



Oklahoma State University
America's Brightest **ORANGE**

Annual Student Assessment Report 2018-2019

Prepared for
The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
December 2, 2019

Chih Ming (Ryan) Chung, Ph.D.
Director

&

Kelva Hunger, Ph.D.
Assistant Director, Assessment & Analysis

James Knecht, MBA
Associate Director

Sohee Kim, Ph.D.
Assessment Specialist

Binu Sharma, M.S.
Assessment Specialist

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



Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
Section I – Entry Level Assessment and Course Placement	4
Activities.....	4
Analyses and Findings	7
Section II –General Education Assessment.....	13
Administering Assessment.....	13
Analyses and Findings	16
Section III – Program Outcomes	27
Administering Assessment.....	28
Analyses and Findings	55
Section IV – Student Engagement and Satisfaction	57
Administration of Assessment	57
Assessment Budget.....	61



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 4,350 admitted and enrolled new freshmen and transfer students with fewer than 24 earned credit hours were assessed using the entry-level placement assessment process. In addition, 52 (1.20%) were required to enroll in developmental English classes, 146 (3.36%) in developmental reading classes, 197 (4.53%) in developmental mathematics classes, and 167 (3.84%) in developmental science classes.
- Diversity was assessed during the 2018-2019 academic year with the OSU Campus Climate Survey for Students (CCS-S) and Student Artifact Review.
 - In the CCS-S, 89.0% of OSU students indicated they are personally treated with respect by faculty and staff, 37.9% believe the OSU ‘D’ course(s) expand their knowledge in terms of diversity, and 28.5% hesitate to talk about issues of diversity at OSU because of the fear of offending others.
 - In Student Artifact Review, 84.8% of the student artifacts were rated as Milestones ($n = 112$), and 1.5% of student artifacts were rated as Capstone ($n = 2$). In other words, the majority of students **met or exceeded expectations** in diversity artifacts.
- In program outcomes assessment, five components of the annual reports were reviewed: (1) Program Student Learning Outcomes, (2) Assessment Methods, (3) Findings, (4) Use of Findings, and (5) Annual Executive Summary. The review process involved assignment of a color code to each category. The overall program percent averages for each color category are as follows: 56.5% green; 8.0% yellow, and 35.5% red in all five components.
- The OSU Student Engagement Survey (SES) has been in the survey design, planning and development stage, and therefore, currently no data has been collected. Data collection/survey dissemination is planned for spring 2020.
- In terms of student satisfaction, a total of 8,203 OSU students responded to the 2018 Student Satisfaction Survey (SSS) with a 36.5% response rate. **86.9% of students reported either “Very Satisfied” or “Satisfied” to “Being a student at OSU.”**

Next steps:

- In the coming year, UAT will continue to implement the assessment management system, Nuventive Improve, in order to streamline the annual program outcomes assessment reporting process and in turn, will establish and strengthen effective strategies for continuous improvement for program student learning outcomes assessment and other assessment initiatives at OSU.



Section I – Entry Level Assessment and Course Placement

Activities

I-1. What information was used to determine college-level course placement?

The purpose of entry-level assessment at OSU 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) ACT scores (or converted SAT scores), b) the Entry-Level Placement Assessment (ELPA, developed by OSU), and c) secondary testing. Most entry-level assessment listed above 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 Scores

- 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 during the academic advising process (see <http://placement.okstate.edu> for information on current enrollment restrictions, course placement requirements, and required remediation based on ELPA for English, mathematics, reading, and science subject areas).

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 at all levels: remedial/developmental, college-level, and co-requisite).
- Note that there is no secondary test available for science placement. Science placement is determined by a student's ACT subscore and ELPA calculations; 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 in science.



I-2. What information was used to determine co-requisite course placement (e.g., cut scores, high school GPA, class ranking)?

In 2018-19, OSU offered co-requisite sections of four courses: MATH 1483 (Mathematical Functions and Their Uses), MATH 1513 (College Algebra), MATH 1813 (Preparation for Calculus), and MATH 2144 (Calculus I). Placement in co-requisite sections of both Math Functions and College Algebra was determined by secondary testing using the OSU Math Placement Exam (ALEKS) (see <http://mathplacement.okstate.edu/> for information on current cut scores). Placement cut scores for co-requisite sections of these courses were set by the OSU Mathematics department at ranges near but below the cut scores for standard sections. Placement in co-requisite sections of Preparation for Calculus and Calculus I also included students who earned cut scores in a range set by the Mathematics department near but below the cut score for standard sections of the course. However, Preparation for Calculus and Calculus I placement also included some students who scored high enough on the exam to enroll in standard sections (or had prior college math credit) but who instead opted to take a co-requisite section as a means to receive additional help in the course. These enrollments occurred after the students talked with an academic advisor and also a mathematics instructor and/or the Associate Head.

National guidelines suggest that students scoring in the 30-45 range on the ALEKS placement exam enroll in Pre College Algebra (UNIV 0123 at OSU), the highest remedial college math course. OSU allows students with a score of 40 to enroll in a standard section of College Algebra, and students who earn a score of 30-39 can enroll in a co-requisite section of College Algebra. Students who earn a score of 25-29 can enroll in a co-requisite version of the Math Functions. Thus, OSU offers opportunities for students to enroll in college-level mathematics courses sooner through its co-requisite instruction and placement process, as opposed to rigidly enforcing enrollment in remedial/developmental courses based solely on cut scores.

For Fall 2019, OSU lowered the ALEKS placement cut-offs for standard sections of two courses, moving the cut-off for standard College Algebra from 45 to 40 and for standard Preparation for Calculus from 60 to 56. OSU will monitor student success in these courses to ensure that these cut-offs are appropriate. These changes freed substantial numbers of seats in co-requisite sections, allowing OSU to meet demand better, and preliminary data suggested that students in the affected ranges were still likely to succeed in standard sections.

I-3. How were students determined to need remediation deficiencies (e.g., cut scores, multiple-measure metrics, or advising process)?

All new OSU 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 includes the following information:

- 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 provided to academic advisors for use during the advising process. This entry-level assessment process is implemented immediately prior to the spring and fall enrollment periods to assist with course placement for new OSU students.

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-4. What options were available for students to remediate basic academic skill deficiencies?

Many resources are available to students for academic support to remediate basic academic skill deficiencies. OSU's *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 research and writing 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 also offer additional resources such as tutoring, transition programs, and other academic resources to assist their students.

OSU students who have been identified as having basic academic skills deficiencies in the subject areas of English, reading, science, and/or mathematics are advised to enroll in developmental (0-level) UNIV courses (taught by NOC-Stillwater) in order to remediate in those four subject areas. For English remediation, the recommended course is UNIV 0133 (Basic Composition), for reading and science remediation, the recommended course is UNIV 0153 (Critical Content Reading and Scientific Reasoning), and for mathematics remediation the recommended course is UNIV 0123 (Pre College Algebra).

The OSU Math Placement Exam (ALEKS) includes 6-weeks of free access to learning modules that target mathematical areas where students were not able to show mastery. Students can use these modules to improve their OSU Math Placement Exam score (students are allowed to attempt the exam up to five times) to remove remediation and/or to prepare for math courses. Earning a score of 30 or higher on the exam removes remediation. The *Mathematics Learning Success Center* also provides additional tutoring specifically to assist students with the OSU Math Placement Exam.



Analyses and Findings

I-5. Describe analyses and findings of student success in developmental, co-requisite and college-level courses (include enrollment counts, grade distribution and overall pass rates), effectiveness of the placement decisions, evaluation of cut-scores, and changes in the entry-level assessment process or approaches to teaching as a result of findings.

Entry-Level (and Developmental) Placement Analyses and Findings:

In 2018-2019, a total of 4,350 admitted and enrolled new freshmen and transfer students with fewer than 24 earned credit hours were assessed using the entry-level placement assessment process. Table I-5a 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-5a. Number of enrolled new students with ACT subscores (or SAT subscores converted to ACT equivalents) below 19 in each subject area and the number of students who were cleared for college-level coursework by ELPA in 2018-2019.

Subject Area	# of Students with ACT sub-scores <19 ¹	# of Students cleared for college-level coursework by ELPA
English	441	400
Mathematics	747	604
Reading	255	220
Science	246	80

1. Some students had ACT subscores less than 19 in more than one subject area. Additionally, the following numbers of students were missing ACT subscores in these subject areas: English: 130, Mathematics: 130, Reading: 130, Science: 496.

Students who were not cleared for college-level coursework in English or reading using ELPA could choose to take the OSU English Placement Exam (ACCUPLACER Sentence Skills or Next-Generation Writing exams) and/or the OSU Reading Placement Exam (ACCUPLACER Reading Comprehension or Next-Generation Reading 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-5b.

Table I-5b. Number of new students who took English (ACCUPLACER Sentence Skills or Next-Generation Writing) or Reading (ACCUPLACER Reading Comprehension or Next-Generation Reading) Placement tests for 2018-2019 placement and pass numbers and rates.

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	38	9
Reading	139	13

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 developmental courses.



In mathematics, students had the option of taking the OSU Math Placement Exam (ALEKS) to clear remediation requirements. 206 new students with ACT Math scores below 19 cleared remediation requirements using the OSU Math Placement Exam (ALEKS) in 2018-19.

After all entry-level assessment was completed, 406 students (9.34% of the total new students enrolled) were required to take at least one developmental (remedial) course. Of the 4,350 new students in 2018-2019, 52 (1.20%) were required to enroll in developmental English courses, 146 (3.36%) in developmental reading courses, 197 (4.53%) in developmental mathematics courses, and 167 (3.84%) in developmental science courses. Some students who initially were required to complete developmental classes later satisfied the requirement with transfer courses or by passing a secondary assessment. For this reason, the number of students who completed developmental courses may differ from the number of students required to do so. Table I-5c provides the number of students who enrolled in developmental courses for 2018-19 as well as the number (and percentage) who passed.

Table I-5c. Number of new students who enrolled in sections of developmental (remedial) courses (0-level courses taught by Northern Oklahoma College in Stillwater) during 2018-2019 (Fall, Spring, and Summer combined) with pass numbers and rates.

OSU Course Number (Subject Areas)	# of Students who Enrolled in sections of developmental (remedial) courses taught by NOC-Stillwater ¹	# of Students who passed the developmental courses (% of total enrolled) ¹
UNIV 0133 (English)	10	9 (90.0 %)
UNIV 0153 (reading and science)	149	126 (84.6 %)
UNIV 0123 (mathematics)	61	38 (62.3 %)
1. Figures are totals for the Fall, Spring, and Summer semesters combined. Some students who dropped or failed developmental courses may be counted more than once if they re-enrolled in the courses in subsequent semesters.		

Annual trends in grades, drops, withdrawals, and failure rates in common freshmen (1000-level) courses are monitored by Institutional Research and Information Management and University College Advising. Results from this tracking process are shared with OSU's Directors of Student Academic Services (DSAS) and 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/developmental and college-level courses.



Co-requisite and College-Level Analyses and Findings:

Tables I-5d through I-5s provide OSU Mathematics Department analysis and findings related to co-requisite course offerings in MATH 1483 (Mathematical Functions and Their Uses), MATH 1513 (College Algebra), MATH 1813 (Preparation for Calculus), and MATH 2144 (Calculus I). In these tables, “Standard” section types are face-to-face sections of mathematics courses that were not co-requisite sections. The OSU Mathematics department excluded online sections of these courses from their data and analysis because success rates in online courses are generally worse than success rates for face-to-face sections due to the nature of online course delivery. Including online sections in the analysis as part of the “standard” sections likely gives co-requisite sections an unfair advantage in comparison. Additionally, OSU does not offer any co-requisite sections through online delivery, so comparisons should be made only with face-to-face sections.

MATH 1483 Mathematical Functions and Their Uses

Table I-5d. MATH 1483 (Math Functions) Fall 2018 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates and Co-Requisite Sections’ Grade Distribution					
Section Type		Enrollment		Success rate (C or better)	
Standard		289		81.7%	
Co-Requisite		94		75.5%	
Fall 2018 Co-Requisite Sections’ Grade Distribution:					
A	B	C	D	F	W
12.8%	34.0%	28.7%	8.5%	5.3%	10.6%

Table I-5e. MATH 1483 (Math Functions) Fall 2018 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates		
Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-generation student success Rate (C or better)
Standard	16.6%	70.8%
Co-Requisite	21.3%	65.0%

Table I-5f. MATH 1483 (Math Functions) Spring 2019 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates and Co-Requisite Sections’ Grade Distribution					
Section Type		Enrollment		Success rate (C or better)	
Standard		109		74.3%	
Co-Requisite		62		79.0%	
Spring 2019 Co-Requisite Sections’ Grade Distribution:					
A	B	C	D	F	W
19.3%	30.6%	29.0%	11.3%	1.6%	8.1%

Table I-5g. MATH 1483 (Math Functions) Spring 2019 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates		
Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-generation student success Rate (C or better)
Standard	15.6%	70.6%
Co-Requisite	24.2%	73.3%



2018-2019 Annual Student Assessment Report
MATH 1513 College Algebra

Table I-5h. MATH 1513 (College Algebra) Fall 2018 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates and Co-Requisite Sections' Grade Distribution

Section Type		Enrollment	Success rate (C or better)			
Standard		595	77.6%			
Co-Requisite		209	71.8%			
Co-Requisite Sections' Grade Distribution:						
A	B	C	D	F	W	
28.2%	25.4%	18.2%	9.6%	10.0%	8.6%	

Table I-5i. MATH 1513 (College Algebra) Fall 2018 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates

Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-generation student success Rate (C or better)
Standard	16.1%	71.9%
Co-Requisite	20.1%	71.5%

Table I-5j. MATH 1513 (College Algebra) Spring 2019 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates and Co-Requisite Sections' Grade Distribution

Section Type		Enrollment	Success rate (C or better)			
Standard		113	62.8%			
Co-Requisite		90	68.9%			
Co-Requisite Sections' Grade Distribution:						
A	B	C	D	F	W	
25.6%	22.2%	21.1%	4.4%	12.2%	14.4%	

Table I-5k. MATH 1513 (College Algebra) Spring 2019 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates

Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-generation student success Rate (C or better)
Standard	21.2%	62.5%
Co-Requisite	31.1%	64.3%

MATH 1813 Preparation for Calculus

Table I-5l. MATH 1813 (Preparation for Calculus) Fall 2018 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates and Co-Requisite Sections' Grade Distribution

Section Type		Enrollment	Success rate (C or better)			
Standard		559	64.8%			
Co-Requisite		67	80.6%			
Co-Requisite Sections' Grade Distribution:						
A	B	C	D	F	W	
29.9%	35.8%	14.9%	6.0%	6.0%	7.5%	



Table I-5m. MATH 1813 (Preparation for Calculus) Fall 2018 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates		
Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-generation student success Rate (C or better)
Standard	25.8%	55.6%
Co-Requisite	7.5%	(not reported: too small of a population to protect privacy)

Table I-5n. MATH 1813 (Preparation for Calculus) Spring 2019 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates and Co-Requisite Sections' Grade Distribution					
Section Type		Enrollment		Success rate (C or better)	
Standard		364		58.5%	
Co-Requisite		19		57.9%	
Co-Requisite Sections' Grade Distribution:					
A	B	C	D	F	W
15.8%	15.8%	26.3%	15.8%	10.5%	15.8%

Table I-5o. MATH 1813 (Preparation for Calculus) Spring 2019 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates		
Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-generation student success Rate (C or better)
Standard	24.7%	53.3%
Co-Requisite	16.7%	(not reported: too small of a population to protect privacy)

MATH 2144 Calculus I

Table I-5p. MATH 2144 (Calculus I) Fall 2018 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates and Co-Requisite Sections' Grade Distribution					
Section Type		Enrollment		Success rate (C or better)	
Standard		471		68.6%	
Co-Requisite		39		76.9%	
Co-Requisite Sections' Grade Distribution:					
A	B	C	D	F	W
20.5%	30.8%	25.6%	5.1%	10.3%	7.7%

Table I-5q. MATH 2144 (Calculus I) Fall 2018 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates		
Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-generation student success Rate (C or better)
Standard	15.9%	62.7%
Co-Requisite	15.4%	(not reported: too small of a population to protect privacy)



Table I-5r. MATH 2144 (Calculus I) Spring 2019 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates and Co-Requisite Sections' Grade Distribution					
Section Type		Enrollment		Success rate (C or better)	
Standard		337		65.9%	
Co-Requisite		14		64.3%	
Co-Requisite Sections' Grade Distribution:					
A	B	C	D	F	W
7.1%	14.3%	42.9%	14.3%	7.1%	14.3%

Table I-5s. MATH 2144 (Calculus I) Spring 2019 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates		
Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-generation student success Rate (C or better)
Standard	22.3%	61.3%
Co-Requisite	14.3%	(not reported: too small of a population to protect privacy)

In nearly every case, students enrolled in co-requisite sections did as well as (or better than) students in standard sections despite being significantly less prepared at the start of the semester. This pattern holds whether one looks at all students or restricts the analysis to first-generation students.

Beginning in May 2018, OSU required all OSU Math Placement Exam attempts to be taken in a proctored environment in order for the score to count for placement. This change is a departure from previous guidelines that allowed a first attempt to be unproctored for students who did not require remediation in mathematics (ACT math subscore <19). This new requirement dramatically shifted enrollment for Fall 2018 and beyond, and the OSU Department of Mathematics believes that this change has led to significantly better placement. For example, the overall DFW rate in Calculus I dropped substantially, and the DFW rate among Calculus I students who qualified via the placement test was under 14% compared to over 25% in Fall 2017. Additionally, OSU began offering a new class, MATH 1813 (Preparation for Calculus), in Fall 2018, which takes the place of MATH 1613 (Trigonometry) and MATH 1715 (Precalculus). The new course is more conceptual and prepared students better for calculus. Those who took 1813 in Fall 2018 had a 25.8% DFW rate in Calculus I in Spring 2019, compared to a 35.1% DFW rate in Spring 2018 Calculus I among those who took OSU's 1613 or 1715 in Fall 2017.

The OSU Department of Mathematics continues to expand its co-requisite offerings with a record number of co-requisite seats in Fall 2019, including four sections of MATH 1483, seven sections of MATH 1513, two sections of MATH 1813, and two sections of MATH 2144. A total of 429 students were enrolled in co-requisite math classes at the end of the first two weeks of the Fall 2019 semester.



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.

For the 2018-19 academic year, Diversity was assessed, which was the last year of the previous three-year cycle. A new four-year cycle was approved for the upcoming years to evaluate general education at OSU. Here are the previous and current cycles:

Previous Cycle:

1. **2016-17 | Written Communication and Critical Thinking** (student artifacts)
2. **2017-18 | Student Engagement** (BCSSE & NSSE)
3. **2018-19 | Diversity** (student artifacts/survey)

Current/Upcoming Cycle

1. **2019-20 | Information Literacy** (student artifacts/survey)
2. **2020-21 | Diversity** (student artifacts/survey)
3. **2021-22 | Professionalism and Ethics** (student artifacts)
4. **2022-23 | Written Communication and Critical Thinking** (student artifacts)

The purpose of general education assessment is to provide data-driven information on students’ achievement of the objectives of the General Education program outcomes using an institutional portfolio review process. Oklahoma State University conducts the general education assessments based on the above cycles.

In the 2018-2019 academic year, OSU evaluated diversity as a general education outcome. In addition to evaluating written student artifacts by means of the AAC&U’s Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric, OSU also administered the OSU Campus Climate Survey for Students to all students (for more information about the rubric, please refer to:

<https://uat.okstate.edu/sites/default/files/assessPDFs/GenEdRubrics/Diversity%20VALUE%20Rubric.pdf>).



II- 2. Describe how the assessments were administered and how students were selected.***OSU Campus Climate Survey for Students (CCS-S)***

The CCS-S was conducted during the spring semester of 2019 at Oklahoma State University. The CCS-S was administered to students in the Stillwater and Tulsa campuses. A total of 2,248 students responded to the CCS-S, which was 10.0% of the target population (22,498 students), and 2,109 student responses (9.4%) were analyzed after data cleaning procedures. The CCS-S contained 39 items asked on a 5-point agreement Likert scale. Topics of these items included inclusion, support, experience at OSU, belonging, 'D' course issues, working with others, improvement, concern, discussion with others, and equity. There were also seven demographic items and one open-ended item, which asked, "Do you have any other comments you would like to make about diversity at OSU?" For this open-ended question, there were 450 participants who responded (21.3%); after deleting cases such as "no", "n/a", or "nope", 363 responses remained (17.2%).

Student Artifact Review

A call for student artifacts was sent out to all instructors of courses designated with a 'D' (Diversity), 'I' (International), 'S' (Social and Behavioral Sciences), or 'H' (Humanities). Student artifacts were collected by UAT and compiled for review by the facilitator. UAT and the facilitator examined the assignments of these artifacts to determine if they aligned with AAC&U's Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric. Once the qualifying student artifacts were identified, the artifacts were split between two teams of two faculty raters (four in total). The distribution of artifacts submitted, rated, and used for analysis can be found in Table 1.

II-3. Describe strategies used to motivate students to substantively participate in the assessment.***OSU Campus Climate Survey for Students (CCS-S)***

The CCS-S was administered online, in which students received a survey invitation and up to four reminders by email. The students were informed that:

in order to gain a better understanding of your experience with diversity and inclusion at Oklahoma State University, Assessment and Testing in collaboration with the Division of Institutional Diversity are conducting a short climate survey to learn about your experience at OSU. Your responses will contribute to the advancement of a welcoming and inclusive environment that appreciates and values all members of the University community. The survey will take 5-10 minutes to complete and will provide meaningful and useful feedback to us.

By completing this survey, the students were entered for a chance to win a \$10 gift card to the University Store. They were informed that the survey is completely voluntary and their responses were to remain confidential.



Student Artifact Review

The instructors of courses with the designation of ‘D,’ ‘I,’ ‘S,’ or ‘H’ were solicited for participation in submitting student artifacts to be used in the diversity artifact review. Instructors were given information on what type of assignment we would be able to use, the rubric used to review, instructions on how to collect the artifacts, and insurance that the artifacts would be anonymized and in no way identifiable back to the student.

II-4. What instructional changes occurred or are planned in response to general education assessment results?***OSU Campus Climate Survey for Students (CCS-S)***

UAT worked with CAGE and Institutional Diversity (ID) on developing an institutional internal campus climate survey which could be beneficial in providing not only valuable results for general education assessment of diversity, but also meaningful information about the current climate of the institution as a whole. This survey is cost effective and could yield a potentially higher response rate once it has been further established among students and once funds could be acquired in order to offer an attractive incentive for students.

Student Artifact Review

In the current monthly meeting discussion, CAGE agreed that the planned process for collecting diversity student artifacts could be more efficient in terms of time consumption and quality of usable artifacts. UAT is in the process of working with a subcommittee that includes the 2018-19 faculty raters, some members from CAGE, and a representative from ID on developing an institutional diversity rubric, fitting for OSU, and that could yield better, more robust results. This subcommittee is also talking about a putting together an initiative that will engage diversity instructors to produce student artifacts that better align with OSU general education assessment and the corresponding OSU diversity rubric.



Analyses and Findings

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

OSU Campus Climate Survey for Students (CCS-S)

Important demographic information is below:

Classification: (n=2,050¹)

- 23.6% of participants were Senior students (n=498),
- 18.4% of participants were Junior students (n=388),
- 16.9% of participants were Sophomore students (n=356),
- 14.8% of participants were Freshman students (n=313),
- 12.1% of participants were Doctoral students (n=255), and
- 11.4% of participants were Master's students (n=240).

Campus: (n=2,109)

- 90.8% of participants were Stillwater based students (n=1,914),
- 5.6% of participants were Stillwater and Tulsa based (n=118), and
- 3.7% of participants were Tulsa based students (n=77).

Gender: (n=2,109)

- 55.8% of participants responded Female (n=1,177)
- 31.2% responded Male (n=659),
- 0.8% of participants responded Transgender (n=16),
- 0.8% of participants responded Other (n=16), and
- 0.9% of participants responded 'Prefer not to answer' (n=19).

Sexual Orientation: (n=2,109)

- 73.8% of participants responded Heterosexual/Straight (n=1,557),
- 6.1% responded Bisexual (n=129),
- 2.8% responded Prefer not to answer (n=59),
- 2.0% responded Gay (n=42),
- 1.9% responded Other (n=40),
- 1.7% responded Lesbian (n=36), and
- 1.1% responded Questioning (n=23).

¹ 59 students could not be grouped into these classifications.



Religion: (n=2,109)

- 43.4% of participants responded Christian - Protestant ($n=915$),
- 21.8% responded No religious affiliation ($n=459$),
- 11.6% responded Christian - Catholic ($n=244$),
- 3.4% responded Prefer not to answer ($n=72$),
- 3.3% responded Other ($n=70$),
- 2.7% responded Hindu ($n=57$),
- 1.8% responded Muslim ($n=39$),
- 0.9% responded Buddhist ($n=19$),
- 0.6% responded Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints ($n=12$), and
- 0.3% responded Jewish ($n=6$).

Marital Status: (n=2,109)

- 65.9% of participants responded Single ($n=1,390$),
- 13.6% of participants responded Married ($n=286$),
- 6.4% of participants responded Not married but living with a partner ($n=134$),
- 1.5% of participants responded Other ($n=31$),
- 1.1% of participants responded Prefer not to answer ($n=24$),
- 1.1% of participants responded Divorced ($n=23$),
- 0.1% of participants responded Widowed ($n=2$), and
- 0.1% of participants responded Separated ($n=1$).

Ethnicity: (n=2,109)

- The majority of participants were not Hispanic or Latino (80.2%; $n=1,691$), and
- 184 participants were Hispanic or Latino (8.7%; $n=184$).

Reported Race: Multiple Response Item

- 54.5% of participants responded European American, White ($n=1,270$),
- 10.6% responded American Indian, Native American, or Alaska Native ($n=246$),
- 9.3% responded Asian ($n=217$),
- 6.2% responded Hispanic ($n=145$),
- 5.4% responded Two or more races ($n=126$),
- 5.3% responded African American or Black ($n=123$),
- 3.0% responded Prefer not to answer ($n=70$),
- 2.9% responded I self-identify as [...] ($n=68$),
- 1.7% responded Nonresident alien ($n=39$),
- 0.6% responded Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander ($n=13$), and
- 0.5% responded Race unknown ($n=12$).



Reported Disability: Multiple response item

- No: 84.8%; $n=1,789$
- Yes: 4.8%; $n=101$

Of those who responded “Yes,”

- 25.6% of participants responded Psychological and Mental Health ($n=41$),
- 15.6% responded Chronic Illness ($n=25$),
- 13.8% responded Other ($n=22$),
- 11.3% responded Learning Disability ($n=18$),
- 11.3% responded Physical Disability ($n=18$),
- 6.9% responded Hearing Loss and Deafness ($n=11$),
- 4.4% responded Autism ($n=7$),
- 3.8% responded Vision Loss and Blindness ($n=6$),
- 3.1% responded Memory Loss ($n=5$),
- 2.5% responded Prefer not to answer ($n=4$),
- 1.3% responded Speech and Language Disorder ($n=2$), and
- 0.6% responded Intellectual Disability ($n=1$).

The CCS-S was developed by University Assessment and Testing (UAT) in fulfillment of the General Education Assessment for Diversity, set by the Committee for the Assessment of General Education (CAGE). During this process, UAT collaborated with CAGE, the Assessment and Academic Improvement Council (AAIC), the division of Institutional Diversity, and the Office of Multicultural Affairs.

Model Fit: Reliability & Validity**Overall Model Fit ($n=1,899$)**

Reliability:

- The overall, updated model of OSU CCS-S was found to be highly reliable (39 items; Cronbach’s Alpha = 0.899).

Validity:

- Validity of the overall, updated model indicates that the model is a good fit to the data.

Model fit indices support this:

- The Comparative Fit Index (CFI) is a value between 0 and 1 and is considered *good* if it is greater than 0.90. CFI for this model is 0.92 and is *good*.
- Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) ranges from 0 to 1 and a value of 0.06 or less is indicative of an *acceptable* model fit. RMSEA for this model is 0.06 and *acceptable*.
- The Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) ranges from 0 to 1 and a value of 0.08 or less indicates an *acceptable* model. The SRMR for this model is 0.08 and therefore indicates an *acceptable* fit.

Overall, the theorized model is a good and acceptable fit for the data. Therefore, this model could be considered reliable and valid.



Highest or Lowest Ranking Items ($n=2,109$)

Top 10 “Strongly Agree” and “Agree” Items:

- At OSU, I am personally treated with respect by faculty and staff – *Inclusion/Support* (89.0%)
- At OSU, I am able to work well with my peers/classmates in class – *Belonging* (85.3%)
- At OSU, I am personally treated with respect by peers – *Inclusion/Support* (84.4%)
- There is a fellow student at OSU that I feel comfortable turning to if I need support – *Inclusion/Support* (83.0%)
- When I graduate from OSU, I will be confident in my ability to work with individuals from different backgrounds and cultures than my own – *Working with Others* (80.7%)
- In class at OSU, I am able to work with classmates from different backgrounds and cultures than my own – *Working with Others* (80.2%)
- I believe that meaningful interactions with individuals different from me is an essential part of my college education at OSU – *Working with Others* (79.4%)
- At OSU, I have opportunities for academic success that are similar to those of my classmates – *Equity* (77.6%)
- I am satisfied with the sense of community I have at OSU – *Inclusion/Support* (73.5%)
- It is important for OSU’s leaders to talk about racial and ethnic issues to help work through and solve the problems. – *Working with Others* (72.2%)

Bottom 5 “Strongly Agree” and “Agree” Items:

- I believe the OSU’s ‘D’ course(s) I have taken expand my knowledge in terms of diversity – *D-Course Issues* (37.9%)
- I feel the quality of the ‘D’ course(s) I took at OSU is/are solid and that the course(s) include adequate information and knowledge for students – *D-Course Issues* (38.4%)
- At OSU, the ‘D’ course(s) I have taken serve as tools for students to discuss and learn about diversity issues – *D-Course Issues* (39.0%)
- I participate in OSU campus events often – *Belonging* (45.7%)
- I hesitate to talk about issues of diversity at OSU because of the fear of offending others – *Concern* (45.9%)

Top 5 “Strongly Disagree” and “Disagree” Items:

- I hesitate to talk about issues of diversity at OSU because of the fear of offending others – *Concern* (28.5%)
- At OSU, in the past year, I have witnessed insulting or disparaging remarks about someone’s ethnic background - *Concern* (24.8%)
- At OSU, I feel that I personally have experienced being ignored – *Experience at OSU* (23.4%)
- I participate in OSU campus events often – *Belonging* (22.9%)
- At OSU, I feel that I personally have experienced exclusion/isolation – *Belonging* (21.0%)



Student Artifact Review

In the assessment of diversity artifacts, six categories of the Intercultural Knowledge and Competence Value rubric and the overall student ratings were assessed. The six categories were:

- A. Knowledge - Cultural self-awareness,
- B. Knowledge - Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks,
- C. Skills – Empathy,
- D. Skills - Verbal and nonverbal communication,
- E. Attitudes – Curiosity, and
- F. Attitudes – Openness.

For more information about the above six categories or to view the Intercultural Knowledge and Competence Value rubric, please refer to:

<https://uat.okstate.edu/sites/default/files/assessPDFs/GenEdRubrics/Diversity%20VALUE%20Rubric.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 = .933; $n = 132$).

- Overall, 84.8% of the student artifacts were rated as Milestones ($n = 112$), and 1.5% of student artifacts were rated as Capstone ($n = 2$). In other words, the majority of students **met or exceeded expectations** in diversity artifacts.
- Below are the results for each rubric category:
 - A. Knowledge - Cultural self-awareness:
79.5% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones ($n = 105$), and 3.0% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone ($n = 4$).
 - B. Knowledge - Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks:
81.8% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones ($n = 108$), and 0.8% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone ($n = 1$).
 - C. Skills - Empathy:
90.2% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones ($n = 119$), and 1.5% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone ($n = 2$).
 - D. Skills - Verbal and nonverbal communication:
85.7% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones ($n = 60$).
 - E. Attitudes - Curiosity:
90.2% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones ($n = 119$), and 0.8% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone ($n = 1$).
 - F. Attitudes - Openness:
87.1% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones ($n = 115$), and 3.0% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone ($n = 4$).



Further Analysis and Explanation

Mann-Whitney U test and Kruskal Wallis test was performed to test differences among diversity artifacts scores in gender, class, and college. In the ‘Knowledge - Cultural self-awareness’ and ‘Skills – Empathy’ category, artifacts scores were different between male and female. In the ‘Knowledge - Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks’ category, artifacts scores were different between CAS and CASNR.

Analysis tables follow.



Table 1. *Collection of Diversity Artifacts*

College ¹	Course Prefix and Number	Course Name	General Education Designation (if any) ²	Number of Artifacts Submitted	Number of Artifacts Rated	Number of Artifacts Included in Analysis
CAS	AFAM 3950	Special Topics in Africana Studies	D, H	20	20	10
	AMST 2103 ³	Introduction to American Studies	D, H	85	N/A	N/A
	ENGL 2243	Language, Text and Culture	H, I	19	N/A	N/A
	ENGL 2413 ³	Conversations in Literature	D, H	67	N/A	N/A
	HIST 4523	American Environmental History	H	20	N/A	N/A
	MC 1143	Media in a Diverse Society	D, S	81	10	10
	PHIL 4733	Philosophy of Biology	H	15	N/A	N/A
	SOC 4213	Sociology of Sexualities	S	18	18	17
	SOC 4643	Sociology of Gender	S	21	N/A	N/A
	SOC 4103	The Death Penalty in America	S	12	N/A	N/A
CASNR	AGEC 2303	Food Marketing to a Diverse Population	D	27	N/A	N/A
	AGEC 4343	International Agricultural Markets and Trade	I	36	N/A	N/A
	AGLE 2403	Agricultural Leadership in a Multicultural Society	D, S	102	30	29
CoHS	HDFS 2123	Developmental Disabilities: Issues Across the Lifespan	D	50	30	28
	HDFS 3123	Parenting	S	942 ⁴	N/A	N/A
	HLTH 4233	Health and Sexuality	D, S	22	22	22
EHA	SCFD 3223	Role of Teacher in American Schools	D	12	12	11
	SPED 3202	Educating Exceptional Learners	D	198 ⁴	N/A	N/A
HC	HONR 1000	Story of Lizzie Borden	D, H	22	10	0
	HONR 1000	Introductory Honors Topics		21	N/A	N/A
	HONR 2423 ³	The Middle Ages and Renaissance	H	18	N/A	N/A
	HONR 3053	Biology, Race, and Gender: Honors	D, H	11	10	5
SSB	ECON 1113	The Economics of Social Issues	S	45	N/A	N/A
	LSB 4633	Legal Aspects of International Business Transactions	I	26 ⁴	N/A	N/A
Total Number of Diversity Artifacts:				1,890⁵	162⁶	132

Note: ¹Colleges: CAS = College of Arts and Sciences; CASNR = College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources; CEAT = College of Engineering, Architecture and Technology; CoHS = College of Human Sciences; EHA = Education, Health and Aviation; SSB = Spears School of Business; UC = University College

²Designations: D= Diversity, H = Humanities, I = International Dimension, S = Social and Behavioral Sciences

³Course name and prefix includes multiple sections.

⁴Value contains artifacts from multiple assignments.

⁵Although many artifacts were submitted, not all could be used for rating because they did not align with the rubric.

⁶Although 162 artifacts were rated, 30 artifacts could not be used in analysis due to their lack of applicability to the rubric.



Table 2. *Student Demographics Associated with Diversity Artifacts, 2007-2019*

		2007-2013	2016	2019	Combined
		# of artifacts (% of total)	# of artifacts (% of total)	# of artifacts (% of total)	# of artifacts (% of total)
Class	Freshman	45 (9.6%)	24 (32.8%)	7 (5.3%)	76 (11.2%)
	Sophomore	118 (25.1%)	8 (10.9%)	38 (28.8%)	164 (24.3%)
	Junior	162 (34.4%)	24 (32.8%)	42 (31.8%)	228 (33.7%)
	Senior	146 (31.0%)	17 (23.2%)	45 (34.1%)	208 (30.8%)
	Total	<i>n</i> =471	<i>n</i> =73	<i>n</i>=132	<i>N</i> = 676
College ¹	CAS	181 (38.4%)	27 (36.9%)	41 (31.1%)	249 (36.7%)
	CASNR	28 (5.9%)	22 (30.1%)	21 (15.9%)	71 (10.5%)
	CEAT	50 (10.6%)	3 (4.10%)	6 (4.5%)	59 (8.7%)
	CoHS	51 (10.8%)	5 (6.8%)	24 (18.2%)	80 (11.8%)
	EHA	100 (20.7%)	4 (5.4%)	31 (23.5%)	135 (19.9%)
	SSB	28 (5.9%)	9 (12.3%)	6 (4.5%)	43 (6.3%)
	UC	35 (7.4%)	3 (4.1%)	3 (2.3%)	41 (6.0%)
	Total	<i>n</i> =473	<i>n</i> =73	<i>n</i>=132	<i>N</i> =678
Gender	Female	255 (54.1%)	25 (34.2%)	101 (76.5%)	385 (57.1%)
	Male	216 (45.9%)	48 (65.7%)	31 (23.5%)	295 (43.6%)
	Total	<i>n</i> =471	<i>n</i> =73	<i>n</i>=132	<i>N</i> =676
OSU GPA	<2.0	28 (5.9%)	2 (2.7%)	3 (2.3%)	33 (4.8%)
	2.0 to 2.49	70 (14.9%)	3 (4.1%)	11 (8.3%)	84 (12.2%)
	2.50 to 2.99	118 (25.1%)	15 (20.5%)	35 (26.5%)	168 (24.5%)
	3.00 to 3.49	126 (26.6%)	19 (26.0%)	33 (25.0%)	178 (25.9%)
	3.50 to 4.00	130 (27.6%)	34 (46.5%)	50 (37.9%)	214 (31.1%)
	Missing	10 (2.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10 (1.5%)
Total	<i>n</i> =482	<i>n</i> =73	<i>n</i>=132	<i>N</i> =687	

Note: ¹Colleges: CAS = College of Arts and Sciences; CASNR = College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources; CEAT = College of Engineering, Architecture and Technology; CoHS = College of Human Sciences; EHA = Education, Health and Aviation; SSB = Spears School of Business; UC = University College

Table 3. *Diversity Artifact Scores, 2019*

Class	SCORE: <i>n</i> (%)				
	Benchmark	Milestones		Capstone	<i>N</i>
	1	2	3	4	
Freshman	0(0.0)	5(71.4)	2(28.6)	0(0.0)	7
Sophomore	4(10.5)	22(57.9)	11(28.9)	1(2.6)	38
Junior	9(21.4)	24(57.1)	9(21.4)	0(0.0)	42
Senior	5(11.1)	24(53.3)	15(33.3)	1(2.2)	45
College¹					
CAS	3(7.3)	23(56.1)	13(31.7)	2(4.9)	41
CASNR	4(19.0)	14(66.7)	3(14.3)	0(0.0)	21
CEAT	1(16.7)	4(66.7)	1(16.7)	0(0.0)	6
CoHS	2(8.3)	13(54.2)	9(37.5)	0(0.0)	24
EHA	7(22.6)	16(51.6)	8(25.8)	0(0.0)	31
SSB	1(16.7)	2(33.3)	3(50.0)	0(0.0)	6
UC	0(0.0)	3(100.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	3
Gender					
Male	5(16.1)	21(67.7)	4(12.9)	1(3.2)	31
Female	13(12.9)	54(53.5)	33(32.7)	1(1.0)	101
Overall	18(13.6)	75(56.8)	37(28.0)	2(1.5)	132

Note: ¹Colleges: CAS = College of Arts and Sciences; CASNR = College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources; CEAT = College of Engineering, Architecture and Technology; CoHS = College of Human Sciences; EHA = Education, Health and Aviation; SSB = Spears School of Business; UC = University College

Table 4. *Diversity Artifact Scores for each rubric category, 2019*

Class	SCORE: <i>n</i> (%)				
	Benchmark	Milestones		Capstone	<i>N</i>
	1	2	3	4	
A ¹	23(17.4)	68(51.5)	37(28.0)	4(3.0)	132
B	23(17.4)	80(60.6)	28(21.2)	1(0.8)	132
C	11(8.3)	62(47.0)	57(43.2)	2(1.5)	132
D	10(14.3)	42(60.0)	18(25.7)	0(0.0)	132
E	12(9.1)	91(68.9)	28(21.2)	1(0.8)	132
F	13(9.8)	67(50.8)	48(36.4)	4(3.0)	132
Overall	18(13.6)	75(56.8)	37(28.0)	2(1.5)	132

Note: ¹A = Knowledge (Cultural Self-Awareness); B = Knowledge (Knowledge of Cultural Worldview Frameworks); C = Skills (Empathy); D = Skills (Verbal and Nonverbal Communication); E = Attitudes (Curiosity); F = Attitudes (Openness)



Overall Discussion

The vast majority of students feel they were treated with respect by faculty and staff and they are able to work well with their peers/classmates in class. Most students surveyed have a good sense of working with others; particularly when they graduate from OSU, they are confident in their ability to work with individuals from different backgrounds and cultures than their own. The majority of students believe they have similar opportunities for academic success to those of their classmates at OSU.

Somewhat concerning is the result of the items rated lowest “Strongly Agree” or “Agree.” The majority of these items were from the topic of D-Course Issues. Most students seem to be less satisfied with their ‘D’ course(s) they have taken. There could be improvement of ‘D’ courses in terms of expanding student knowledge, providing adequate information, and facilitating discussion in terms of diversity. These results suggest that improvement of the ‘D’ course may be necessary.

The highest rated “Strongly Disagree” or “Disagree” items lead to the conclusion that students feel most hesitant to talk about issues of diversity at OSU because of the fear of offending others. Other dissatisfied items have to do with student concerns such as witnessing insulting or disparaging remarks about someone’s ethnic background. Some students feel that they have personally experienced being ignored at OSU.

When comparing student responses across classification (Undergraduate and Graduate), mean scores of graduate students were generally higher than those of undergraduate students, with small effect sizes. This indicates that graduate students have an overall better experience of the campus climate at OSU than undergraduate students. When comparing student responses across undergraduate classification (freshman, sophomore, junior and senior), one noticeable difference was found under the topic of D-course related issues: *“I feel the quality of the ‘D’ course(s) I took at OSU is/are solid and that the course(s) include adequate information and knowledge for students.”* Significant differences were found between upper classmen and lower classmen: Junior and Senior students have a higher mean score than Freshman and Sophomore students. This suggests that through OSU’s effort and commitment to excellence in diversity and inclusion, ‘D’ designated courses have aided in impacting students on this issue during their time at OSU, yet there is still room for improvement.

When comparing student responses based on gender, mean scores of female students were overall higher than those of male students, and white students had overall higher mean scores than non-white students. These significant differences generally yielded a small effect size. When comparing student responses based on race, non-white students experienced more discrimination and feelings of being ignored, excluded, or isolated than white students did.



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

OSU Campus Climate Survey for Students (CCS-S)

Currently, student performance on the CCS-S cannot be tracked since spring 2019 was the first time this survey was conducted; however, this survey will again be distributed in spring of 2021, which will allow us to establish a baseline and track student self-reported climate at OSU.

Student Artifact Review

The instructors of 481 courses with the designation of ‘D,’ ‘H,’ ‘I,’ or ‘S’ were solicited for participation in submitting student artifacts. The number of artifacts used for analysis has been tracked in Table 2 from 2007 to 2013, 2016, and 2019. Student performance cannot currently be tracked based on student artifact ratings because different rubrics have been used, making comparison inadvisable. However, a diversity assessment subcommittee is currently undergoing meetings to collaborate and develop an OSU diversity rubric which will then be used every time we are assessing diversity, making student performance tracking across years possible.

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 has been and will continue to 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).



- In an effort to streamline assessment of diversity, the Campus Climate Survey for Students will continue to be administered to OSU students for each diversity assessment cycle year in order to establish a baseline and track progress at OSU across years. The next year for assessment of diversity will be during the 2020-2021 academic year so the next survey administration will be in spring of 2021. By collecting responses from all students, we will be able to improve upon the existing CCS-S which will provide OSU with the ability to measure progress and effectiveness of diversity initiatives. With this information, OSU will be able to address any issues or concerns effectively.
- There has been discussion from the diversity artifact review subcommittee about creating our own OSU rubric. Also, an initiation of the promotion of solid diversity assignments will be competitively offered with a stipend to approved instructors of qualifying courses.

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. Data collection methods for program outcomes assessment include:
 - Analysis of Written Artifacts (18.0%),
 - Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) (11.4%),
 - Surveys (7.6%),
 - Oral Presentation (7.3%),
 - Rating of Student Skills (e.g. rubrics) (6.5%),
 - Review of Thesis, Dissertation, or Creative Component (5.8%),
 - Portfolio Review (4.6%),
 - Capstone Assignment (4.5%),
 - Course Exam(s) (4.3%),
 - Course Embedded Assignment (4.0%),
 - Course Projects (2.8%),
 - Internship (2.6%),
 - Review of Student Research (2.2%),
 - Projects & Assignments (2.0%),
 - Performance or Jury (2.0%),
 - Presentation/Performance (1.7%),
 - Interviews (1.7%), and
 - Other (11.1%).



- Assessment plans must be updated every five years and reviewed at least once every five years by a subcommittee of the Assessment and Academic Improvement Council (AAIC). Currently, UAT is working with each college to close the gap of missing information.
- 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). Later on, the assessment plans and reports will be available through public pages created within Nuventive Improve.
- Data collected for program outcomes assessment are analyzed by faculty and staff in each department and/or program according to the plan. 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 (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.



Table III.1. Program Outcomes Assessment
College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources¹

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed# 1	Number Assessed# 2	Number Assessed# 3
Agribusiness	BSAG	Project & Assignments				No data submitted	
Agricultural Communications	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	4	4	4
Agricultural Communications	BSAG	Portfolio Review	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Portfolio Review	35	32	33
Agricultural Economics	BSAG			No assessment report submitted			
Agricultural Economics	MS			No assessment report submitted			
Agricultural Economics	PhD			No assessment report submitted			
Agricultural Education	BSAG	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	35	29	41
Agricultural Education	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	Analysis of written Artifacts	2	2	2
Agricultural Education	PhD	Oral Presentation	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts, Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	2	2	5
Agricultural Leadership	BSAG	Survey	Interviews	Analysis of written Artifacts	6	17	17

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	BSAG	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of written Artifacts	158	20	205
Animal Science	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Survey	1	1	1
Animal Science	PhD	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	3	3	3
Biochemistry & Molecular Biology	BSAG	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Course Project	140	140	47
Biochemistry & Molecular Biology	MS	Presentation/Performance	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/Creative Component	Presentation/Performance	No data submitted		
Biochemistry & Molecular Biology	PhD	Review of Student Research	Presentation/Performance		15		
Biosystems Engineering	BSBE	Survey	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Interviews	8	14	21
Biosystems Engineering	MS	Rating of Skills	Exit Survey	Exit survey	10	5	5
Biosystems Engineering	PhD	Rating of Skills	Exit Survey	Exit Interviews	17	4	4
Crop Science	PhD	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/Creative Component	Rating of Skills	Oral Presentation	5	5	5
Entomology	BSAG	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Analysis of written Artifacts	7	5	24



Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed# 1	Number Assessed# 2	Number Assessed# 3
Entomology	PhD	Oral Presentation	Rating of Skills	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	3	1	1
Entomology & Plant Pathology	MS	Oral Presentation	Oral Presentation	Analysis of written Artifacts	5	5	5
Environmental Science	BSAG	Oral Presentation	Capstone Assignment	Other: Resume review	12	0	11
Food Science	BSAG	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of written Artifacts	8	0	8
Food Science	MS	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Survey	Survey	2	5	5
Food Science	PhD	Review of Student Research	Survey	Survey	3	3	3
General Agriculture: Agricultural Leadership	MAG	No assessment report submitted					
Horticulture	BSAG	Internship	Internship	Internship	6	6	6
Horticulture	MS	Presentation	Rating of Skills	Presentation	7	7	7
International Agriculture	MAG	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Other: Jobs		16	24	
International Agriculture	MS	Review of written artifacts	Others: Job		16	24	
Landscape Architecture	BLA	Portfolio Review	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Portfolio Review	16	14	16
Landscape Management	BSAG	Internship	Internship	Survey	3	3	3



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	Oral Presentation	Project & Assignments	Analysis of written Artifacts	37	41	
Natural Resource Ecology & Management	MS	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Analysis of written Artifacts	7	7	7
Natural Resource Ecology & Management	PhD	Review of Student Research	Rating of Skills	Analysis of written Artifacts	1	1	1
Plant & Soil Sciences	BSAG	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	18	0	0
Plant & Soil Sciences	MS	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Rating of Skills	Oral Presentation	15	15	15
Plant Pathology	PhD	Oral Presentation	Review of Student Research	Analysis of written Artifacts	1	4	4
Soil Sciences	PhD	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Rating of Skills	Oral Presentation	4	4	4
University Studies	BUS	No assessment report submitted					



Table III.1. Program Outcomes Assessment (continued)
College of Arts and Sciences¹

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed# 1	Number Assessed# 2	Number Assessed# 3
American Studies	BA	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of written Artifacts	10	10	10
American Studies	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Survey	10	10	10
Applied Statistics	MS	Course Exam(s)	Course Exam(s)	Course Embedded Assignments	0	0	2
Art History	MA	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	2	2	2
Art: Art History	BA	Oral Presentation	Oral Presentation	Oral Presentation	3	3	3
Art: Graphic Design	BFA	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	24	24	24
Art: Studio	BFA	No assessment report submitted					
Art: Studio Art	BA	Portfolio Review	Portfolio Review	Portfolio Review	10	10	10
Art: Studio Art	BFA	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	12	12	12
Arts Administration	BA	No assessment report submitted					
Biochemistry	BS	No assessment report submitted					
Biological Science	BS	Other	Other	Analysis of Written Artifacts	49	41	36
Chemistry	MS	No assessment report submitted					
Chemistry	PhD	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
Chemistry: ACS Approved	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts			9		
Chemistry: Departmental Degree	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts			No data submitted		
Communication Science & Disorders	BS	Course Exam(s)	Course Assignment	Oral Presentation	274	152	31
Communication Science & Disorders	MS	Rating of Skills	Written project	Oral Presentation	46	118	77
Computer Science	BS	Rating of Skills	Rating of Skills	Rating of Skills	297	504	368
Computer Science	MS	Thesis proposal review	Thesis proposal review	Thesis proposal review	7	7	7
Computer Science	PhD	Diagnostic examination	Comprehensive examination	Thesis proposal presentation	7	7	7
Creative Writing	MFA	Supervisor Evaluation			8		
Economics	BA	No assessment report submitted					
Economics	BS	No assessment report submitted					
English	BA	Other: Rubric	Other: Rubric	Other: Rubric	41	39	41
English	MA	Other: Rubric	Other: Rubric	Other: Rubric	20	20	20
English	PhD	Other: Rubric	Other: Rubric	Other: Rubric	20	20	20
French	BA	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Embedded Assignments	42	20	20
Geography	BA	Other: Course review	Other: Course review	Other: Course review	1	0	0
Geography	BS	Rating of Skills	Course Assignment	Rating of Skills	10	10	3
Geography	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Course Embedded Assignments	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/Creative Component	12	4	6



Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed# 1	Number Assessed# 2	Number Assessed# 3	
Geography	PhD	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	10	4	1	
Geology	BS	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Capstone Assignment	Analysis of written Artifacts	8	12	5	
Geology	MS	No assessment report submitted						
Geology	PhD	No assessment report submitted						
Geospatial Information Sciences	BS	Other: Rubric	Other: Rubric	Portfolio Review	2	0	2	
German	BA	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Embedded Assignments	23	5	5	
Global Studies	BA	No assessment report submitted						
Graphic Design	MFA	No assessment report submitted						
History	BA	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts		10	10		
History	PhD	Artifact review	Artifact review	Artifact review	4	4	4	
History: Public History	MA	Portfolio Review	Analysis of Written Artifacts		6	6		
Integrative Biology	MS	Rating of skills (rubric)	Public Presentation	Review of student progress	8	8	5	
Integrative Biology	PhD	Rating of skills (rubric)	Oral Presentation	Review of student progress	3	7	5	
Mass Communication	MS	Artifact review	Artifact review	Artifact review	9	4	4	
Mathematics	BA	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of written Artifacts	0	0	0	
Mathematics	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts			17			



Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed# 1	Number Assessed# 2	Number Assessed# 3
Mathematics	MS	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component			No data submitted		
Mathematics	PhD	Course Exam(s)	Project & Assignments	Oral Presentation	15	5	7
Medicinal and Biophysical Chemistry	BS	No assessment report submitted					
Microbiology/Cel l & Molecular Biology	BS	Course Exam(s)	Course Project	Course Embedded Assignments	39	39	36
Microbiology/Cel l & Molecular Biology	MS	Oral Presentation	Thesis Presentation	Exit survey	12	3	3
Microbiology/Cel l & Molecular Biology	PhD	Other- Research Publication	Presentation		23	23	
Multidisciplinary Studies	BA	Rating skills (rubric)	Rating skills (rubric)	Rating skills (rubric)	No data submitted		
Multidisciplinary Studies	BS	No assessment report submitted					
Multimedia Journalism	BA	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Survey	Portfolio Review	120	5	5
Multimedia Journalism	BS	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Survey	Portfolio Review	120	5	5
Music	BA	No assessment report submitted					
Music	BM	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Performance or Jury	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	23	15	15



Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed# 1	Number Assessed# 2	Number Assessed# 3
Music	MM	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Oral Presentation		16	10	
Music Education	BM			No assessment report submitted			
Music Industry	BS			No assessment report submitted			
Philosophy	BA			No assessment report submitted			
Philosophy	MA			No assessment report submitted			
Physics	BS	Other: Portfolios Review	Other: Project Review		62	62	
Physics	MS	Rating of Skills	Rating of Skills	Review of Student Research	9	11	1
Physics	PhD	Rating of Skills	Rating of Skills	Review of Qualifying exam	9	11	3
Music	BM	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Performance or Jury	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	23	15	15
Music	MM	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Oral Presentation		16	10	
Music Education	BM			No assessment report submitted			
Music Industry	BS			No assessment report submitted			
Philosophy	BA	Course Embedded Assignment				No data submitted	
Philosophy	MA			No assessment report submitted			
Physics	BS			No assessment report submitted			
Physics	MS	Rating of Skills	Rating of Skills	Review of Student Research	9	11	1
Physics	PhD	Rating of Skills	Rating of Skills	Review of Qualifying exam	9	11	3
Physiology	BS	Other	Other	Artifact analysis	23	41	36



Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed# 1	Number Assessed# 2	Number Assessed# 3
Plant Biology	BS	Course Exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of written Artifacts	6	1	0
Plant Biology	MS	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	3	3	2
Plant Science	PhD	No assessment report submitted					
Political Science	BA	Capstone project	Capstone project	Capstone project	22	22	22
Political Science	BS	Capstone project	Capstone project	Capstone project	22	22	22
Political Science	MA	Course Exam(s)	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	5	6	6
Psychology	BA	Course Exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	985	434	434
Psychology	BS	Course Exam(s)	Course Exam(s)	Analysis of written Artifacts	985	148	434
Psychology	MS	Portfolio Review	Other: Progress Review		22	22	
Psychology	PhD	Portfolio Review	Portfolio Review		49	49	
Sociology	BA	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of written Artifacts	26	26	12
Sociology	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of written Artifacts	55	55	30
Sociology	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of written Artifacts		No data submitted	
Sociology	PhD	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts		No data submitted	
Spanish	BA	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Embedded Assignments	99	64	64
Sports Media	BA	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Survey	Portfolio Review	140	7	5

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed# 1	Number Assessed# 2	Number Assessed# 3	
Sports Media	BS	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Survey	Portfolio Review	140	7	5	
Statistics	BS	Course Exam(s)	Capstone Assignment	Course Exam(s)	3	2	1	
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	Rating of Skills	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Course Embedded Assignments	1	1	2	
Strategic Communication	BA	Survey	Survey	Portfolio Review	34	33	5	
Strategic Communication	BS	Survey	Survey	Portfolio Review	34	33	5	
Theatre	BA	No assessment report submitted						
Theatre	MA	No assessment report submitted						
University Studies	BUS	No assessment report submitted						
Zoology	BS	Other	Other	Analysis of written Artifacts	35	41	36	



Table III.1. Program Outcomes Assessment (continued)
College of Education, Health, and Aviation ¹

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed# 1	Number Assessed# 2	Number Assessed# 3
Aerospace Administration and Operations	BS	Review of Student Research - Written Rubric	Review of Student Research - Written Rubric	Review of Student Research - Written Rubric	47	45	49
Applied Educational Studies: Aviation and Space	EDD	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation		10	2	
Applied Exercise Sciences	BS	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Performance or Jury	Internship		No data submitted	
Aviation and Space	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts		10	11	
Career & Technical Education	BS	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Portfolio Review		1	4	
College Teaching	GCRT	Project			4		
Counseling	MS	Rating of Skills	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	106	8	106
Education	EDS						
Education	PhD	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Research proposal		12	5	
Education: School Psychology	EDS	Nationally Benchmarked Exam	Portfolio Review	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component		No data 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
Educational Leadership & Policy Studies: Educational Administration	PhD	No assessment report submitted					
Educational Leadership & Policy Studies: Higher Education	PhD	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s); Rating of Skills; Analysis of Written Artifacts			1		
Educational Leadership Studies: College Student Development	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Rating of Skills	Portfolio Review	22	14	14
Educational Leadership Studies: Higher Education	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts; Rating of Skills; Internship; Course Project	Analysis of Written Artifacts; Course Project; Rating of Skills	Portfolio Review	6	2	2
Educational Leadership Studies: School Administration	MS	No assessment report submitted					
Educational Psychology: Counseling Psychology	PhD	No assessment report submitted					
Educational Psychology: Educational Psychology	MS	Qualification Exam			13		



Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed# 1	Number Assessed# 2	Number Assessed# 3
Educational Psychology: Educational Psychology	PhD	Survey	Qualification Exam	Qualification Exam	22	22	22
Educational Psychology: Research and Evaluation	MS	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	2	2	2
Educational Psychology: Research and Evaluation	PhD	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	5	5	5
Educational Psychology: School Psychology	PhD	No assessment report submitted					
Educational Technology	MS	No assessment report submitted					
Elementary Education	BS	Portfolio Review	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Portfolio Review; Capstone Assignment	91	91	91
Health and Human Performance	MS	No assessment report submitted					
Health Education and Promotion	BS	No assessment report submitted					
Health, Leisure & Human Performance: Health & Human Performance	PhD	No assessment report submitted					



Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed# 1	Number Assessed# 2	Number Assessed# 3
Health, Leisure & Human Performance: Leisure Studies	PhD	Performance or Jury	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component		5	3	
Higher Education	EDD	No assessment report submitted					
Leisure Studies	MS	Performance or Jury	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component		10	10	
Nursing	BSN	Other - Theoretical and Conceptual Foundations of Nursing: review various nursing theories and describe a framework	Other - Health Assessment, Wellness, and Community Health (NURS 3025): work with patients	Other - Theoretical and Conceptual Foundations of Nursing (NURS 3013): address legal issues, ethics, communication and collaboration in nursing	23	21	19
Physical Education	BS	Portfolio Review - Portfolio	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	26	4	13
Recreational Management & Recreational Therapy	BS	Rating of Skills	Rating of Skills		121	121	
School Administration	EDD	No assessment report submitted					
School Psychology	PhD	No assessment report submitted					
Secondary Education	BS	No assessment report submitted					



Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed# 1	Number Assessed# 2	Number Assessed# 3
Social Foundations of Education	MA	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	No data submitted		
Sports and Coaching Science	BS	Internship			No data submitted		
Teaching	MAT	Portfolio Review; Oral Presentation	Portfolio Review; Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s); Supervisor Evaluation	Oral Presentation; Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s); Supervisor Evaluation	2	2	2
Teaching, Learning and Leadership	MS	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s); Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s); Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s); Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	28	28	28
Teaching, Learning and Leadership: Special Education	MS	No assessment report submitted					
University Studies	BUS	No assessment report submitted					



Table III.1. Program Outcomes Assessment (continued)
College of Engineering, Architecture, and Technology¹

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed#1	Number Assessed#2	Number Assessed#3
Aerospace Engineering	BSAE	No assessment report submitted					
Architectural Engineering	BEN	Capstone Assignment	Course Project	Course Project	9	9	9
Architecture	BAR	Visiting professionals who attended two juried presentations; Survey	Performance or Jury; Survey	An invited jury of practicing professionals assessed	36	36	36
Chemical Engineering	BSCH	Survey	Survey	Survey	79	79	79
Chemical Engineering	MS	Performance or Jury; Survey; Interviews	Performance or Jury; Survey; Interviews	Oral Presentation; Review of Thesis/Dissertation/Creative Component; Interviews	1	4	2
Chemical Engineering	PhD	Performance or Jury; Survey; Interviews	Performance or Jury; Survey; Interviews	Oral Presentation; Interviews; Analysis of Written Artifacts	9	25	5
Civil Engineering	BSCV	No assessment report submitted					
Civil Engineering	MS	Review of Student Research	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/Creative Component	Presentation/Performance	14		
Civil Engineering	PhD	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Review of Student Research	Presentation/Performance	No data 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	
Computer Engineering	PSCP	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment; Analysis of Written Artifacts	Capstone Assignment; Analysis of Written Artifacts	69	69	69	
Construction Engineering Technology	BSET	Internship; Professional Exam(s)	Internship	Internship; Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	55	55	55	
Electrical Engineering	BSEE	Capstone Assignment; Analysis of Written Artifacts	Capstone Assignment; Analysis of Written Artifacts	Capstone Assignment; Analysis of Written Artifacts	69	69	69	
Electrical Engineering	ME	No assessment report submitted						
Electrical Engineering	MS	Survey				No data submitted		
Electrical Engineering	PhD	Analysis of Written Artifacts; Oral Presentation	Analysis of Written Artifacts; Oral Presentation	Survey	18	17	0	
Electrical Engineering Technology	BSET	Course Project; Project & Assignments	Capstone Assignment	Course Exam(s)	16	23	21	
Engineering and Technology Management	MS	A written assignment	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Organization and preparing an abstract defining problem.	No data submitted			
Engineering Technology	MS	Course Exam(s)	Course Exam(s)	Capstone Assignment	6	0	2	
Environmental Engineering	MS	No assessment report submitted						
Fire & Emergency Management	PhD	Qualifying exam & Dissertation defense	Dissertation reports and Qualifying exams	Qualifying exam & Dissertation defense	3	3	3	



Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed#1	Number Assessed#2	Number Assessed#3
Fire & Emergency Management Admn	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of written Artifacts	8	8	8
Fire Protection & Safety Engineering Technology	BSET	Project & Assignments; Capstone Assignment	Course Project; Capstone Assignment	Course Project; Capstone Assignment	64	19	16
Industrial Engineering & Management	BSIE	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Embedded Assignments	No data submitted		
Industrial Engineering & Management	MS	Survey			4		
Industrial Engineering & Management	PhD	Survey	Survey	Survey	3	3	3
Integrative Design of Building Envelope	GCRT	Analysis of Written Artifacts			No data submitted		
Materials Science and Engineering	MS	Oral Presentation	Oral Presentation	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/Creative Component	2	2	2
Materials Science and Engineering	PhD	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/Creative Component	Oral Presentation	Oral Presentation	1	1	1
Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering	MS	Rating of Skills	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	No data submitted		



Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed#1	Number Assessed#2	Number Assessed#3
Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering	PhD	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)			No data submitted
Mechanical Engineering	BSME	No assessment report submitted					
Mechanical Engineering Technology	BSET	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Project & Assignments		65	65	
Petroleum Engineering	MS	Course Project	Oral Presentation	Rating of Skills			No data submitted
University Studies	BUS	Course Embedded Assignments					No data submitted



Table III.1. Program Outcomes Assessment (continued)
College of Human Sciences¹

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed# 2	Number Assessed# 3	
Design, Housing and Merchandising	BSHS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	Rating of skills: Rubric	22	16	31	
Design, Housing and Merchandising	MS	No assessment report submitted						
Early Child Care and Development	BSHS	No assessment report submitted						
Family and Consumer Sciences Education	MS	No assessment report submitted						
Family Financial Planning	MS	No assessment report submitted						
Hospitality and Tourism Management	BSHS	Other: Rubric	Oral Presentation	Other	No data submitted			
Hospitality and Tourism Management	MS	Oral Presentation	Other	No data submitted				
Human Development and Family Science	BSHS	Survey	Survey	Analysis of written Artifacts	127	127	127	

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



Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed# 2	Number Assessed# 3
Human Development and Family Science	MS	Other: Rubric	Other: Rubric	Other: Rubric	10	0	40
Human Sciences	PhD	No assessment report submitted					
Human Sciences: Design, Housing and Merchandising	PhD	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Rating of Skills	No data submitted		
Human Sciences: Hospitality and Tourism Management	PhD	Rating of Skills	Rating of Skills	Rating of Skills	No data submitted		
Human Sciences: Human Development and Family Science	PhD	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of written Artifacts	0	4	0
Nutritional Sciences	BSHS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Project & Assignments	Group Project	No data submitted		
Nutritional Sciences	MS	Oral Presentation	No data submitted				
Nutritional Sciences	PhD	No assessment report submitted					
University Studies	BUS	No assessment report submitted					



Table III.1. Program Outcomes Assessment (continued)
Spears School of Business¹

Programs	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed# 1	Number Assessed# 2	Number Assessed# 3
Accounting	BSBA	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s); Course Exam(s)	Project & Assignments	Course Exam(s)	121	122	145
Accounting	MS	Course Exam(s)	Nationally Benchmarked Exam	Other - Written Communication	30	44	41
Business Administration	MBA	Course Embedded Assignments	Group Project	Nationally Benchmarked Exam	3		23
Business Administration	PhD	Performance or Jury	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation; Analysis of Written Artifacts	17	10	23
Business Administration: Accounting	PhD	No assessment report submitted					
Business Administration: Entrepreneurship	PhD	Analysis of Written Artifacts	No data submitted				
Business Administration: Executive Research	PhD	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/creative Component	Review of Student Research	Review of Student Research	17	15	28

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>.



Programs	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed# 1	Number Assessed# 2	Number Assessed# 3
Business Administration: Finance	PhD			No assessment report submitted			
Business Administration: Management	PhD			No assessment report submitted			
Business Administration: Management Information Systems	PhD			No assessment report submitted			
Business Administration: Marketing	PhD			No assessment report submitted			
Business Analytics	MS			No assessment report submitted			
Business Analytics	MS	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	49	51	38
Business Data Mining	GCRT	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)			4		
Economics	BSBA			No assessment report submitted			
Economics	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of written Artifacts		No data submitted	
Economics	PhD	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Analysis of written Artifacts	4	4	7
Entrepreneurship	BSBA			No assessment report submitted			



Programs	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed# 1	Number Assessed# 2	Number Assessed# 3
Entrepreneurship	MS	No assessment report submitted					
Finance	BSBA	No assessment report submitted					
General Business	BSBA	Course Exam(s)	Nationally Benchmarked Exam	Course Exam(s)	547	237	342
Information Assurance	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Course Exam(s)		21	7	
International Business	BSBA	No assessment report submitted					
Management	BSBA	No assessment report submitted					
Management Information Systems	BSBA	No assessment report submitted					
Management Information Systems	MS	Survey	Internship		20	15	
Marketing	BSBA	No assessment report submitted					
Marketing Analytics	GCRT	Course Exam(s)			7		
Nonprofit Management	GCRT	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Embedded Assignments	No data submitted		
Quantitative Financial Economics	MS	Rating of skills (e.g. rubrics)	Oral Presentation		6	7	
General Business	BSBA	Course Exam(s)	Nationally Benchmarked Exam	Course Exam(s)	547	237	342
University Studies	BUS	No assessment report submitted					



Table IV.1. Program Outcomes Assessment (continued)
Graduate College¹

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed#1	Number Assessed#2	Number Assessed#3
Environmental Science	MS	Survey	Survey	Survey	3	3	3
Environmental Science	PHD	Survey	Survey	Survey	2	2	2
Interdisciplinary Studies	MS	Group Project				No data submitted	
Photonics	PhD	No assessment report submitted					
Public Health	MPH	Project & Assignments; Group Project; Internship	Analysis of Written Artifacts; Presentation/ Performance			No data submitted	
Veterinary Biomedical Science	MS	Course Exam(s)	Course Exam(s); Project & Assignments	Oral Presentation; Analysis of Written Artifacts	0	6	5
Veterinary Biomedical Science	PhD	Course Exam(s); Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Course Exam(s); Project & Assignments; complete an online training module	Oral Presentation; Analysis of Written Artifacts	0	8	13

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>.



Analyses and Findings

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

University Assessment and Testing has received 269 (90%) annual program outcomes assessment reports out of 299 programs from seven colleges. Five components were used in the reviewing process of the reports: (1) Program Student Learning Outcomes, (2) Assessment Methods, (3) Findings, (4) Use of Findings, and (5) Annual Executive Summary. 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 or exceeds 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: 56.5% of programs received green; 8.0% yellow, and 35.5% red in all five components.

Below are the overall analyses and findings from reviewing the program outcomes assessment reports received for the 2018-2019 academic year:

Student Learning Outcomes:

Approximately 55.0% of programs received the color of green for having measureable/observable program student learning outcomes. Only a few issues/concerns were identified: among 19.3% of programs need to update or modify their student learning outcomes. In red, 25.7% of programs had missing information in this component.

Assessment Methods:

Approximately 66.6% of programs received the color of green for having appropriate program assessment methods. Only a few issues/concerns were identified: among 5.9% of programs need to update or modify their assessment methods. In red, 27.5% of programs had missing information in this component.

Findings:

Approximately 58.8% of programs received the color of green for having useful program results. Very few issues/concerns were identified: only 3.7% of programs need to update or modify their results. In red, only 37.5% of programs had missing information in this component.

Use of Findings:

Approximately 44.6% of programs received the color of green for having effective use of findings. Only a few issues/concerns were identified: among 3.7% of programs need to update or modify their use of results. In red, 51.7% of programs had missing information in this component.



Annual Executive summary:

Approximately 57.6% of programs received the color of green for having an effective annual executive summary. Only a few issues/concerns were identified: among 7.1% of programs need to update or modify their executive summary. In red, 35.3% of programs had missing information in this component.

III-3. What instructional 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. UAT and AAIC will discuss 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 2020, 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 2020, UAT will meet with programs that received yellow (issues with one or more components of the report) and/or red (missing components or report) 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.



Section IV – Student Engagement and Satisfaction

Administration of Assessment

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

OSU Student Engagement Survey (SES)

- The SES was developed during the 2018-19 academic year in collaboration with AAIC (the Assessment and Academic Improvement Council) and CAGE (the Committee for the Assessment of General Education) to measure student engagement at Oklahoma State University.
- The SES is a 31 item questionnaire which includes 21 items on a 5-point Likert-scale about frequency, five items on a 3-point scale about participation/intention, and one open-ended item. This survey asks questions about student effort, higher order learning, interaction, supportive environment, and involvement.
- The survey will be administered online and the sample of students invited to take the SES will include all students enrolled at OSU-Stillwater or Tulsa. The SES will have its first distribution during the spring 2019 semester and will be included along with the Student Satisfaction Survey. The SES will be conducted for three consecutive years in order to establish a baseline.

OSU Student Satisfaction Survey (SSS)

- The Assessment and Academic Improvement Council (AAIC) and the Committee for the Assessment of General Education (CAGE) will conduct the SSS for three consecutive years beginning in 2018 in order to establish a baseline; then a recurrent schedule of survey data collection will be established.
- Data will be collected from both undergraduate and graduate students on the OSU-Stillwater and OSU-Tulsa campuses (including full- and part-time students).
- The survey is administered online using Qualtrics survey software. The SSS consists of 27 five-point Likert scale items and one open-ended item designed to measure concepts regarding overall OSU student experiences: Academic, Campus Life, Campus Services, Sense of Belonging, and Diversity.



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

Student Engagement

OSU Student Engagement Survey (SES)

- Because the SES has been in the survey design, planning and development stage, there currently has been no data collected. Data collection/survey dissemination is planned for spring 2020.

Student Satisfaction

OSU Student Satisfaction Survey (SSS)

- Data collection yielded 8,643 (38.4%) responses, with 8,203 (36.5%) in the final data set
- Response Rates
 - College
 - CAS: 35.8% ($n = 1,859/5,191$)
 - CASNR: 41.2% ($n = 1,158/2,810$)
 - CEAT: 33.5% ($n = 1,307/3,902$)
 - EHA: 35.3% ($n = 854/2,419$)
 - CoHS: 42.1% ($n = 676/1,605$)
 - SSB: 35.2% ($n = 1,685/4,781$)
 - CVHS, HC, UC: 37.1% ($n = 664/1,789$)
 - Classification:
 - Undergraduate: 34.0% ($n = 6,328/18,627$)
 - Graduate: 46.6% ($n = 1,631/3,498$)
- Demographics
 - Campus
 - Stillwater: 91.0% ($n = 7,463$); Stillwater/Tulsa: 5.9% ($n = 485$); Tulsa: 3.1% ($n = 255$)
 - Gender
 - Female: 60.5% ($n = 4,959$); Male: 39.5% ($n = 3,244$)
 - Reported Race
 - White: 64.6% ($n = 5,296$); Nonresident Alien: 9.4% ($n = 767$); Multiracial: 8.5% ($n = 701$); Hispanic: 7.8% ($n = 639$); American Indian or Alaska Native: 3.9% ($n = 321$); Black or African American: 3.6% ($n = 295$); Asian: 2.0% ($n = 165$); Unknown: 0.2% ($n = 14$); Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander: 0.1% ($n = 5$)



- Class Level
 - FR: 14.0% ($n = 1,152$); SO: 16.6% ($n = 1,365$); JR: 17.9% ($n = 1,471$); SR: 28.0% ($n = 2,293$); Master's: 10.7% ($n = 878$); Doctoral: 8.7% ($n = 712$); Other (GC, SG, SU): 4.0% ($n = 332$)
- Classification
 - Undergraduate: 77.1% ($n = 6,328$); Graduate: 19.9% ($n = 1,631$); Professional: 3.0% ($n = 244$)
- Full-Time/Part-Time Status
 - FT: 78.5% ($n = 6,440$); PT: 21.5% ($n = 1,763$)
- Home State
 - OK: 67.2% ($n = 5,516$); TX: 12.9% ($n = 1,059$); KS: 1.5% ($n = 123$); CA: 1.3% ($n = 106$); Other: 17.1% ($n = 1,399$)
- A total of 2,215 open-ended comments were recorded.
- Overall reliability (Cronbach's alpha) is .94 indicating excellent internal consistency.
- Overall validity CFI is .87 indicating a good fit.

Item Analysis – Overall

Top 10 “Very Satisfied” and “Satisfied” items:

- OSU health and fitness services (**88.6%**)
- Your safety and security on the OSU campus (**87.5%**)
- OSU library services (**87.3%**)
- Being a student at OSU (**86.9%**)
- Your intellectual growth at OSU (**84.7%**)
- Pete's Pet Posse at OSU (**83.2%**)
- Availability of OSU faculty (**83.1%**)
- The quality of teaching at OSU (**82.6%**)
- The variety of activities for students at OSU (**81.8%**)
- OSU course registration process (**75.2%**)

Bottom 5 “Very Satisfied” and “Satisfied” items:

- Parking availability at OSU (**20.3%**)
- OSU food and dining options (**54.5%**)
- OSU financial aid received (**56.1%**)
- Gender identity inclusion on the OSU campus (**63.4%**)
- Your experience in OSU residence halls (**63.6%**)



Top 5 “Very Dissatisfied” and “Dissatisfied”:

- Parking availability at OSU (**63.8%**)
- OSU food and dining options (**21.2%**)
- OSU financial aid received (**20.6%**)
- Your experience in OSU residence halls (**13.1%**)
- OSU academic advising (**11.0%**)

Note: Frequency percentages were calculated without including “N/A” responses.

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

- The University Assessment and Testing (UAT) office created an overall institution student engagement survey to gather more up-to-date data from OSU students in terms of their aspects of student engagement. The survey concludes with an open-ended question where the students can provide any additional information about their OSU experience.
- The survey items are based on both theoretical and practical aspects of student engagement from research done in higher education.
- SES items were reviewed by UAT and the Assessment & Academic Improvement Council (AAIC) and related units at OSU.
- After the successful pilot of the OSU-Student Satisfaction Survey in 2018 and 2019, UAT and OSU will proceed to pilot this survey for another year (2020).
- The OSU-Student Engagement Survey will be piloted in 2019, 2020, and 2021.



Assessment Budget

State Regents policy states that academic services fees “shall not exceed the actual costs of the course of instruction or the academic services provided by the institution” (Chapter 4 – Budget and Fiscal Affairs, 4.18.2 Definitions)

Provide the following information regarding assessment fees and expenditures for 2018-19:

Assessment Fees	\$812,859.89
Assessment Salaries	\$433,945.36
Distributed to Other Departments	\$165,621.10
Operational Costs	\$199,289.96
Total Expenditures	\$798,856.42¹

¹Expenditures were slightly below collected fees as there was some assessment staff turnover, which resulted in some savings in “Assessment Salaries” during the replacement period.

