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Introduction

At its June 25-26, 2014 meeting, the Board of Commissioners accepted Oregon State University’s Year 3 Report. However, as part of the communication on that outcome the Commission also reflected on our Ad Hoc Peer Evaluation Report of 2012 and asked the University to submit an additional “Ad Hoc Report without a visit in the fall of 2015” to address the following Peer Evaluation Report recommendation:

**Recommendation 2: The committee recommends that the institution provide evidence that assessment data are used to revise educational programs (Standard 4.A.3).**

We provide context for our response to this recommendation by demonstrating how OSU continues to develop, implement, and refine a robust multi-pronged assessment practice that touches all aspects of OSU’s academic enterprise. The report describes annual assessment reporting at the undergraduate and graduate levels, baccalaureate core (general education) assessment, assessment components at the undergraduate and graduate levels of academic program reviews, and other assessment-related activities.

Undergraduate assessment is overseen by the office of Academic Programs, Assessment, and Accreditation (APAA) and graduate assessment is overseen by the Graduate School. Although there are some minor differences between assessment processes, the office of APAA and the Graduate School coordinate to help ensure process consistency (such as similar due dates, forms, and guidelines) for annual assessment reporting and academic program reviews.
I. Annual Assessment Reporting

The Year 3 Report provided a detailed overview of OSU’s assessment processes. This follow-up Ad Hoc report shares accomplishments and advancements that have occurred since the last report submission. In particular, we focus on the ways in which we have increased support for and tracking of the academic units as they utilize their assessment results to make programmatic improvements, and engage in full-cycle assessment. In specific response to the recommendation, the undergraduate assessment and graduate assessment reporting process sections includes narrative examples of the types of assessment-informed changes occurring at the program level.

Assessment of Undergraduate Programs

Since OSU’s Year 3 Report, the undergraduate program annual assessment reporting process has become even more robust and integrated into the culture of the university. We continue to see an increasing number of programs engaging fully in direct assessment of their student learning outcomes (SLOs). Between 2014 and 2015 the percentage of programs that submitted up-to-date reports grew from 40% to 75%. Additionally, more faculty members are involved in reflecting and acting on the results of their program’s assessment. The impact of this is best seen in the thoughtful and meaningful summaries in the annual assessment reports and the resulting programmatic changes. Examples of the types of assessments and changes are highlighted in the “Program Change Examples” section.

For the OSU annual reporting process, all undergraduate degree programs develop assessment plans to evaluate program level SLOs. These outcomes represent the knowledge and skills that graduates from that program should demonstrate and possess upon completion of their degree. The curriculum, pedagogy, and program structure are guided and informed by the student achievement of these outcomes. These programmatic outcomes are aligned to the program curriculum and embedded course assessments. Many of the undergraduate programs utilize the office of APAA curriculum map matrix to map the ways in which the outcomes, courses, and assessments align. Each academic program conducts direct assessment of at least one of their SLOs each academic year. The program is responsible for tracking and analyzing data that captures student learning, reflecting on the information obtained through the assessment, implementing appropriate changes based on the results, and reporting on that process to the office of APAA. The assessment plans, reports, and any supplemental materials are housed on the office of APAA SharePoint site.

An important part of the annual assessment reporting process, which we have strengthened since our previous report, is the way in which the office of APAA provides feedback and support to the programs as they undergo this rigorous self-reflective process. Through the hiring of two assessment coordinators, the office of APAA has increased our capacity to consult with the programs, help them capture their assessment efforts, and track and summarize the results. The additional FTE has also allowed us to make several enhancements to the annual undergraduate assessment report review process in the following ways:

(1) The assessment coordinators provide specific and relevant written feedback to each undergraduate program’s assessment report from the previous year.

---

1 To log on to the APAA SharePoint site, an OSU Network Identification (ONID) account is required. We can provide access to this site if requested.
(2) The assessment coordinators hold in-person meetings with each of the undergraduate academic programs to review their reports and help them revise (if necessary) to more clearly and completely articulate and explain their assessment methods, results, and actions taken.

(3) The assessment coordinators serve as mentors and consultants for programs at any stage in the assessment process. This includes assisting programs with: writing/revising outcomes, aligning outcomes and coursework, developing or identifying direct-assessment methods, tracking and analyzing results, describing changes, etc.

(4) The office of APAA partnered with the Student Affairs Office of Research, Evaluation, and Planning to develop an institution-wide tracking system to capture the assessment methods and results from programs in both divisions (Appendix A).

(5) The office of APAA has developed common tools for academic programs, such as training materials, worksheets, handouts, and tutorials, to increase the consistency and clarity of information provided. These materials have been very well received by college-level leadership as well as the faculty engaged in program assessment.

As a result of our efforts, the office of APAA is better positioned to summarize and provide examples of the assessment processes and data that have led to programmatic changes. The next section provides three examples of such programmatic changes. These examples highlight the creativity and depth of inquiry and reflection that the campus assessment culture is fostering.

A key component of undergraduate program assessment is baccalaureate core (general education) assessment. The baccalaureate core assessment is outlined separately in Section II of this report.

We now provide a few examples of recent changes resulting from comprehensive assessment of undergraduate programs.

**Agricultural Business Management**

Program Learning Outcome: “Explain microeconomic theory at the intermediate level, including producer theory, how markets work and prices are formulated, market failure and its causes, and welfare theory.”

The program faculty first mapped the course learning outcomes from several required and elective courses within the major to the program level learning outcomes. Additionally, the faculty determined to what degree the outcome was addressed in the courses. Some of the courses in which this outcome was well-integrated include: AEC\(^3\) 250 Introduction to Environmental and Economics and Policy, AEC 311 Intermediate Economics, AEC 351 Natural Resource Economics and Policy, AEC 434 Environmental and Resource Economics, AEC 444 Commodity Futures and Options Markets, and AEC 447 Agricultural Price and Market Analysis. The faculty then assembled portfolios to assess each course which aligned to the program outcome. The portfolios included course syllabi, direct assessment tools, such as student work

---

2 The undergraduate degree in Agricultural Business Management is offered by the Department of Applied Economics in the College of Agricultural Sciences.

3 AEC is the course designator for Applied Economics courses.
samples and rubrics of student achievement, and grade distributions. The learning outcome was assessed by the Undergraduate Committee, made up of departmental faculty appointed by the department head. The committee assessed each course that aligned with the outcome individually by reviewing the portfolios and meeting with the course instructors to get more information orally or in writing. Finally, the committee employed and reviewed indirect assessment data gathered from student exit interviews conducted by the department head to determine what areas of the program may need revision. The committee determined that the courses that were evaluated showed positive results of student learning and student success, based on the criteria that they had established. Additionally, their review resulted in several observations suggesting programmatic changes, including:

1. The tools used for assessment need to be more directly related to the learning outcomes; the program is improving their assessments to better measure the outcome.
2. Baccalaureate Core courses need to have tools that are aligned with both Baccalaureate Core and program level outcomes.
3. Courses with multiple sections taught by more than one faculty person now have core learning outcomes that are common across the sections to increase consistency within the program.
4. Expectations about math skills and the pre-requisites of a few courses were not consistent and the program has made changes to correct that inconsistency.

These changes are being made and will be assessed and reported on in the coming year’s report.

Horticulture

Program Learning Outcome: “Find, interpret, and integrate data and theory from horticultural systems and sciences, and related disciplines.”

This outcome is directly assessed by weekly quizzes, a mid-term exam, and a term project that is designed to have students develop a vineyard establishment and management portfolio. Weekly portfolio assignments are used to assess student understanding of core concepts and to require students to integrate these core concepts into the portfolio. Additionally, vineyard managers were asked to evaluate several student projects in 2014. They reported that this type of project was vital to having students think critically about the application of vineyard management practices. Students often report through the in-class discussions, portfolio evaluation report, and SET’s, that the vineyard project is the most challenging part of the class as this is their first time making these types of real-world decisions and developing this type of a management portfolio. However, feedback from graduates of the program indicates that they are more confident in dealing with these types of questions and projects on-the-job as a result of this project.

The vineyard portfolio term project requires a considerable amount of time outside of class for students, primarily used to conduct research for the project. Through grading the weekly assignments in the class, the instructors noticed that the open nature of the assignments led some students into a non-productive direction, as they spent far too much time on components that were not focused on the weekly assignments and overall portfolio guidelines. For the Spring 2015 term, the instructor implemented a weekly assignment “worksheet” with specific questions that direct students in developing specific portions of the portfolio. The open nature of the previous weekly assignments was too challenging to students who were learning vineyard management concepts for the first time. The instructor also found that students spent too much time identifying a specific vineyard location within

---

4 The undergraduate degree in Horticulture is offered by the Department of Horticulture in the College of Agricultural Sciences.
the region that they were assigned. Therefore, in the Spring 2015 term, the instructor assigned students to specific vineyard businesses within wine regions throughout the US. This change was implemented in order to help students focus on more important details immediately rather than trying to select the “perfect” vineyard within the region. This change also helped students perform better on weekly assignments.

Another issue that has been addressed in this program resulted from the instructors learning that students often had a knowledge gap because they had not yet completed viticulture prerequisite courses for HORT5 454 or they had not yet taken the recommended prerequisite HORT 453: Grapevine Growth & Physiology. It was preferred that students take the viticulture course series in sequence (HORT 452: Berry & Grape Physiology, HORT 453 and 454) but the schedule the courses were offered didn't facilitate this. The three instructors for these courses met in Summer 2014 to align course content and restructure their course schedules to have HORT 452 offered in fall, HORT 453 in winter and HORT 454 in spring. It is hoped this will ensure students get a stronger background to build upon, coming into HORT 454 and help them be more successful in completing the course and the project therein. Assessments from these courses are currently being evaluated and will become part of this year’s annual report.

Honors6

Program Learning Outcome: “Students will develop the ability to engage in pursuits that create new knowledge and contribute to one or more scholarly areas of study.”

This learning outcome is assessed using both an indirect method (Student Thesis Self-Assessment Survey) and a direct method (Thesis Committee Assessment). Students complete the Thesis Self-Assessment after they have defended their theses (usually in the senior year). The survey asks the students, faculty mentors, and committee members to assess specific skills pertaining to scholarly inquiry. Additionally, students are rated by their Committee members and their mentor on the following criteria: Ability to synthesize and/or analyze results from a significant, self-directed, and open-ended project; ability to write an honors thesis; ability to present an honors thesis; ability to defend and honors thesis.

Students scored lowest in their ability to synthesize/analyze results. The University Honors College (UHC) is in the process of implementing a number of new strategies for supporting students through the thesis process and particularly this element of the learning outcome. First, beginning in Winter 2015, the UHC will offer a revised version of the HC7 408 thesis workshop course to better support and guide students through the writing process and preparation for their thesis defense. Prior to these changes, students did not have coursework to help them with all stages of the thesis process. By designing and adding curriculum to specifically support students’ development of thesis skills, the UHC is hoping to see improvement in all areas of this learning outcome, but especially in the analysis and synthesis components. Second, students will have more frequent and intentional work with their mentors to ensure milestones are met and that there is sufficient development, analysis, and explanation of their thesis results. Finally, beginning this year, students will be asked to plan and submit their thesis.

5 HORT is the course designator for Horticulture courses.
6 The University Honors College offers the Honors Baccalaureate Degree, which can be earning in any major at the university.
7 HC is the course designator for Honors College courses.
timelines with milestones that the UHC will follow up with them and with their mentors. The new approach and resources are outlined for students at [http://honors.oregonstate.edu/current/thesis](http://honors.oregonstate.edu/current/thesis). Additionally, in the upcoming year, the UHC will adjust the delivery method for the thesis surveys used to assess Scholarly Inquiry by collecting them online rather than as hard copies, thereby making the responses more securely anonymous and facilitating the storage and analysis of the results.

**Plans and Next Steps for Undergraduate Assessment**

We will continue to strengthen our annual assessment report review process and the ways in which we provide direct support to academic programs. Below are some of the specific plans we have to enhance and build on our current process:

- **Analyze the trends and needs across the programs based on the assessment reports submitted this year, and create relevant tools and opportunities to help each program further its ability to reflect on and utilize SLO assessment.**
- **Assist programs in incorporating their learning outcomes in our new learning management system, Canvas. There is an outcomes assessment feature which may be very helpful to some programs when it comes to tracking student progress and attainment of the SLOs.**
- **Work with the programs that have not yet formally aligned the SLOs with coursework and assessments to complete a learning outcome matrix to help guide their assessment planning and data usage.**
- **Work with new programs from the beginning of the program submission process to ensure they have a plan to be engaged in full-cycle assessment as it is now a requirement that all new programs submit program level student learning outcomes, a 5-year assessment plan, and a formal curriculum map when submitting a new program proposal.**

All undergraduate programs at OSU undergo an external review every 10 years, as outlined in Section III of this document, providing an important opportunity to review an entire program in the context of assessment processes.

**Assessment of Graduate Programs**

In the last four years, assessment and evaluation processes for graduate education at OSU have matured immensely. We now have a robust, full-cycle, iterative system established for graduate student learning assessment and program evaluation. Responsibility for graduate-level assessment is shared by the individual graduate programs, the Graduate School, the Graduate Council of the Faculty Senate, and the office of APAA. Faculty, administrators and units across campus have demonstrated an increased commitment to graduate assessment in recent years, as evidenced by increased compliance with annual reporting requirements (described in more detail below). The Graduate School coordinates with the Office of Institutional Research and other campus units to compile, analyze, and provide to all programs, annually, a core set of performance metrics in graduate education that guide their evaluative reflections as individual programs, the Graduate School and Graduate Council consider opportunities to revise, advance and/or restructure graduate education in light of assessment data.

All graduate programs develop and implement assessment plans, and are responsible for teaching and assessing the university Graduate Learning Outcomes (GLOs) as well as their own program-specific graduate learning outcomes. The Graduate School leads strategic planning efforts (see The 5-Year Strategic Plan for Graduate Education at OSU), implements policies developed through shared
governance with Graduate Council, conducts professional development workshops and trainings, collects and disseminates centralized data, assists in curricula development, oversees the annual assessment process as well as the decadal program reviews in conjunction with Graduate Council, and is otherwise responsible for insuring the collective success of OSU graduate students. Within the Graduate School, the individuals primarily responsible for assessment leadership are Dean Brenda McComb, Associate Deans Anita Azarenko and Jennifer Dennis, and Graduate Program Analyst, Courtney Everson. Dr. Azarenko currently represents the Graduate School on the University Assessment Council, and Dr. Jennifer Dennis assumed this position beginning Fall 2015.

Summary of Processes

Assessment processes for graduate education involve five primary activities:

1. Program-level evaluation: A program evaluation report is submitted annually in the spring by every graduate program. The report summarizes and critically reflects upon a suite of 10-year core performance metrics in graduate education that are delivered by the Graduate School to programs on an annual basis. These data provide a comprehensive review of the graduate student life-cycle and program success, from applications and admission to course offerings through to graduate student retention and degree completion. These data profiles allow programs to identify areas of strength and areas in need of improvement, and otherwise make data-informed decisions in the revision and enhancement of graduate programs.

2. Graduate student learning assessment: A program assessment report is submitted annually in the spring by every graduate program. The report requires programs to reflect on the extent to which GLOs are being met by students, courses, and the program on the whole; changes that impact GLO(s); and the intersection of assessment efforts with strategic planning, and program, college, and university mission(s).

Collectively, the program evaluation and assessment reports indicate areas where program revision may be needed, and serve as a timely mechanism for insuring continual improvement in light of assessment data.

3. Course-level assessment: All courses undergo a Category II review process in which the Graduate Council and Curriculum Council of the Faculty Senate, in conjunction with APAA, review all new proposals for graduate-level courses. During this review process, course learning outcomes are carefully examined to insure appropriateness to the degree level, relevance to mastery of subject material, and preparation in meeting university- and program-specific GLOs.

4. Decadal external reviews: All graduate programs at OSU undergo an external review every ten years. External reviews may result in one of six primary recommendations by the review panel: expansion, maintenance, restructuring, reduction, temporary suspension, or discontinuation. External reviews serve as a significant opportunity to insure graduate educational programs are appropriately revised as a consequence of assessment processes. Out-of-cycle reviews may also be requested by the Dean of the Graduate School if there is evidence that the program may not be meeting university GLOs or other expectations of high quality programs. For instance, annual assessment and evaluation data may indicate the need for a more thorough investigation.
New program proposals: All new graduate programs must undergo a Category I review process in which several committees and councils review the proposal (including, Academic Programs Committee, Graduate Council, Curriculum Council, Faculty Senate) and all proposals must be approved at the state level by the Provosts’ Council and the Higher Education Coordinating Commission. An external review must also take place for all new graduate-level proposals. Notably, an assessment plan is a required core component of this Category I review process.

Figures 1 and 2, in Appendix B and C, respectively, illustrate the graduate program assessment process and cycle, respectively. Figure 3, in Appendix D, illustrates the process and actions associated with decadal external reviews. The multi-layered approach to ongoing assessment has led to some significant changes in graduate courses, programs and curricula. We provide a few examples of recent changes resulting from comprehensive assessment at the Graduate level at OSU.

Because of a recent focus on assessment, there is now increased attention to improving diversity in applicant, admissions, and enrollment pools, especially for individuals who represent under-represented minorities. Multiple programs discussed the need to diversify their student body in their most recent annual evaluation report. For example, Agricultural Education and Applied Anthropology identified improvements in recruitment strategies to diversify their student body, and Botany and Plant Pathology is focusing on improving the admitted-to-matriculant ratio for minority students.

Decadal external reviews have led to a number of significant changes, largely because we require an action plan as a product of each review to ensure that programs are held accountable for response to review recommendations, and we follow up 3 years after each review with an assessment of progress on their action plans. For example, the College Student Services Administration masters program changed its administrative structure, and is currently altering its curriculum, in response to a decadal review; the program continued this momentum in subsequent annual evaluation reports with plans to increase hiring of senior faculty and a program coordinator. The MA in Interdisciplinary Studies is also changing its structure and focus as a result of a decadal review; momentum has continued in their subsequent annual evaluation reports, especially in delineating plans for increasing the interdisciplinarity of the program.

Annual assessment reports in such different programs as Applied Ethics, Physics, and History of Science have increased their focus on providing additional financial support for their students, both through teaching assistantships and research assistantships, as well as fellowships. Many other graduate programs focused their attention in their annual reports on improving time-to-degree and graduation rates (e.g., Wildlife Science, Environmental Sciences, and Mathematics, to name a few).

We provide 10-year trend data on a suite of key metrics to each of the 80 degree programs annually. Simply providing these data to program directors has led to programs taking the initiative to restructure their programs (e.g., Comparative Hispanic Studies). When we consider new degree programs, we can also use some of these same metrics to assess the likelihood of a proposed new degree program to be successful. Academic Analytics is a third party resource that we use to assess one aspect of readiness of OSU to offer a new degree program. For instance, the metrics associated with the proposed PhD in Women, Gender and Sexuality studies indicated that OSU faculty are already performing at or above their peers at other institutions offering the PhD in this area.

In summary, programs are using annual assessment and evaluation reports to assess not only what needs improvement, but also what is going well. The Graduate School expects to identify best practices
coming out of assessment and evaluation processes that can be replicated in other programs struggling with similar issues.

New Developments

We continually strive for refinement of assessment and evaluation processes based on faculty and program feedback as well as administrative and accreditation recommendations. Major initiatives in the past two years relating to student assessment and program evaluation in graduate education include: 1) additional development of the annual data program profiles, which involve a suite of core metrics provided annually to all graduate programs and that follow the student life-cycle; 2) integration of annual evaluation reports into the Qualtrics system in order to facilitate both individual program evaluation as well as in analyzing trends across colleges and the campus; 3) an improved process and platform for the successful submission of annual assessment reports on GLOs by programs; and 4) revision to the Graduate Program Review (GPR) guidelines, and accompanying self-study document prepared, to reflect greater incorporation of both GLO assessment and program evaluation data into decadal external review standards.

All assessment, evaluation and external review data and reports are housed on the SharePoint site of the office of APAA.

To facilitate program planning and continual revision, the Graduate School administers the Advanced Degree Recipient Exit Survey to all graduate students upon degree conferral. Results from this survey are delivered to programs as part of decadal external reviews, and are also analyzed annually to identify areas in need of improvement as well as areas that are working well and may be scaled to reach additional graduate students across campus. In the 2014-15 academic year, a revised Exit Survey was launched to insure trends in graduate education and changes at the university were reflected in questions asked. Notably, four specific questions were added specifically on GLOs in an effort to assess the efficacy of training and education in preparing students to successfully meet these outcomes.

II. Baccalaureate Core Assessment

In the 2012 report, Ad Hoc Self-Evaluation Report: Assessment Response to NWCCU 2011, we described the implementation of a new, rigorous Baccalaureate Core Category Review. The “Bacc Core” process looks at courses over a seven-year cycle such that every Bacc Core course is thoroughly reviewed to ensure it is meeting the Baccalaureate Core requirements and to collect student learning data from each course for the applicable Baccalaureate Core Category Student Learning Outcomes (CLOs). Table II.1 displays the review schedule for the next five years in the cycle.

We are now in the third year of the Baccalaureate Category Review process and continue to make procedural refinements, such as collecting all of the information electronically through Qualtrics, using increasingly sophisticated features in the Qualtrics software, modifying the questions asked on the course review form, tracking follow-up reviews in subsequent years, and refining the internal review calendar which includes everything from initial contact dates to submission deadlines.
### Table II.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Term Activities</th>
<th>Categories to be Reviewed</th>
<th>1-Year Follow-up for Courses Not Recertified</th>
<th>3-Year Follow-up for Provisional Recertification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2015   | April 6, 2015 – Forms emailed June 19, 2015 – Forms due Fall 2015 - Review occurs | • Western Culture  
• Cultural Diversity  
• WIC: College of Liberal Arts - WLF, Psych, Arts/Comm | • Synthesis  
• Speech, Math, Fitness, WIC (Ag, COB, PHHS)                                                 |                                                                                                         |
| 2016   | End of Spring 2016 - Complete web forms Fall 2016 - Review occurs               | • Literature and the Arts  
• Social Processes and Institutions  
• WIC: College of Liberal Arts - LCS, History/PHL/Rel, Public Policy, American Studies, Liberal Studies | DPD, WIC College of Engineering                                                                                     | Synthesis                                                                 |
| 2017   | End of Spring 2017 - Complete web forms Fall 2017 - Review occurs               | • Writing I  
• Writing II  
• WIC: College of Science; College of Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences; BRR; ENC | Western Culture, Cultural Diversity, WIC (CLA - WLF, Psych, Arts/Comm)                                         | DPD, WIC College of Engineering                                                                                       |
| 2018   | End of Spring 2018 - Complete web forms Fall 2018 - Review occurs               | • Physical Science  
• Biological Science                                                      | Literature and the Arts, Social Processes and Institutions, WIC (CLA - LCS, HST/PHL, Public Policy, AS, LS) | Speech, Math, Fitness, WIC (Ag, COB, PHHS)                                                                         |
| 2019   | End of Spring 2019 - Complete web forms Fall 2019 - Review occurs               | • Contemporary Global Issues  
• Science, Technology and Society  
• WIC: College of Forestry; College of Education; College of Pharmacy | Writing I & II, WIC (COS, CEOAS, BRR, ENC)                                                                      | Western Culture, Cultural Diversity, WIC (CLA - WLF, Psych, Arts/Comm)                                           |

An example of the Qualtrics forms used to collect submissions can be accessed here: [WIC Category Review Master Form](#).

### Results

The Faculty Senate Baccalaureate Core Committee (BCC) reviews each course in the category to determine how well it addresses and assesses CLOs and other category criteria. Upon review, if it is found that a course did not fully meet the category criteria it is given one of three designations: provisional recertification, incomplete submission, or decertification as a Baccalaureate Core course. For courses that are provisionally recertified, they have two years to make corrections. These courses usually have a few issues that need to be addressed, but clearly fit the category. Courses with incomplete submissions responded to initial data requests, but did not provide the committee with enough information to determine the appropriateness of the course or assessing student learning. These courses are required to submit again the following year to retain certification. Courses designated with decertification either submitted no information or were deemed inappropriate for the category. Should a decertified course wish to continue in the Bacc Core, they have one year to make acceptable changes, otherwise they will be removed from the category.

During the 2014-15 academic year, the committee assessed over 50 courses in the Difference, Power and Discrimination (DPD) Category and Writing Intensive Curriculum (WIC) courses in the College of Engineering and assigned specific designations to each, as seen in table II.2. Most of the courses that received “decertification” were courses that had not recently been taught or were exclusively being taught by an instructor that has left the university. The exemplary course, from the WIC review, was not
only a clear and well-crafted submission, but the design of the course itself is truly exemplary. The committee strongly suggested that this course serve as an example to other courses, as both the framework for a WIC category course and model for a complete submission.

Table II.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Number of Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary Recertification</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recertification</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional Recertification</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete response</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decertification from Bacc Core, no submission</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decertification from Bacc Core</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The committee made several observations during the review process regarding both of the categories under review. With the exception of the decertification designated courses, the committee believes that all courses were appropriate for the category and should remain. They did identify common problems in each category.

In the DPD category, the committee identified the following:

- **Syllabi not meeting requirements** – This is the case for nearly all courses given a Provisional Recertification. Common problems include: lack of statement saying the course is in the Bacc Core, no Bacc Core CLOs listed or not listed separately from other course outcomes, and a lack of basic syllabi requirements (such as a statement for students with disabilities).

- **Demonstration of contemporary examples of perceived differences** – This is a requirement of CLO #2, *Using historical and contemporary examples, describe how perceived differences, combined with unequal distribution of power across economic, social, and political institutions, result in discrimination.* Several courses did not describe how contemporary examples were being used.

- **Unexplained differences between different versions of the same course** – The committee acknowledges that different instructors and different versions (such as online or hybrid courses delivered through Ecampus) will approach the material differently. However, some courses either did not adequately explain the differences or did not provide information about all sections to demonstrate all sections were equally and adeptly addressing and assessing the CLOs.

- **Identified assessment of specific outcomes** – Several courses did not adequately describe how specific outcomes were assessed in the course.

After reviewing instructor submissions for the DPD review, several recurring issues were observed and addressed, as seen in Table II.2.
Learning Outcome #1: *Explain how difference is socially constructed*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor rating of student attainment (average)</th>
<th>83 (100 point scale)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Common observation: Many instructors remark on students entering the course with a general understanding of the concept of “difference” but do not have a good understanding of how it is socially constructed. Instructors take this into consideration when planning the course. As a result, students respond very well to discussions and various assignments designed to address this outcome.

Learning Outcome #2: *Using historical and contemporary examples, describe how perceived differences, combined with unequal distribution of power across economic, social, and political institutions, result in discrimination*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor rating of student attainment (average)</th>
<th>84 (100 point scale)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Common observation: Many instructors mention that students struggle to overcome their own preexisting notions of difference. Students expand their ideals throughout the course, but several instructors note a need to use new resources that focus on this outcome, especially at the start of the term.

Learning Outcome #3: *Analyze ways in which the interactions of social categories, such as race, ethnicity, social class, gender, religion, sexual orientation, disability, and age, are related to difference, power, and discrimination in the United States.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor rating of student attainment (average)</th>
<th>78 (100 point scale)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Common observation: Instructors noted that students do well when focused on one social category, but have difficulty with intersectionality. Many are planning to add substantial projects and assignments to specifically address this area.

In the WIC – College of Engineering, the committee identified the following:

- **Class size** – WIC courses are required to have fewer than 30 students per section. Most of the courses reviewed, including recertified courses, had class sizes that went beyond the required maximum. Some made use of graduate assistants, but not all of these provided detailed information about how the assistants were utilized. Even with assistants, many courses still had a very high student/instructor ratio.
- **Student revision** – Students in WIC courses are required to revise a major paper after receiving constructive feedback. Several courses did not provide enough information for the committee to adequately assess if these student revisions were a mandatory part of the assignment. However, it was clear that some courses did not require revision at all.
- **Feedback to students** – The required student revisions, mentioned above, must be based on feedback received by the student. The committee often had difficulty determining the type of feedback students received as well as who was responsible for delivering the feedback.
- **Assignment length** – WIC courses are required to have at least one 2000 word assignment. Several courses did not have an assignment that met this requirement.

The information provided by the WIC category review will be used to make adjustments at the course, program, and university level. The courses themselves will need to make adjustments to address concerns like assignment length, feedback, and revisions. They will resubmit material for a follow-up review, which occurs three years from the initial review, to show the BCC they are addressing all issues. At the program level, by identifying concerns about class sizes, departments will need to review how

---

8 Average of the instructor rating represents the average instructor-reported score of learning outcome attainment across approximately 50 courses/sections.
they allocate resources and personnel. At the university level, support groups such as APAA and the WIC program will use the identified issues to target services and develop resources that address areas such as developing writing assignments of appropriate length and useful student feedback processes.

**Process**

The Bacc Core review process is consistent with a robust assessment process at both the course and university levels. At the course level, faculty are using the collected data and self-reflection imbedded in the process, as well as using feedback from the process, to make course-related changes. These changes are captured in either the original submission form (when faculty have self-reflected and reported the changes) or in the follow-up forms (where we can compare the original submission with information in the new submission).

Units responsible for overseeing these courses have also taken responsibility for course-level changes as a result of the review. For example, the unit responsible for the fitness courses has made several changes to better align fitness education with physical activity courses so students more directly apply the lessons being learned in the lecture course. Math courses have made major changes to address large class sizes, adding prerequisites to allow for better foundational skills, as well as, standardizing instruction and training graduate teaching assistants to reduce multi-section variability in the same course. They also have standardized certain exam questions to imbed across all sections of the same course and in other courses to better track student learning.

At the university level, numerous modifications have occurred as a result of the reviews, including changes to the Bacc Core CLOs and changes to policies and processes. For example, after it was observed that some of the (high enrollment) Bacc Core speech courses did not require students to make oral presentations, the BCC realized that the outcomes for Speech did not explicitly require public-speaking and oral presentation, even though the category was created to develop this skill. The outcomes and criteria have since been modified to return the emphasis to oral communication and courses are being modified to meet this expectation. This year, following the review the DPD category, it became clear that the DPD SLOs are difficult to interpret and will likely be revised.

The Synthesis review revealed broad differences in the interpretation of the writing requirements for this category. Additionally, students were having difficulty synthesizing complex information and utilizing high quality sources. This resulted in a policy change requiring an assignment with 1250 words of writing that develops and sustains a critical perspective and multi-disciplinary approach. This writing must use at least two high-quality sources of evidence as support. The BCC is also exploring whether to require that all Writing II courses, which students take earlier in the curriculum, imbed the identification and use of high quality sources as a required component of the course. Lastly, in order to accommodate the writing component, the BCC set a maximum class size of 70 students for Synthesis courses.

In addition to policy changes, the university has implemented process changes to address findings from the review. The Bacc Core categories are designed as a purposeful sequence of knowledge and skills, with certain categories of courses intended to occur earlier or later in the curriculum sequence. Analysis of course enrollment data revealed unwanted trends in student distribution in certain categories of courses, with some students taking some key courses later than required and others taking courses too early. This prompted two actions, (1) restricting enrollment of upper division students in certain lower division courses and (2) standardizing advising across the university to encourage students to take
courses at the proper time and in the correct sequence. These actions have resulted in measurable changes in the distribution of students in certain courses follow-up reviews will identify if these resulted in improvements in student learning and success.

**Conclusion: Baccalaureate Core Review**

The Bacc Core review process is responsible for broadly engaging units and faculty in assessment of student learning; prompting communication and planning between instructors of the same course; and making units more accountable for their role in the Baccalaureate Core. These reviews have highlighted areas of strength and areas of improvement at all levels - the course level, unit level, and university level. Important conversations and actions have occurred to ensure that all of the Baccalaureate Core learning outcomes are addressed and assessed equally and that students are engaging with and attaining the learning outcomes.

**III. Academic Program Reviews**

Comprehensive academic program reviews that consider the curriculum, assessment of student learning, program resources, and the alignment of the program with the OSU goals and mission, are part of OSU’s multi-pronged assessment and evaluation framework. All graduate and undergraduate programs are reviewed within a 10-year cycle and followed up in 3-years. Graduate programs also receive an external review as part of the initial program approval process.

Academic Program Reviews are conducted by a team of 2-3 external reviewers and 1-2 internal reviewers who are part of the Faculty Senate Curriculum Council (CC) or Graduate Council (GC). The self-study and other review documents (i.e. the reviewer report, program response to the report, and the action plan) are also reviewed by the respective Faculty Senate council (CC for undergraduate reviews and GC for graduate program reviews). Program reviews and subsequent changes to a program as a result of the review are accountable to the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, the College Dean, and the Faculty Senate.

During the 2014-15 academic year, several improvements have been made to the program review processes, including: (1) updating the undergraduate program review guidelines to standardize the metrics and reporting and expand the assessment reporting requirements, and (2) for graduate programs, OSU began implementing annual program level data sharing, requiring an annual reflection of that data as part of their annual assessment reporting. Undergraduate programs will begin a similar process later in the year.

The current 10-year program review calendar and updated guidelines are available on the office of APAA website. The Undergraduate Program Review Guidelines includes an updated list of metrics required for undergraduate program review and graduate program reviews (Appendix 2 of the document).
IV. Other Assessment Related Activities

The last section of this report highlights additional assessment-related activities that have occurred since the Ad Hoc review.

Curricular Proposals

OSU has a rigorous peer-review process for all curriculum proposals, be it new programs and courses or for changes to programs and courses. All courses and programs must have well-developed and clearly written SLOs that are communicated to students and provide a description of their assessment plan. During the 2014-15 academic year, we have increased the expectations for communicating assessment planning in proposals. For program proposals, a curriculum map must be submitted along with the assessment plan. Courses wishing to become part of the Baccalaureate Core must clearly describe how the course addresses the SLOs, identify assessments that will be used for each SLO, and describe how the unit will manage coordination and assessment across multiple sections/instructors of the course to ensure all sections meet the learning outcomes and are adequately assessing student learning.

First-Year Experience Assessment

Assessment has been an important part of the development of the new First-Year Experience (FYE) initiative that has taken place at Oregon State University over the last two years. APAA has served as the central support for FYE related data collection and dissemination in terms of tracking broad measures of student success, such as GPA and persistence, and providing guidance around assessing student learning from FYE signature areas (such as the residential education programming, first-year advising, and first-year orientation courses). Much of the support offered by APAA guides the FYE initiative to develop a foundation for a sustainable system of evaluation where we collect meaningful data, develop relevant assessments, make meaning of the results in light of institutional priorities, and develop changes and plans based on the evaluation and analysis.

Results of these efforts include:

- First-Year Experience metrics⁹;
- clear FYE goals and objectives that align all FYE programs and activities;
- first-year cohort parameters to longitudinally assess the programmatic impact and changes in student performance through their participation in FYE program activities¹⁰;
- assessment plans and research questions to guide future changes in the signature program areas;
- Annual report analyzing longitudinal disaggregated student performance data to identify groups and efforts for prioritization.

Future assessment efforts will expand support to additional FYE programs to develop direct student learning outcomes and direct measures of their attainment within the programs.

---

⁹ To access the FYE metrics and report, which is stored on the APAA Sharepoint site, an OSU Network Identification (ONID) account is required. We can provide access to this site if requested.

¹⁰ In partnership with the Registrar’s Office and the academic advising community established a common set of parameters to help improve consistency and clarity in measuring first-year student success metrics. Prior to this effort there were several, often conflicted, definitions and approaches used to analyze performance metrics.
Student Success and Retention Assessment

APAA is also involved in guiding data collection and providing analyst support for several student success and retention efforts on campus. We help these units by collaborating on what data and/or methodology would help answer the research question. We offer suggestions, help design new tools, provide workshops or facilitate assessment planning meetings, and often either provide direct support or teach and train the staff to engage with the data collection and analysis processes. For example, our office helped the Students Taking Academic Responsibility (STAR) program (which intervenes and supports students who fall into negative academic standing during their first year) with the development of an assessment plan. APAA worked closely with the advising community, the Registrar’s Office, and others to create new processes and design the infrastructure that allows us to measure the impact of the program. While advisors are responsible for the interventions and student-interactions, APAA provided training and support for data collection, helped the advisors engage with the results, and use evidence to improve their efforts. APAA continues to refine the process and remains actively engaged in the quarterly and yearly assessment activities to track the program efforts and student progress.

The university has recently established the Office of Undergraduate Studies and appointed Dr. Susana Rivera-Mills as Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies to lead it. With the overall goal of raising and equalizing undergraduate students retention and success rates, the Office will focus on institutionalizing first year experiences, enhancing middle years and transfer students engagement, enhancing planning and advising systems, and building adaptive learning tools. As part of this process, Oregon State University is part of University Innovation Alliance, an eleven-university consortium working to enhance student retention and success, particularly for low-income and first-generation students. The consortium is focused on developing data analytic tools to help the member institutions identify at-risk students and help design appropriate adaptive learning tools for their success.

V. Conclusion

This report provides examples and evidence of full-scale adoption of assessment across OSU, incorporating it into all levels from courses, to academic programs, and into the academic infrastructure (such as student success initiatives). These efforts build upon existing assessment and evaluation infrastructures, like those within the student affairs arm of the university (which has received commendations from previous accreditation reviews). We are happy to provide any additional materials or evidence the reviewers feel they need to affirm these activities and accomplishments.
Appendices

Appendix A

Full-Cycle Assessment Tracking Tool
We are tracking the following information about all institutional examples of full-cycle assessment using a Full-Cycle Assessment Tracking Tool we developed in partnership with the Student Affairs assessment office.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category tracked</th>
<th>Description/Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Academic Year for which the assessment was completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
<td>Student Affairs or Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/Group Alignment</td>
<td>Larger unit affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Department affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program (optional)</td>
<td>Program name (some reports are submitted at the department level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>What student learning outcome was assessed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>What is used as evidence of learning? (includes description and tool/instrument)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of analysis</td>
<td>What type of analysis was conducted? Examples include summary/descriptive statistics, qualitative analysis, inferential qualitative analysis, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results/Interpretation</td>
<td>What were the results of the assessment and what is the meaning in terms of student attainment of the learning outcome?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark attainment</td>
<td>Was the benchmark for this outcome attained?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resulting action/Decision/modification</td>
<td>What was changed as a result of this assessment and result?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future assessment</td>
<td>Will this outcome be assessed in the same way in the future?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct/indirect</td>
<td>Was this a direct or indirect assessment measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Robust or Developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keywords/tags</td>
<td>What other ways can this particular assessment be categorized? For example method type: Checklist, rubric ; also, what was the topic of the assessment: Communication skills, critical thinking etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1: Graduate Program Assessment Process at Oregon State University
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Figure 2. Graduate Program Assessment Cycle at Oregon State University
Figure 3. Flow chart of graduate program, Graduate School and Council, and University actions; and outputs for graduate program reviews.