Oklahoma State University
America's Brightest ORANGE

Assessment Report
2016-2017

Prepared for
The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
December 1, 2017

Chih Ming (Ryan) Chung, Ph.D.
Director, University Assessment & Testing

Kelva Hunger, M.S.
Assistant Director, Assessment & Analysis

James Knecht, M.S.
Assistant Director, Testing & Technology

Wei-Kang Kao, M.S., Graduate Research Assistant
Jhapendra Sapkota, M.S., Graduate Research Assistant

University Assessment and Testing
100 UAT Building
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK 74078-6043
405-744-6685
http://uat.okstate.edu/

Contents

Executive Summary

Introduction:

University Assessment and Testing (UAT) has collaborated with academic units and programs on gathering assessment data and reviewing annual program assessment reports based on the components requested by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. University Assessment and Testing has also been advised by the Assessment and Academic Improvement Council (AAIC), the Committee for the Assessment of General Education (CAGE), and the General Education Advisory Council (GEAC) to implement a more robust process and procedure to assess continuous improvement of student learning at Oklahoma State University.

Key findings:

- A total of 4,528 admitted and enrolled students with fewer than 24 earned credit hours were assessed using the entry-level placement assessment process. In addition, 59 (1.3%) were required to enroll in remedial English classes, 35 (0.8%) in remedial reading classes, 137 (3.0%) in remedial mathematics classes, and 138 (3.0%) in remedial science classes.
- The skills of critical thinking and written communication were assessed during the 2016-2017 academic year. The majority of students (84%) **met or exceeded expectations** on both skills in terms of general education assessment.
- In program outcomes assessment, four components of the annual reports were reviewed: (1) Program Student Learning Outcomes, (2) Assessment Methods, (3) Results, and (4) Use of Results. The review process involved assignment of a color code to each category. The overall program percent averages for each color category are as follows: 77% of programs received green (met expectation); 3% yellow (some issues/concerns were identified), and 18% red (missing information/no report).
- For student engagement, a total of 1,626 students responded to the 2015 NSSE with a 16% response rate. First-year students (91%) and senior students (87%) rated their overall OSU experience as “Excellent” or “Good”. First-year students (90%) and senior student (87%) would “Definitely” or “Probably” attend OSU again.
- In terms of student satisfaction, 90% of Oklahoma State alumni responded either “Satisfied” or “Very Satisfied” with their overall educational experience at OSU.

Next steps:

- Following the program outcomes assessment annual report review process, the next step is to engage in open dialogue with all stakeholders of programs on establishing effective strategies for continuous improvement for program student learning outcomes assessment.
- Create a yearly online survey to gather major aspects of overall student satisfaction at OSU based on the best practice.

Section I – Entry Level Assessment and Course Placement

Activities

I-1. What information was used to determine course placement and I-2. How were students determined to need remediation?

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. Information from three sources are used to assess students' readiness for college-level coursework in the areas of English, reading, mathematics, and science: a) the ACT (or converted SAT scores), b) the Entry-Level Placement Assessment (ELPA, developed by OSU), and c) 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.

a) ACT

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

b) 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.

c) Secondary Testing

- Secondary testing includes ACCUPLACER tests (published by The College Board) for English and reading, and the Assessment of LEarning in Knowledge Spaces (ALEKS; published by McGraw Hill) for mathematics (see http://placement.okstate.edu for information on current 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 subscore; 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 above. 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 (IRIM) 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.

I-3. What options were available for the students to remediate lack of preparedness?

Many resources are available to students for academic support to remediate lack of preparedness. 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 (SLIC) 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 OSU colleges and departments offer additional resources such as tutoring, transition programs, and other academic resources. OSU students can also enroll in UNIV 0-level courses (taught by NOC-Stillwater) in order to remediate in the four subject areas of English (UNIV 0133), reading and science (UNIV 0153), and mathematics (UNIV 0123).

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

Analyses and Findings

I-4. Describe analyses and findings of student success in both remedial and college-level courses, effectiveness of the placement decision, evaluation of cut-scores, and changes in the entry-level assessment process or approaches to teaching as a result of findings.

In 2016-2017, a total of 4,528 admitted and enrolled students with fewer than 24 earned credit hours were assessed using the entry-level placement assessment process. Table I-4a shows the number of enrolled students who had performance deficiencies in each subject area based on ACT scores (or converted SAT scores) and the number of students who were cleared for college-level coursework using ELPA.

Table I-4a. Number of enrolled new students with ACT subscores below 19 in each subject area and the number of students who were cleared for college-level coursework by ELPA in 2016-2017.

Subject Area	# of Students with ACT sub-scores <19[1]	# of Students cleared for college-level coursework by ELPA
English	506	447
Mathematics	712	575
Reading	315	280
Science	222	84

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: 577, Mathematics: 577, Reading: 577, Science: 853.

Students who were not cleared for college-level coursework in English or reading using ELPA could choose to take the OSU English Placement Exam and/or the OSU Reading Placement Exam (ACCUPLACER Sentence Skills and Reading Comprehension exams) in the area(s) of deficiency for remediation. The number of students who took such a test in each subject area and the number of students who passed are shown in Table I-4b.

Table I-4b. Number of students who took English (ACCUPLACER Sentence Skills) or Reading (ACCUPLACER Reading Comprehension) Placement tests for 2016-2017 placement.

Subject Area	# of Enrolled Students who took an ACCUPLACER test[1]	# of Students who passed an ACCUPLACER and were cleared for college-level coursework
English	47	10
Reading	35	11

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

In mathematics, students had the option of taking the OSU Math Placement Exam (ALEKS) to clear remediation requirements. 712 students with ACT Math scores below 19, 393 cleared remediation requirements using the OSU Math Placement Exam (ALEKS) in 2016-17.

After all entry-level assessment was completed, 287 students (6.3% of the total new students enrolled) were required to take at least one remedial course. Of the 4528 new students in 2016-2017, 59 (1.3%) were required to enroll in remedial English classes, 35 (.8%) in remedial reading classes, 137 (3.0%) in remedial mathematics classes, and 138 (3.0%) in remedial science 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.

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

Administering Assessment

II- 1. Describe the institutional general education competencies/outcomes and how they are assessed.

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 components are used to evaluate the general education program at OSU:

1. **Diversity** (student artifacts/interviews/surveys)
2. **Written Communication and Critical Thinking** (student artifacts)
3. **Beginning College Survey of Students Engagement** (BCSSE) and **National Survey of Student Engagement** (NSSE) (survey instruments)

The purpose of general education assessment is to provide information on students' achievement of the objectives of the General Education program outcomes using an institutional portfolio process. Oklahoma State University conducts the general education assessments based on the above mentioned three-year cycle.

In the fall of 2016 and spring of 2017, three teams of faculty raters scored 225 artifacts using the AAC&U (Association of American Colleges & Universities) Critical Thinking VALUE rubric, and an additional three teams of faculty raters scored 223 artifacts using the AAC&U Written Communication VALUE rubric.

II- 2. Describe how the assessments were administered and how students were selected.

The general education assessment process is organized by faculty on the Committee for the Assessment of General Education (CAGE) and facilitated by staff in the Office of University Assessment and Testing (UAT). At OSU, the artifacts were reviewed by teams of faculty volunteers.

Twelve faculty reviewers participated in the assessment process: six reviewers were assigned to Critical Thinking assessment (three teams of two raters each), and six reviewers were assigned to Written Communication assessment (three teams of two raters each).

In the 2017 general education assessment, AAC&U's VALUE rubrics was used. In total, there are 16 VALUE Rubrics and two of these rubrics (Critical Thinking and Written Communication) were used.

- **Critical Thinking** is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.
- **Written communication** is the development and expression of ideas in writing. Written communication involves learning to work in many genres and styles. It can involve working with many different writing technologies, and mixing texts, data, and images. Written communication abilities develop through iterative experiences across the curriculum.

The VALUE rubrics are scored on a scale of 1 to 4, where 1 (low) is defined as benchmark, 2 and 3 are defined as milestones, and 4 (high) is defined as capstone.

II-3. Describe strategies used to motivate students to substantively participate in the assessment.

Each CAGE committee member representative communicated with their college faculty members who taught general education courses and encouraged students to perform to their best ability to produce the artifact for the class. Students are informed about their participation in this assessment process as a requirement for the course work.

CAGE contacted departments who have gathered artifacts for the general education assessment. At the end of the 2016-2017 academic year, 225 students participated in the critical thinking assessment and 223 students participated in the written communication assessment. Participants were selected from different classes: English, Philosophy, Sociology, History, Psychology, and Animal Science.

II-4. What instructional changes occurred or are planned in response to general education assessment results.

- In the current monthly meeting discussion, CAGE agreed that the planned process for collecting data on assessment of critical thinking and written communication were on the right track and worked well among faculty and instructors who provided the artifacts for review.
- CAGE plans to share more detailed findings among colleges in the spring of 2018 for further discussion and to gather more feedback and comments for the next cycle.

Analyses and Findings

II-5. Report the results of each assessment by sub-groups of students, as defined in institutional assessment plans.

The assessment was divided into three sub-groups: **all students**, **freshmen only**, and **seniors only**.

In critical thinking, five categories of the AAC&U Critical Thinking VALUE rubric and the overall student ratings were assessed. The five categories were:

1. Explanation of Issues
2. Evidence
3. Influence of Context and Assumptions
4. Students' Position (Perspective, Thesis/Hypothesis)
5. Conclusion and Related Outcomes (Implications and Consequences)

For more information about the above five categories or to view the AAC&U Critical Thinking VALUE rubric, please refer to:
https://uat.okstate.edu/sites/default/files/assessPDFs/GenEdRubrics/rubric_criticalthinking.pdf

In the assessment which included **all students**, reliability was tested by calculating Cronbach's Alpha. The resulting statistic suggested that the scale's reliability is "Excellent" (Cronbach's Alpha = .956; N = 225).

- Overall, 79.5% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones (n = 179), and 12.9% of the students' artifacts were rated as Capstone (n = 29). In other words, the majority of students **met or exceeded expectations** in critical thinking.
- Below are the results for each rubric category:
    1. Explanation of Issues:
       78.7% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones (n = 177), and 16% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone (n = 36).
    2. Evidence:
       81.4% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones (n = 183), and 12% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone (n = 27).
    3. Influence of Context and Assumptions:
       78.7% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones (n = 177), and 10.2% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone (n = 23).
    4. Student's Position (Perspective, Thesis/Hypothesis):
       78.7% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones (n = 177), and 12.4% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone (n = 28).

5. Conclusion and Related Outcomes (Implications and Consequences):
   77.8% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones (*n* = 175), and 11.6% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone (*n* = 26).

In the assessment for **freshman only**, reliability was tested by calculating Cronbach's Alpha. The resulting statistic suggested that the scale's reliability is "Excellent" (Cronbach's Alpha = .960; *N* = 113).

- Overall, 75.2% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones (*n* = 85), and 13.3% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone (*n* = 15).
- Below are the results for each rubric category:
  1. Explanation of Issues:
     77% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones (*n* = 87), and 16% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone (*n* = 18).
  2. Evidence:
     81.4% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones (*n* = 92), and 12.4% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone (*n* = 12).
  3. Influence of Context and Assumptions:
     72.6% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones (*n* = 82), and 10.6% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone (*n* = 12).
  4. Student's Position (Perspective, Thesis/Hypothesis):
     75.2% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones (*n* = 85), and 12.4% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone (*n* = 14).
  5. Conclusion and Related Outcomes (Implications and Consequences):
     75.2% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones (*n* = 85), and 11.5% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone (*n* = 13).

In the assessment for **seniors only**, reliability was tested by calculating Cronbach's Alpha. The resulting statistic suggested that the scale's reliability is "Excellent" (Cronbach's Alpha = .951; *N* = 112).

- Overall, 83.9% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones (*n* = 94), and 12.5% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone (*n* = 14).
- Below are the results for each rubric category:
  1. Explanation of Issues:
     80.4% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones (*n* = 90), and 16.1% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone (*n* = 18).
  2. Evidence:
     80.5% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones (*n* = 91), and 11.6% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone (*n* = 13).

3. Influence of Context and Assumptions:
   84.9% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones (*n* = 95), and 9.8% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone (*n* = 11).
4. Student's Position (Perspective, Thesis/Hypothesis):
   82.2% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones (*n* = 92), and 12.5% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone (*n* = 14)
5. Conclusion and Related Outcomes (Implications and Consequences):
   80.4% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones (*n* = 90), and 11.6% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone (*n* = 13).

In written communication, five categories of the AAC&U Written Communication VALUE rubric and the overall student ratings were assessed. The five categories were:

1. Context of and Purpose for Writing
2. Content Development
3. Genre and Disciplinary Conventions
4. Sources and Evidence
5. Control of Syntax and Mechanics.

For more information about the above five categories or to view the AAC&U Written Communication VALUE rubric, please refer to:
https://uat.okstate.edu/sites/default/files/assessPDFs/GenEdRubrics/rubric_writtencommunication.pdf

In the assessment which included **all students**, reliability was tested by calculating Cronbach's Alpha. The resulting statistic suggested that the scale's reliability is "Excellent" (Cronbach's Alpha = .909; *N* = 223).

- Overall, 89.3% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones (*n* = 201), and 5.8% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone (*n* = 13). In other words, the majority of students **met or exceeded expectations** in written communication.
- Below are the results for each rubric category:
  1. Context of and Purpose for Writing:
     82.7% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones (*n* = 189), and 12.9% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone (*n* = 29).
  2. Content Development:
     81.3% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones (*n* = 183), and 10.7% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone (*n* = 24).

3. Genre and Disciplinary Conventions:
   86.3% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones (*n* = 194), and 9.8% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone (*n* = 22).
4. Sources and Evidence:
   77.7% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones (*n* = 175), and 13.8% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone (*n* = 31).
5. Control of Syntax and Mechanics:
   83.5% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones (*n* = 188), and 8% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone (*n* = 18).

In the assessment for **freshman only**, reliability was tested by calculating Cronbach's Alpha. The resulting statistic suggested that the scale's reliability is "Good" (Cronbach's Alpha = .895; *n* = 112).

- Overall, 90% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones (*n* = 103), and 4.5% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone (*n* = 5).
- Below are the results for each rubric category:
  1. Context of and Purpose for Writing:
     85.7% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones (*n* = 94), and 10.7% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone (*n* = 12).
  2. Content Development:
     83.9% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones (*n* = 94), and 8% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone (*n* = 9).
  3. Genre and Disciplinary Conventions:
     89.4% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones (*n* = 100), and 6.3% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone (*n* = 7).
  4. Sources and Evidence:
     84.8% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones (*n* = 95), and 7.1% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone (*n* = 8).
  5. Control of Syntax and Mechanics:
     83.9% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones (*n* = 94), and 6.3% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone (*n* = 7).

In the assessment for **seniors only**, reliability was tested by calculating Cronbach's Alpha. The resulting statistic suggested that the scale's reliability is "Excellent" (Cronbach's Alpha = .916; *n* = 111).

- Overall, 88.3% of the students were rated as Milestones (*n* = 98), and 7.2% of the students were rated as Capstone (*n* = 8).
- Below are the results for each rubric category:
    1. Context of and Purpose for Writing:
       81.1% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones (*n* = 90), and 15.3% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone (*n* = 17).
    2. Content Development:
       80.2% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones (*n* = 89), and 13.5% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone (*n* = 15).
    3. Genre and Disciplinary Conventions:
       84.7% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones (*n* = 94), and 13.5% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone (*n* = 15).
    4. Sources and Evidence:
       72.1% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones (*n* = 80), and 20.7% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone (*n* = 23).
    5. Control of Syntax and Mechanics:
       84.7% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones (*n* = 94), and 9.9% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone (*n* = 11).

In conclusion, students **met or exceeded expectations** in critical thinking. In particular, students did well in the category of Explanation of Issues. In written communication, students **met or exceeded expectations**, particularly in the categories of Context of and Purpose for Writing and Genre and Disciplinary Conventions. It is worth noting that in general, seniors scored better than freshmen in critical thinking and written communication.

II-6. How is student performance tracked into subsequent semesters and what were the findings?

- The Committee for the Assessment of General Education (CAGE) agrees that longitudinal analysis would be meaningful; however, in the current assessment procedure of gathering student artifacts, we are unable to track students into subsequent semesters. Also, OSU currently does not have an assessment management system capable of doing this type of assessment. Therefore, at this time, it is not possible to track students into subsequent semesters.
- The committee affirmed that if the added follow-up analysis shows to be beneficial and cost efficient, CAGE will consider implementation of a method/procedure and software for longitudinal data collection. CAGE will begin to look into this possibility in the near future which will include more detailed discussions among colleges and departments.

II-7. Describe the evaluation of the general education assessment and any modification made to assessment and teaching in response to the evaluation.

- Assessment data collected from the general education assessment process will be 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.
- 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 assessment for all undergraduate and graduate programs are conducted according to the program assessment plans and reports submitted by the respective unit to University Assessment and Testing.
- The assessment approaches and methods used in the program outcomes assessment are designed and 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 and staff in each respective department and/or 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 (e.g. rubrics); comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s); surveys; capstone projects; internship evaluations; course projects; oral presentations; benchmarking; measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards; review of thesis, dissertation, or creative component; interviews; performance or jury; visual collection (photos, videos, etc.); and review of student research**.**
- 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 and/or program according to the plan provided by the program. Results from program outcomes assessment data are disseminated and discussed by program faculty to ensure continuous improvement of student achievement for the program's student learning outcomes.
- Common uses of program outcomes assessment results include modifying the assessment plan and process, developing new methods and 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.

Administering Assessment

III-1. List, in table format, assessment measures and number of individuals assessed for each degree program. Including graduate programs if applicable to the institutional assessment plan.

Table III-1 (Please see below) 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.

Analyses and Findings

III-2. What were the analyses and finding from the program outcomes assessment?

University Assessment and Testing has received a total of 224 annual program outcomes assessment reports from eight colleges. Four components were used in the reviewing process of the reports: (1) Program Student Learning Outcomes, (2) Assessment Methods, (3) Results, and (4) Use of Results. Each review component was evaluated using a color-coded system: green, yellow, and red. Specifically, the color of green means the content of the specific review component meets the expectation of the criteria; the color of yellow means some issues or concerns were identified in the content of the review component, and the color of red means that missing information or no report was provided by the program. The overall program percent averages for each color category are as follows: 77% of programs received green; 3% yellow, and 18% red in all four components.

Here are the overall analyses and findings from reviewing the program outcomes assessment reports received from the 2016-2017 academic year:

Student Learning Outcomes:

Approximately 79% of programs received the color of green for having measureable/observable program student learning outcomes. Only a few issues/concerns were identified: among 3% of programs need to update or modify their student learning outcomes. In red, 18% of programs had missing information in this component.

Assessment Methods:

Approximately 76% of programs received the color of green for having appropriate program assessment methods. Only a few issues/concerns were identified: among 5% of programs need to update or modify their assessment methods. In red, 19% of programs had missing information in this component.

Results:

Approximately 79% of programs received the color of green for having useful program results. Very few issues/concerns were identified: only 2% of programs need to update or modify their results. In red, only 9% of programs had missing information in this component.

Use of Results:

Approximately 74% of programs received the color of green for having effective use of results. No issues/concerns were identified. In red, 26% of programs had missing information in this component.

III-3. What institutional changes occurred or are planned in the programs in response to program outcomes assessment?

- Findings of the program outcomes assessment report review will be presented to AAIC during the December meeting. The committee will advise UAT to proceed with the best approach to disseminate the outcomes of the review information.
- All relevant stakeholders of the program outcomes assessment (such as College deans, associate and assistant deans, chairs, directors, program assessment coordinators, etc.) will be informed of the results.
- In spring 2018, UAT will be working with programs that need assistance in modifying program student learning outcomes, creating more robust assessment methods, analyzing results, and identifying the best strategies for use of results of their program assessment for continuous improvement.
- UAT will collaborate with each of the associate deans, department chairs, program directors, and program assessment coordinators on how to use program assessment results to strengthen the quality of student learning outcomes assessment.
- In the spring of 2018, UAT will meet with programs that received yellow and/or red in one or more of the categories in their report review in order to address the issues/concerns in the assessment process. UAT will also meet with programs who received green that are willing to further improve the current status of their report to exceed the expectation level.
- University Assessment and Testing will facilitate collaboration between the programs that exceeded expectation on their program outcomes assessment report and all other programs to provide a source of internal support.

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	BSAG	Writing new assessment plan					
Agricultural Communications	BSAG	Visual collection (photos, videos, etc.)	Analysis of written artifacts	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	54	54	54
Agricultural Communications	MS	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	10	10	10
Agricultural Economics	BSAG	Writing new assessment plan					
Agricultural Economics	MS	Writing new assessment plan					
Agricultural Economics	PHD	Writing new assessment plan					
Agricultural Education	BSAG	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Analysis of written artifacts	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	21	27	21
Agricultural Education	MS	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	10	10	10
Agricultural Education	PHD	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Oral presentation	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	2	2	2
Agricultural Leadership	BS	No assessment report submitted					
Agricultural Leadership	MAG	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Not reported				
Animal Science	BSAG	No assessment report submitted					

[1] The first three assessment methods are listed. Some programs reported additional assessment methods and uses. For details, see the complete reports at https://uat.okstate.edu/assessCurrent.

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Animal Science	MAG	No assessment report submitted					
Animal Science	MS	Writing new assessment plan					
Animal Science	PHD	Writing new assessment plan					
Biochemistry & Molecular Biology	BSAG	No assessment report submitted					
Biochemistry & Molecular Biology	MS	No assessment report submitted					
Biochemistry & Molecular Biology	PHD	No assessment report submitted					
Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering	MS	Review of student research	Interviews	Interviews	9	1	1
Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering	PHD	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	Interviews	Interviews	20	4	4
Biosystems Engineering	BSBE	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam	Capstone project	Survey	27	27	27
Crop Science	PHD	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Oral presentation	Not reported		
Entomology	BSAG	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam	Survey	11	6	15
Entomology	MAG	No assessment report submitted					

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Entomology	PHD	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	3	Not reported	2
Entomology & Plant Pathology	MS	Oral presentation	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam	9	7	7
Environmental Science	BSAG	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	13	9	9
Food Science	BSAG	No assessment report submitted					
Food Science	MS	No assessment report submitted					
Food Science	PHD	No assessment report submitted					
Horticulture	BSAG	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	7	18	9
Horticulture	MAG	No assessment report submitted					
Horticulture	MS	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	14	14	14
International Agriculture	MS	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)		26	16	
Landscape Architecture	BLA	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Portfolio evaluation		8	8	8
Landscape Management	BSAG	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	4	4	4

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Natural Resource Ecology & Management	BSAG	Writing new assessment plan					
Natural Resource Ecology & Management	MS	Writing new assessment plan					
Natural Resource Ecology & Management	PHD	Writing new assessment plan					
Plant & Soil Sciences	BSAG	No assessment report submitted					
Plant & Soil Sciences	MS	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	6	6	6
Plant Pathology	MAG	No assessment report submitted					
Plant Pathology	PHD	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	3	0	2
Plant Science	MAG	No assessment report submitted					
Soil Science	MAG	No assessment report submitted					
Soil Science	PHD	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Oral presentation	Not reported		

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
American Studies	BA	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	26	26	26
Applied Statistics	BS	New program; currently no assessment data					
Art History	BA	Oral presentation	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	6	6	6
Art History	MA	Oral presentation	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	2	2	2
Biochemistry	BS	No assessment report submitted					
Biological Science	BS	Other: Transcript data	Other: Conceptual inventory	Analysis of written artifacts	58	41	36
Chemistry	BS(ACS)	Analysis of written artifacts	Analysis of written artifacts		11	11	
Chemistry	BS	Analysis of written artifacts	Analysis of written artifacts		11	11	
Chemistry	MS	Oral presentation	Survey		1	2	
Chemistry	PHD	Oral presentation	Survey		11	22	
Communication Science & Disorders	BS	Other: Pre-designated exam questions	Analysis of written artifacts	Oral presentation	383	88	95

[2] The first three assessment methods are listed. Some programs reported additional assessment methods and uses. For details, see the complete reports at https://uat.okstate.edu/assessCurrent.

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Communication Science & Disorders	MS	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Review of student research	30	43	92
Computer science	BS	Other: Evaluations based on programming samples	Other: Evaluations based on assignments & projects	Other: Evaluations based on assignments, projects, proofs, & papers	729	597	749
Computer Science	MS	Other: Master of Science assessment rubric	Other: Master of Science assessment rubric	Other: Master of Science assessment rubric	17	17	17
Computer Science	PHD	Other: Doctorate assessment rubric	Other: Doctorate assessment rubric	Other: Doctorate assessment rubric	7	7	7
Creative Writing	MFA	No assessment report submitted					
Economics	BS	No assessment report submitted					
English	BA	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Survey	54	25	34
English	MA	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	Survey	51	9	19
English	PHD	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	Survey	51	9	19
Fire & Emergency Protection	MS	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Course project	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	3	5	6

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Fire & Emergency Protection	PHD	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	2	2	2
French	BA	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Analysis of written artifacts	2	28	28
Geography	BA	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Course project	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	9	6	18
Geography	BS	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Course project	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	9	6	18
Geography	MS	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	Oral presentation	Analysis of written artifacts	9	14	30
Geography	PHD	Analysis of written artifacts	Course project	Course project	30	2	1
Geology	BS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Capstone project	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	33	38	19
Geology	MS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	39	19	19
Geology	PHD	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	9	3	3
Geospatial Information Sciences	BS	New program; currently no assessment data					

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
German	BA	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Analysis of written artifacts	16	12	12
Global Studies	BA	No assessment report submitted					
Graphic Design	BFA	Course project	Course project	Course project	19	19	19
Graphic Design	MFA	New program; currently no assessment data					
History	BA	Analysis of written artifacts	Analysis of written artifacts	Analysis of written artifacts	10	10	10
History	MA	Analysis of written artifacts	Analysis of written artifacts	Analysis of written artifacts	5	5	5
History	PHD	Analysis of written artifacts	Analysis of written artifacts	Analysis of written artifacts	5	5	5
Liberal Studies	BA	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	8	8	8
Liberal Studies	BS	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	8	8	8
Mass Communications	MS	Analysis of written artifacts	Analysis of written artifacts	Analysis of written artifacts	Not reported		
Mathematics	BA	Analysis of written artifacts	Analysis of written artifacts	Analysis of written artifacts	20	12	12
Mathematics	BS	Analysis of written artifacts	Analysis of written artifacts	Analysis of written artifacts	20	12	12
Mathematics	MS	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	Oral presentation	6	6	6
Mathematics	PHD	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Oral presentation	17	2	1
Microbiology	MS	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	6	6	6

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Microbiology	PHD	Capstone project	Oral presentations		24	24	
Microbiology, Cell, & Molecular Biology	BS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Course project	25	25	40
Multimedia journalism	BA	Survey	Survey	Interviews	5	5	5
Multimedia journalism	BS	Survey	Survey	Interviews	5	5	5
Music	BA	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Performance or jury	Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards	29	136	19
Music	MM	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Performance or jury	Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards	29	136	19
Music Business	BM	No assessment report submitted					
Music Education	BM	No assessment report submitted					
Music Performance	BM	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Performance or jury	Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards	29	136	19
Philosophy	BA	Analysis of Written Artifacts			8		

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Philosophy	MA	Analysis of written artifacts	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	Survey	3	3	3
Physics	BS	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Survey	34	28	4
Physics	MS	Other: Course grades	Other: Course grades	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	14	18	13
Physics	PHD	Other: Course grades	Other: Course grades	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	14	18	13
Physiology	BS	Other: Transcript data	Other: Conceptual inventory of natural selection	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	100	41	36
Plant Biology	BS	Other: Selected final exam questions	Analysis of written artifacts	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	33	3	0
Plant Biology	MS	Analysis of written artifacts	Analysis of written artifacts	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	2	2	5
Political Science	BA	Capstone project	Capstone project	Capstone project	49	49	49
Political Science	BS	Capstone project	Capstone project	Capstone project	49	49	49
Political Science	MA	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	10	2	2

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Psychology	BA	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Analysis of written artifacts		1276	204	
Psychology	BS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Analysis of written artifacts		1276	204	
Psychology	MS	No assessment report submitted					
Psychology	PHD	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component		48	48	
Sociology	BA	Analysis of written artifacts	Analysis of written artifacts	Analysis of written artifacts	72	72	19
Sociology	BS	Analysis of written artifacts	Analysis of written artifacts	Analysis of written artifacts	72	72	19
Sociology	MS	Analysis of written artifacts	Other: Theory paper		4	4	
Sociology	PHD	Analysis of written artifacts	Other: Theory paper	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	1	1	4
Spanish	BA	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Analysis of written artifacts	60	59	59
Sports Media	BA	Survey	Interviews	Interviews	5	5	5
Sports Media	BA	Survey	Interviews	Interviews	5	5	5
Statistics	BS	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Capstone course	Analysis of written artifacts	2	3	2

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Statistics	MS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	2	2	2
Statistics	PHD	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	4	3	1
Strategic Communications	BA	Survey	Interviews	Interviews	5	5	5
Strategic Communications	BS	Survey	Interviews	Interviews	5	5	5
Studio Art	BFA	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Capstone project	11	11	11
Studio Art	BA	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Not reported		
Theatre	BA	Analysis of written artifacts	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards	5	6	8
Theatre	MA	Analysis of written artifacts	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	3	3	2
Zoology	BS	Other: Transcript data	Other: Conceptual inventory of natural selection	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	25	41	36
Zoology	MS	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Review of student research	12	12	6

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 (e.g. rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Review of student research	2	4	6

Table III.1. Program Outcomes Assessment (continued)
College of Education[3]

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Applied Exercise Science	BS	No assessment report submitted					
Aerospace Administration and Operations	BS	Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards	Other: Case study	Analysis of written artifacts	33	23	38
Applied Educational Studies - Aviation and Space	EDD	Analysis of written artifacts	Oral presentation		6	3	
Aviation and Space	MS	Analysis of written artifacts	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component		24	6	
Career & Technology Education	BS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Analysis of written artifacts	Course project	68	22	54
Counseling	MS	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	98	25	29

[3] The first three assessment methods are listed. Some programs reported additional assessment methods and uses. For details, see the complete reports at https://uat.okstate.edu/assessCurrent.

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Educational Psychology - Counseling Psychology	PHD	No assessment report submitted					
Education	PhD	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Oral presentation		10	5	
Educational Leadership & Policy - Education Admin	PhD	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Analysis of written artifacts	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	2	1	Not reported
Educational Leadership Studies - College Student	PhD	No assessment report submitted					
Educational Leadership Studies - Higher Education	MS	No assessment report submitted					
Educational Leadership Studies - Higher Education	PhD	No assessment report submitted					
Educational Leadership Studies-School Admin	MS	Measuring effectiveness relative to professional standards	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)		12	8	

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Educational Psychology - Counseling Psychology	PhD	No assessment report submitted					
Educational Psychology - Educational Psychology	MS	Analysis of written artifacts	Analysis of written artifacts	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	2	2	2
Educational Psychology - Educational Psychology	PhD	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Survey	Analysis of written artifacts	5	5	5
Educational Psychology - Research & Evaluation	MS	No assessment report submitted					
Educational Psychology - Research & Evaluation	PhD	No assessment report submitted					
Educational Psychology - School Psychology	PhD	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Review of thesis/ dissertation/ creative component	9	24	4
Educational Psychology - School Psychology	EDD	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	3	9	3
Educational Technology	MS	Capstone project	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)		11	7	

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	159	195	89
Health & Human Performance	MS	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Analysis of written artifacts	7	4	7
Health Education & Promotion	BS	Analysis of written artifacts			50		
Health, Leisure and Human Performance-HHP Option	PhD	No assessment report submitted					
Health, Leisure and Human Performance-Leisure Option	PhD	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Analysis of written artifacts	2	4	2
Higher Education	EDD	No assessment report submitted					
Leisure Studies	MS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Performance or jury	Performance or jury	3	Not reported	
Nursing	BSN	New program; currently no assessment data					

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Physical Education	BS	Analysis of written artifacts	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	26	12	10
Recreation Management and Therapeutic Recreation	BS	Survey	Survey		117	117	
School Administration	EDD	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Analysis of written artifacts	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	4	3	1
School Administration	PhD	No assessment report submitted					
Secondary Education	BS	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	71	71	71
Teaching	MA	New program; currently no assessment data					
Teaching, Learning and Leadership	MS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)			75		

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
Aerospace Engineering	BS	Oral presentation	Analysis of written artifacts		Not reported		
Architectural Engineering	BAE	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Survey	12	12	12
Architecture	BAR	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Course project	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	48	39	39
Chemical Engineering	BS	Analysis of written artifacts			150		
Chemical Engineering	MS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Survey	Interviews	19	21	6
Chemical Engineering	PHD	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Survey	Interviews	19	21	6
Civil Engineering	BS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	48	48	48
Civil Engineering	MS	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	21	21	21

[4] The first three assessment methods are listed. Some programs reported additional assessment methods and uses. For details, see the complete reports at https://uat.okstate.edu/assessCurrent.

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Civil Engineering	PHD	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	6	6	6
Computer Engineering	BS	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Capstone project	Interviews		Not reported	
Construction Management Technology	BS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	150	39	150
Electrical Engineering	BS	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Capstone project	Interviews		Not reported	
Electrical Engineering	MS	Survey	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	Survey	25	14	25
Electrical Engineering	PHD	Survey	Analysis of written artifacts	Survey	16	13	3
Electrical Engineering Technology	BS	No assessment report submitted					
Engineering & Technology Management	MS	No assessment report submitted					

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Environmental Engineering	MS	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	5	5	5
Fire protection & Safety Technology	BS	Course project	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	24	45	21
Industrial Engineering & Management	BS	Oral presentation	Course project	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	50	50	50
Industrial Engineering & Management	MS	Survey	Survey	Survey	20	20	20
Industrial Engineering & Management	PHD	Survey	Survey	Survey	20	20	20
Materials Science & Engineering	MS	No assessment report submitted					
Materials Science & Engineering	PHD	No assessment report submitted					
Mechanical Engineering	BS	Interviews	Survey	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Not reported		
Mechanical Engineering	MS	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component	Survey	Oral presentation	29	Not reported	

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Mechanical Engineering	PHD	Review of thesis/dissertation/ creative component			6		
Mechanical Engineering Technology	BS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Course project	Analysis of written artifacts	57	33	60
Petroleum Engineering	MS	New program; currently no assessment data					

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	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Course project	Analysis of written artifacts	45	50	15
Design, Housing & Merchandising	MS	No assessment report submitted					
Hospitality Administration	MS	Course project	Analysis of written artifacts		Not reported	14	
Hotel & Restaurant Administration	BS	No assessment report submitted					
Human Development & Family Science	BS	Survey	Survey	Analysis of written artifacts	115	167	197
Human Development & Family Science	MS	Analysis of written artifacts	Course project	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	34	22	13
Human Sciences	PHD	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Analysis of written artifacts	Oral presentation	3	3	2
Human Sciences option in Family Financial Planning	MS	No assessment report submitted					
Nutritional Sciences	BS	No assessment report submitted					

[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	No assessment report submitted
Nutritional Sciences	PHD	No assessment report submitted

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

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)	Benchmarking	Analysis of written artifacts	30	41	38
Business Administration	MBA	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	72	15	76
Business Administration (Accounting)	BS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Course project	568	82	90
Business Administration (Accounting)	PHD	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Other: Analysis of curriculum vitae	Not reported		
Business Administration (Economics)	BA	Other: Nationally-benchmarked assessment test	Other: Nationally-benchmarked assessment test	Other: Spreadsheet assignment	13	18	Not reported
Business Administration (Entrepreneurship)	BS	Other: Nationally-benchmarked assessment test	Other: Nationally-benchmarked assessment test	Other: Spreadsheet assignment	25	9	Not reported
Business Administration (Entrepreneurship)	PHD	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Comprehensive, certification, or	Other: Analysis of curriculum vitae	Not reported		

[6] The first three assessment methods are listed. Some programs reported additional assessment methods and uses. For details, see the complete reports at https://uat.okstate.edu/assessCurrent.

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
			professional exam(s)				
Business Administration (Executive Research)	PHD	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Review of student research	Analysis of written artifacts	9	54	54
Business Administration (Finance)	BS	Other: Nationally-benchmarked assessment test	Other: Nationally-benchmarked assessment test	Other: Spreadsheet assignment	64	65	Not reported
Business Administration (Finance)	PHD	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Other: Analysis of curriculum vitae		Not reported	
Business Administration (General Business)	BS	Other: Nationally-benchmarked assessment test	Other: Nationally-benchmarked assessment test	Other: Spreadsheet assignment	28	22	Not reported
Business Administration (International Business)	BS	Other: Nationally-benchmarked assessment test	Other: Nationally-benchmarked assessment test	Other: Spreadsheet assignment	12	17	Not reported
Business Administration (Mangement)	BS	Other: Nationally-benchmarked assessment test	Other: Nationally-benchmarked assessment test	Other: Spreadsheet assignment	142	94	Not reported
Business Administration (Mangement)	PHD	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Other: Analysis of curriculum vitae		Not reported	

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Business Administration (Marketing)	BS	Other: Nationally-benchmarked assessment test	Other: Nationally-benchmarked assessment test	Other: Spreadsheet assignment	112	81	
Business Administration (Marketing)	PHD	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Other: Analysis of curriculum vitae		Not reported	
Business Administration (Mgmt Info Sys)	BS	Other: Nationally-benchmarked assessment test	Other: Nationally-benchmarked assessment test	Other: Spreadsheet assignment	53	40	Not reported
Business Administration (Mgmt Info Sys)	PHD	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Other: Analysis of curriculum vitae		Not reported	
Business Administration (Multidisciplinary)	BS	Other: Nationally-benchmarked assessment test	Other: Nationally-benchmarked assessment test	Other: Spreadsheet assignment		Not reported	
Business Analytics	MS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	18	13	39
Economics	MS	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Analysis of written artifacts	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	1	1	1
Economics	PHD	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Analysis of written artifacts	Analysis of written artifacts	3	3	6

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Entrepreneurship	MS	Survey	Survey	Survey	32	32	32
Information Assurance	MS	Analysis of written artifacts			15		
Management Information Systems	MS	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Survey		9	57	
Quantitative Financial Economics	MS	Analysis of written artifacts	Oral presentation		5	5	

Table IV.1. Program Outcomes Assessment (continued)
Graduate College[7]

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Plant Science	PHD	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Oral presentation		3	3	

Table IV.1. Program Outcomes Assessment (continued)
Center for Veterinary Health Sciences[8]

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Veterinary Biomedical Sciences	**MS**	Other: Course-based assessment	Review of student research	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	7	6	5
Veterinary Biomedical Sciences	**PHD**	Other: Course-based assessment	Review of student research	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Not reported		

[7,8] The first three assessment methods are listed. Some programs reported additional assessment methods and uses. For details, see the complete reports at https://uat.okstate.edu/assessCurrent.

Section IV – Student Engagement and Satisfaction

Administration of Assessment

IV-1. What assessments were used and how were the students selected?

- *National Survey for Student Engagement (NSSE)*
    - Student engagement is assessed using the National Survey for Student Engagement (NSSE).
    - The NSSE survey is administered approximately every three years, with the most recent data collection having occurred in 2015. Preparation for 2018 NSSE data collection is in progress.
    - 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.
    - Only first-year and senior students will be selected for participating in the 2018 NSSE data collection.
- *OSU Alumni Survey*
    - Surveys of OSU alumni are conducted every year. Alumni of an undergraduate program are surveyed in even numbered years, and alumni of a graduate program are surveyed in odd numbered years.
    - In the present 2016-2017 State Regents Report, alumni survey data for graduate programs were collected. Alumni survey data for undergraduate programs will be collected in the 2018 spring semester.
    - Participants for the alumni surveys are all students who graduated 1- and 5- years prior to the year in which the alumni survey was conducted.
    - Surveys were administered via an online survey tool and a call center was utilized in order to increase the response rate of survey participants.
    - The survey consists of a core set of questions developed at the institutional level. In addition to these questions, each undergraduate and graduate program was asked to submit a list of program-specific questions to be included in the alumni survey.
    - For the 2017 alumni survey, a list of survey participants was gathered and verified by University Assessment and Testing (UAT) with joint effort from Institutional Research and Information Management (IRIM) and the OSU Alumni Association.

IV-2. What were the analyses and findings from the student engagement and satisfaction assessment?

- *National Survey for Student Engagement (NSSE)*
    - A total of 1,626 students responded to the 2015 NSSE with a 16% response rate. Specifically, 14% (*n* = 637) of first-year students and 18% (*n* = 989) of senior students participated in the most recent data collection process.
    - Results for OSU from the 2015 NSSE were compared to other peer institutions in the same geographic region and sector (public/private).
    - In terms of student engagement assessment, listed below are the top five highest performing survey items for First-year and Senior students, relative to other peer institutions:

First-year

- Quality of interactions with academic advisors
- Institution emphasis on using learning support services
- Quality of interactions with student services staff
- Quality of interactions with administrative staff/offices
- Talked about career plans with a faculty member

Senior

- Completed a culminating senior experience
- Quality of interaction with academic advisor
- Institution emphasis on providing support for overall well-being
- Worked with other students on course projects/assignments
- Asked another student to help you understand course material

    - In terms of satisfaction assessment, students were asked to evaluate their overall experience at OSU and whether or not they would choose to attend OSU again.
        - 91% of first-year students and 87% of senior students rated their overall OSU experience as “Excellent” or “Good”.
        - 90% of first-year students and 87% of senior student would “Definitely” or “Probably” attend OSU again.
        - OSU students responded more positively on these two NSSE items compared to peer institutions.

- *OSU Alumni Survey*
    - A total of 433 graduate students responded to the survey executed in the 2017 spring semester. The overall response rate was 14%.
    - When asked, *"How satisfied are you with your overall educational experience at OSU?"* 90% of students responded either "Satisfied" or "Very Satisfied."
    - In addition, 87% of students indicated either "Adequately" or "Very Well" when asked, "*How well have OSU graduate programs prepared you prior to graduation?*" and 91% of students indicated either "Adequately" or "Very Well" when asked, "*How well has OSU prepared you for your current position?*"
    - Among all colleges across OSU, the overall satisfaction rate based on the educational experience ranged from 80% to 97%.
    - The alumni survey report is made available for each graduate program to review.

IV-3. What changes occurred or are planned in response to the student engagement and satisfaction assessment?

- The University Assessment and Testing (UAT) office is planning to create an overall institution satisfaction survey to gather more up-to-date data from OSU students in terms of their aspects of satisfaction on (1) Academic, (2) Student/Campus life, (3) Diversity/Campus Climate, (4) Advising, (5) Campus Services, and (6) Sense of Belonging. The survey will conclude with an open-ended question where the students can provide any additional information about their OSU experience.
- The survey items will be based on both theoretical and practical aspects of student satisfaction based on research done in higher education.
- Survey items will be reviewed by UAT and the Assessment & Academic Improvement Council (AAIC) and related units at OSU.
- UAT will seek approval and begin to conduct the pilot study for this satisfaction survey in the 2018 spring semester.
- The reason for having this new survey instrument is that it can help OSU gather more effective and up-to-date information from students. Currently, the OSU alumni survey is only conducted every other year at the program level (undergraduate and graduate), and the NSSE (which specializes in student engagement and not student satisfaction), is only conducted every three years. The gap of time in these surveys is problematic when trying to assess continuous satisfaction and improvement. Therefore, the implementation of a new, annual student satisfaction survey is necessary to measure satisfaction, not only in alumni, but also in current students, and also on a year-to-year basis. This new survey instrument will be beneficial to all units from both academic affairs and student affairs, and most importantly, for OSU as an overall annual assessment effort.
- University Assessment and Testing will begin the process of approval from AAIC to implement new content and questions in the alumni survey, along with a new data collection procedure for this survey. The new data collection procedure will not include the use of a call center.

Assessment Budget

Provide the following information regarding assessment fees and expenditures for 2016-17:

Assessment Fees	**$848,750.78**
Assessment Salaries	**$269,630.66**
Distributed to Other Departments	**$182,605.80**
Operational Costs	**$163,315.00**
Total Expenditures	**$615,551.46**