)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	18	13	7
Chemistry	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	18	13	52
Communication sciences & disorders	BS	New Assessment plan filed; report on new plan due September 2017					
Computer science	BS	Programming Samples	Programming Samples	Programming Samples	1135	881	1315
English	BA	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Exit interviews	10	25	4
French	BA	Course project	Course project	Other (study abroad - foreign language majors only)	10	10	2
German	BA	Course project	Course project	Other (study abroad - foreign language majors only)	8	8	4

[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
Spanish	BA	Course project	Course project	Other (study abroad - foreign language majors only)	71	71	21
Geography	BA	Transcript Analysis	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Transcript Analysis	14	14	14
Geography	BS	Reported concurrently with Geography BA					
Geology	BS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Capstone project	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	38	39	16
American studies	BA	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	46	45	46
History	BA	Course Project	Capstone project	Analysis of Written Communications	10	10	10
Liberal Studies	BA	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)			7		
Mathematics	BA	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Course Projects	13	13	21
Mathematics	BS	Reported concurrently with Mathematics BA					
Multimedia journalism	BA	Capstone Project	Internship	Exit interviews	5	5	5
Multimedia journalism	BS	Reported concurrently with Multimedia Journalism BA					
Sports media	BA	Capstone Project	Internship	Exit interviews	10	5	5
Sports media	BS	Reported concurrently with Sports Media BA					
Strategic communications	BA	Capstone Project	Internship	Exit interviews	12	9	7

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Strategic communications	BS	Reported concurrently with Strategic Communications BA					
Microbiology, cell & molecular biology	BS	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	20	20	30
Music	BA	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Performance or Jury		25	65	0
Music performance	BM	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Performance or Jury		25	22	
Music Business	BM	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Internship		25	1	
Music education	BM	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Internship	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	49	88	29
Philosophy	BA	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Survey		6	3	
Physics	BS	Rubrics	Assessment of research and communication skills	0	74	74	0
Plant Biology	BS	Selected final exam questions	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)		20	2	
Political science	BA	Capstone Project	Capstone Project	Capstone Project	27	27	27

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Political science	BS	Reported concurrently with Political Science BA					
Psychology	BA	Compiled examination questions	Analysis of Written Artifacts		1322	173	
Psychology	BS	Reported concurrently with Psychology BA					
Sociology	BA	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	69	69	20
Sociology	BS	Reported concurrently with Sociology BA					
Statistics	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)		2	4	
Theater	BA	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Analysis of Written Communications	Measuring Effectiveness relative to Professional Standards	0	0	16
Biological science	BS	Course grades	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)		44	35	
Physiology	BS	Course grades	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)		24	Reported concurrently with Biological Sciences BS	
Zoology	BS	Course grades	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)		42		
Art History	MA	Performance or Jury	Review of Thesis/ Dssertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/ Dssertation/ Creative Component	3	2	2

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Chemistry	MS	Oral Presentation	Measuring Effectiveness relative to Professional Standards		7	40	
Chemistry	PHD	Oral Presentation	Measuring Effectiveness relative to Professional Standards		7	40	
Communication Science & Disorders	MS	Writing new Assessment Plan					
Computer Science	MS	Review of Thesis/ Dssertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/ Dssertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/ Dssertation/ Creative Component	13	12	12
Computer Science	PHD	Review of Thesis/ Dssertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/ Dssertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/ Dssertation/ Creative Component	3	3	3
English	MA	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Oral Presentation		14	29	
English	PHD	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Oral Presentation	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam	Reported concurrently with English MA	10	
Geography	MS	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Course project	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	54	0	7

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Geography	PHD	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Course project	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Reported concurrently with Geography PhD	1	
Geology	MS	Content exam	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	39	20	20
Geology	PHD	Content exam	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	9	3	3
Graphic design	MFA	New program; new assessment plan on file					
History	MA	Review of Student Research	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	5	5	5
History	PHD	Review of Student Research	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	5	5	5
Mathematics	MS	Review of Thesis/ Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/ Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/ Dissertation/ Creative Component	1	1	1
Mathematics	PHD	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	16	New assessment methodology; no data for these outcomes	
Mass Communications	MS	No assessment report received					
Microbiology	MS	Low enrollment; will compile data with next year's report					
Microbiology	PHD	Review of Student Research	Oral Presentation		24	24	

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Plant Biology	MS	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Review of Thesis/ Dssertation/ Creative Component	1	1	2
Music	MM	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards	Performance or Jury	13	9	9
Philosophy	MA	Review of Thesis/ Dssertation/ Creative Component	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Exit interviews	New assessment methodology; no data for these outcomes		
Physics	MS	Course grades	Course grades	Review of Thesis/ Dssertation/ Creative Component	15	18	9
Physics	PHD	Course grades	Course grades	Review of Thesis/ Dssertation/ Creative Component	Reported concurrently with Physics MS	9	
Fire & Emergency Management	MS	Course project	Course project	Review of Thesis/ Dissertation/ Creative Component	4	4	15

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Fire & Emergency Management	PHD	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	2	2	2
Political Science	MA	Take Home Examination	Review of thesis/ dissertation/ creative	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	12	3	3
Psychology	MS	Review of Student Research	Satisfactory progress towards degree		45	45	
Psychology	PHD	Reported concurrently with Psychology MS					
Sociology	MS	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	10	10	10
Sociology	PHD	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	5	5	3
Statistics	MS	Content exam	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	4	4	4
Statistics	PHD	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	6	3	3
Theatre	MA	Review of Student Research	Review of thesis/ dissertation/ creative	Performance or Jury	3	3	2
Zoology	MS	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Review of Student research	5	5	7

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Zoology	PHD	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Review of Student research	8	5	4

Table III.1. 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
Health Education & Promotion	BS	Capstone Project			53		
Physical Education	BS	Capstone Project	Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional exam(s)	34	9	7
Recreation Management and Therapeutic Recreation	BS	Survey	Survey	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional exam(s)	188	187	24
Aerospace administration and operations	BS	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	39	72	41
Career & Technical Education	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards	Survey	2	29	0
Elementary Education	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards	Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards	41	130	119

[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
Secondary Education	BS	Course Project	Oral Presentation	Analysis of Written Artifacts	30	30	30
Counseling	MS	Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards	Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards	0	0	0	0
Counseling Psychology	PHD	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Oral Presentation	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	24	24	24
Educational Psychology	MS	Rating of skills (eg., rubrics)	Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards	Rating of skills (e.g., rubrics)	6	10	9
Educational Psychology	PHD	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	6		9
Health & Human Performance	MS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Interviews	Interviews	21	21	21
Health, Leisure and Human Performance	PHD	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts		4	4	
Leisure Studies	MS	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional exam(s)	Interviews	Interviews	21	21	21

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
School Psychology	PHD	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	6	6	6
School Psychology	EdS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	6	6	6
Aviation and Space	EDD	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation		8	4	
Aviation and Space	MS	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Analysis of Written Artifacts		10	5	
Educational Leadership Studies	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional exam(s)		14	N/A	
Educational Technology	MS	Capstone Project	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional exam(s)	10	10	10
Educational Leadership Studies	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional exam(s)		14	16	
School Administration	EDD	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional exam(s	23	7	3

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
School Administration	PHD	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional exam(s	1	1	1
Education	PHD	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)			29		
Teaching, Learning and Leadership	MS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)			107		

Table III.1. 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	BAE	Performance or Jury	Satisfaction Survey	Capstone Project	12	12	12
Architecture	BAR	Course Project	Satisfaction Survey	Performance or Jury	98	98	65
Chemical Engineering	BS	No assessment report submitted					
Civil Engineering	BS	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Survey	35	35	35
Electrical Engineering	BS	Peer evaluation survey	Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards	Selected exam questions	N/A	N/A	N/A
Computer Engineering	BS	Reported concurrently with Electrical Engineering BS					
Construction Management Technology	BS	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional exam(s)	Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	70	39	70
Electrical Engineering Technology	BS	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	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
Fire protection & Safety Technology	BS	Course Project	Course Project	Course Project	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mechanical Engineering Technology	BS	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional exam(s)	Course Project	Course Project	54	54	63
Industrial Engineering & Management	BS	Course Project	Exit interviews	Employer survey	N/A	N/A	N/A
Aerospace Engineering	BS	Exit interviews	Alumni surveys	Capstone Project	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mechanical Engineering	BS	Reported concurrently with Aerospace Engineering BS					
Chemical Engineering	MS	No assessment report submitted					
Chemical Engineering	PHD	No assessment report submitted					
Civil Engineering	MS	Survey	Review of thesis/ dissertation/ creative component	review of thesis/ dissertation/ creative component	27	27	27

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Civil Engineering	PHD	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Survey	review of thesis/ dissertation/ creative component	6	6	6
Environmental Engineering	MS	No assessment report submitted					
Electrical Engineering	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Review of thesis/ dissertation/ creative component	Oral Presentation	44	44	8
Electrical Engineering	PHD	Oral Presentation	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Survey	10	10	10
Engineering & Technology Management	MS	No assessment report submitted	Survey	Alumni surveys		N/A	N/A
Industrial Engineering & Management	MS	Survey	Alumni Surveys				
Industrial Engineering & Management	PHD	Reported concurrently with Industrial Engineering & Management MS					
Mechanical Engineering	MS	Reported in odd-numbered years					

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Mechanical Engineering	PHD	Reported in odd-numbered years					

Table III.1. 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	Internship	Survey	Oral presentation	104	74	190
Hotel & Restaurant Administration	BS	Capstone Project	Oral Presentation	Course Project	50	45	50
Human Development & Family Science	BS	Survey	Internship	Analysis of Written Artifacts	N/A	96	96
Nutritional Sciences	BS	Comprehensive test questions	Course Project	0	0	0	0
Human Sciences option in Family Financial Planning	MS	No assessment report submitted					
Design, Housing & Merchandising	MS	Oral Presentation	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	12	12	12
Hospitality Administration	MS	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	6	14	2
Human Development & Family Science	MS	Course Project	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Rating of Skills (Rubrics)	7	39	19

[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.

Nutritional Sciences	MS	Oral Presentation	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional exam(s)	17	17	18
Human Sciences	PHD	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional exam(s)	Oral Presentation	3	3	3

Table III.1. 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	Rating of skills (Rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Survey	45	65	81
Business Administration (Economics)	BS	Rating of skills (Rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Survey	12	12	17
Business Administration (Entrepreneurship)	BS	Rating of skills (Rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Survey	16	20	33
Economics Business Administration (Finance)	BA	Rating of skills (Rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Survey	47	59	77
Business Administration (General business)	BS	Rating of skills (Rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Survey	17	19	39
Business Administration (International business)	BS	Rating of skills (Rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Survey	12	14	19

[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 (Mangement)	BS	Rating of skills (Rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Survey	98	111	165
Business Administration (Mgmt Info Sys)	BS	Rating of skills (Rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Survey	34	39	52
Business Administration (Marketing)	BS	Rating of skills (Rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Survey	55	64	135
Accounting	MS	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional exam(s)	Benchmarking	Analysis of written artifacts	30	44	51
Business Administration	PHD	Rating of skills (Rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Oral presentation	26	19	13
Business Administration	MBA	Course Project	Survey		106	109	

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Business Administration (Executive Research)	PHD	Rating of skills (Rubrics)	Survey	Analysis of written artifacts	9	54	54
Economics	MS	Survey	Survey	Survey	25	25	25
Economics	PHD	Rating of skills (Rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Rating of skills (Rubrics)	4	3	7
Entrepreneurship	MS	Survey	Survey	Survey	25	25	25
Quantitative Financial Economics	MS	Analysis of written artifacts	Oral presentation		13	6	
Management Information Systems	MS	Exam questions	Exam questions		34	92	

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Information Assurance	MS	Course Project	Analysis of written artifacts		19	12	

Section IV – Student Engagement and Satisfaction

Student engagement is assessed using the National Survey for Student Engagement (NSSE). The NSSE survey will is administered approximately every three years. The survey is administered online, and the sample of students invited to take the NSSE survey is determined according to the population and sampling parameters set by NSSE. The NSSE survey may be supplemented with topical modules (short sets of questions on designated topics that can be added on to the NSSE survey) depending on cost at the discretion of University Assessment and Testing. Further, the Beginning College Survey for Student Engagement (BCSSE) is also administered to first year students every three years depending on cost at the discretion of University Assessment and Testing.

Student satisfaction is assessed using select questions from the NSSE as well as through surveys of alumni. Surveys of alumni are conducted every year; surveys of alumni from undergraduate programs are conducted in even numbered years, and surveys of alumni from graduate programs are conducted in odd numbered years. Participants for the alumni surveys are all students who graduated 1- and 5- years prior to the year in which the alumni survey is being conducted. The surveys are administered online and through use of a phone bank staffed by current OSU students. The survey consists of a core set of questions developed at the institutional level. In addition to these questions, each undergraduate and graduate program is asked to submit a list of program-specific questions to be included in the alumni surveys.

Analysis and Use Student Engagement and Satisfaction Assessment Data

NSSE data is analyzed primarily by the Center for Postsecondary Research at Indiana University (the entity that administers and oversees NSSE at a national level). OSU University Assessment and Testing performs additional analyses with NSSE data as deemed necessary. In general, NSSE data is analyzed to compare first year students and seniors on a number of demographic variables and engagement indicators (as identified by NSSE). Results and reports are posted on the University Assessment and Testing website (www.uat.okstate.edu). Results and reports are also shared widely across the institution to encourage use of the data and facilitate discussion that may lead to improvement of processes and experiences that can enhance student engagement.

Satisfaction (alumni survey) data are analyzed by University Assessment and Testing. Responses are reported in aggregate across the entire institution as well as individually by academic program. Results of the aggregated university and program-specific analyses will be posted on the University Assessment and Testing website (www.uat.okstate.edu). Results of alumni surveys are used to identify institutional strengths and areas for improvement, track careers and continuing education of recent graduates, and provide programs with specific information about their alumni. Many academic programs also use alumni survey data as an element of their program outcomes assessment process. Further, all academic programs use the alumni survey in the development of their 5-year Academic Program Review (APR) reports, as these reports require programs to consider and reflect upon results from alumni surveys when developing recommendations for improvement and future plans.