Oklahoma State University
America's Brightest *ORANGE*

Annual Student Assessment Report
2019-2020

Prepared for
The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
December 2, 2020

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

James Knecht, MBA
Associate Director

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

Kaitlynn Holcomb, B.S.
Assessment Specialist

Robin Fitzgerald, B.A.
Assessment Specialist

Paola Sainz Sujet, B.S.
Assessment and Analysis Student Assistant

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

Contents

Executive Summary

Introduction:

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

Key findings:

- A total of 4,369 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, 72 (1.65%) were required to enroll in developmental English classes, 66 (1.51%) in developmental reading classes, 186 (4.26%) in developmental mathematics classes, and 244 (5.58%) in developmental science classes.
- The newest addition to the general education cycle, Information Literacy, was piloted during the 2019-2020 academic year with a student artifact review.
  - In student artifact review, 90.6% of the student artifacts received an overall rating of Milestones ($n = 125$), and 0.0% of the student artifacts received an overall rating of Capstone ($n = 0$). In other words, the majority of students **met expectations** in Information Literacy 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:
  - 64.5% received green, which indicates the item Meets or Exceeds Expectations,
  - 12.1% received yellow, which suggests the item Needs Revision,
  - 9.1% received red, which denotes Missing Information, and
  - 14.4% received gray, which denotes Not Applicable/Pending in all five components. Due to COVID-19 and the associated changes to the school year, some assessment functions and schedules were disturbed. With in-person classes being indefinitely postponed, many non-essential tasks were put on hold during the transition to telecommuting and online learning, leading to a delay in assessment tasks.
- In terms of student engagement, a total of 8,563 OSU students responded to the 2019 Student Engagement Survey (SES) pilot survey with a 38.9% response rate. The top three "Engaged" responses were:
  - 96.9% of students reported either "Always" or "Often" to "I attend my classes at OSU."
  - 92.8% of students reported either "Always" or "Often" to "I spend enough time and make enough effort to learn at OSU."
  - 92.7% of students reported either "Always" or "Often" to "I do my best regarding my responsibilities in group work at OSU."
- In terms of student satisfaction, a total of 8,563 OSU students responded to the 2019 Student Satisfaction Survey (SSS) with a 38.9% response rate. The top three "Satisfied" responses

were:

- 89.2% of students reported either "Very Satisfied" or "Satisfied" to "Your safety and security on the OSU Campus."
- 88.8% of students reported either "Very Satisfied" or "Satisfied" to "OSU health and fitness services."
- 87.8% 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.
- We will continue to streamline the General Education assessment for each cycle and eventually integrate the information in the Nuventive Improve system for ease of distribution and transparency of information. We are beginning to pilot this new process of integration between general education assessment and institutional assessment. We will align this information with program outcomes assessment report information on specific topics.
- We are in the process of upgrading the assessment management system to the Nuventive Platform, which will give UAT staff and OSU faculty and assessment coordinators more useful features and ultimately, further the success of learning outcomes assessment.
- We will use Power BI visual analytics to provide aggregate assessment information based on report information provided by the programs in order to support faculty, programs, and colleges.

Section I – Entry Level Assessment and Course Placement

Activities

I-1. What information was used to determine college-level course placement? Please report the specific multiple measures your institution used for FY 2019-2020 (e.g., high school GPA and CPT cut scores).

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 multiple measures 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 https://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 https://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, as these are updated regularly).
   - 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. How were students determined to need remediation (e.g., CPT cut scores 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 based on the academic summary, 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 the number of students with ACT subscores <19, the number of students cleared for college-level coursework by ELPA, and the number of students cleared for college-level coursework/course placement according to secondary testing scores. The academic performance of students, along with DFW (Drop, Fail, Withdraw) rates of courses, are monitored to provide information about the effectiveness of placement decisions, the need to change cut scores or modify the entry-level assessment process, and to determine how teaching may be modified as a result of findings.

I-3. What options were available for identified students to complete developmental education within the first year or 24 college-level credit hours?

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 their first year or 24 college-level credit hours 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) in use by the OSU Mathematics Department (and other departments on campus) for mathematics and science placement 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 in math and/or to prepare for math and certain science courses. Earning a score of 30 or higher on the exam removes math remediation. The *Mathematics Learning Success Center* also provides additional tutoring specifically to assist students with the OSU Math Placement Exam.

The OSU English Placement Exam and the OSU Reading Placement are also options available to students to remove remediation. Students can attempt these exams up to two times each, and earning a score of 263 or higher on these exams will remove remediation requirements in English or reading respectively.

Many additional 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.

I-4. What information was used to determine co-requisite course placement? Please report the specific multiple measures your institution used for FY 2019-2020 (e.g., high school GPA, and CPT cut scores).

In 2019-20, 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 Department of Mathematics 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 Department of Mathematics 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. All students in Preparation for Calculus and Calculus I took a diagnostic assessment in the first week of classes, and information from that assessment was used to help advise students about whether they might want to switch from a standard section to a co-requisite section (though no one was required to switch).

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. Data from 2019-2020 suggest that students in the affected ranges were still likely to succeed in standard sections.

I-5. Describe the method used to place "adult" students who do not have ACT/SAT scores.

At OSU, all new students and transfer students with less than 24 credit hours, including "adult" students who do not have ACT or SAT scores are put through the same entry-level assessment processes as listed in the sections above. OSU's ELPA and PGI calculations can still make predictions for student course placement without ACT or SAT scores. However, additional, in-depth advising is also provided to "adult" and other students without ACT or SAT scores to assist with course placement to direct these students to enroll in the courses in which they will have the best chance of success. This additional advising helps to uncover career or other life experiences of the student as well as other college/transfer coursework that has not been reported to OSU that can lead to better course placement. Often, the advising discussions result in these students opting to enroll in one of the developmental courses to help refresh their skills or in their taking either or both of the OSU English and Reading Placement Exams to help determine their readiness for college-level work. Additionally, enrollment restrictions for mathematics courses (and select science courses) require all students to earn a requisite cut score on the OSU Math Placement Exam (or to have earned college credit in a lower level math course) before they can enroll in these courses. As such, all students, including "adult" students without ACT or SAT scores, must be able to demonstrate proficiency prior to enrolling in a math or science course

Analyses and Findings

I-6. Describe analyses and findings of student success in both developmental and college-level courses, effectiveness of the placement decisions, evaluations of multiple measures, 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 2019-2020, a total of 4,369 admitted and enrolled students with fewer than 24 earned credit hours were assessed using the entry-level placement assessment process. Table I-6a 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-6a. Number of enrolled new students with ACT subscores below 19 in each subject area and the number of students who were cleared for college-level coursework by ELPA in 2019-2020.

Subject Area	# of Students with ACT sub-scores <19[1]	# of Students cleared for college-level coursework by ELPA
English	509	438
Mathematics	920	752
Reading	340	291
Science	349	108

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: 57, Mathematics: 57, Reading: 57, Science: 502.

Students who were not cleared for college-level coursework in English or reading using ELPA could choose to take the OSU English Placement Exam and/or the OSU Reading Placement Exam (ACCUPLACER Next-Generation Writing and 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-6b.

Table I-6b. Number of new students who took English (ACCUPLACER Sentence Skills) or Reading (ACCUPLACER Reading Comprehension) Placement tests for 2019-2020 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	4	0
Reading	67	6

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. 166 new students with ACT Math scores below 19 cleared remediation requirements using the OSU Math Placement Exam (ALEKS) in 2019-2020.

After all entry-level assessment was completed, 425 students (9.73% of the total new students enrolled) were required to take at least one developmental (remedial) course. Of the 4,369 new students in 2019-2020, 72 (1.65%) were required to enroll in developmental English courses, 66 (1.51%) in developmental reading courses, 186 (4.26%) in developmental mathematics courses, and 244 (5.58%) 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-6c provides the number of students who enrolled in developmental courses for 2019-2020 as well as the number (and percentage) who passed.

Table I-6c. Number of new students who enrolled in sections of developmental (remedial) courses (0-level courses taught by Northern Oklahoma College in Stillwater) during 2019-2020 (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 Students who passed the developmental courses (% of total enrolled)[1]
UNIV 0133 (English)	23	22 (95.65%)

UNIV 0153 (reading and science)	190	173 (91.05%)
UNIV 0123 (mathematics)	89	42 (47.19%)
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 both Institutional Research and Analytics and University College Advising at OSU. 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 Analytics, and the OSU Mathematics and English Departments work cooperatively to evaluate entry-level assessment processes and to track student success in remedial/developmental and college-level courses.

Co-requisite and College-Level Analyses and Findings:

Tables I-6d through I-6s 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.

For the Spring 2020 semester, OSU changed its grading scheme due to disruptions from the COVID19 pandemic. At the end of the semester, students were allowed to see their final letter grade and then choose either to keep that letter grade or convert a grade of A, B, C, or D to Pass (P) and a grade of F to No Pass (NP). Because students were allowed to use a grade of C or better or Pass (P) to move on to the next math course, we count a "success" as a grade of C or better or a Pass (P).

MATH 1483 Mathematical Functions and Their Uses

Table I-6d. MATH 1483 (Math Functions) Fall 2019 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates and Co-Requisite Sections' Grade Distribution					
Section Type		**Enrollment**		**Success rate (C or better)**	
Standard		229		88.2%	
Co-Requisite		119		87.4%	
Fall 2019 Co-Requisite Sections' Grade Distribution:					
A	**B**	**C**	**D**	**F**	**W**
19.3%	44.5%	23.5%	5.0%	5.0%	2.5%

Table I-6e. MATH 1483 (Math Functions) Fall 2019 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates

Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-generation student success rate (C or better)
Standard	14.8%	85.3%
Co-Requisite	24.4%	82.8%

Table I-6f. MATH 1483 (Math Functions) Spring 2020 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates and Co-Requisite Sections' Grade Distribution

Section Type	Enrollment	Success rate (C or better/P)
Standard	99	93.9%
Co-Requisite	62	93.5%

Co-Requisite Sections' Grade Distribution:							
A	B	C	D	F	W	P	NP
6.5%	32.3%	8.1%	1.6%	1.6%	1.6%	46.8%	1.6%

Table I-6g. MATH 1483 (Math Functions) Spring 2020 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates

Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-generation student success rate (C or better/P)
Standard	12.1%	83.3%
Co-Requisite	14.5%	88.9%

MATH 1513 College Algebra

Table I-6h. MATH 1513 (College Algebra) Fall 2019 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates and Co-Requisite Sections' Grade Distribution

Section Type	Enrollment	Success rate (C or better)
Standard	468	78.0%
Co-Requisite	223	69.5%

Co-Requisite Sections' Grade Distribution:					
A	B	C	D	F	W
22.0%	26.0%	21.5%	10.8%	9.4%	10.3%

Table I-6i. MATH 1513 (College Algebra) Fall 2019 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates

Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-generation student success rate (C or better)
Standard	13.7%	65.1%
Co-Requisite	24.7%	67.3%

Table I-6j. MATH 1513 (College Algebra) Spring 2020 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates and Co-Requisite Sections' Grade Distribution

Section Type	Enrollment	Success rate (C or better/P)
Standard	136	77.2%
Co-Requisite	81	67.9%
Co-Requisite Sections' Grade Distribution:		

A	B	C	D	F	W	P	NP
17.3%	21.0%	8.6%	2.5%	1.2%	14.8%	21.0%	13.6%

Table I-6k. MATH 1513 (College Algebra) Spring 2020 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates

Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-generation student success rate (C or better/P)
Standard	19.1%	65.4%
Co-Requisite	28.4%	65.2%

MATH 1813 Preparation for Calculus

Table I-6l. MATH 1813 (Preparation for Calculus) Fall 2019 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates and Co-Requisite Sections' Grade Distribution

Section Type	Enrollment	Success rate (C or better)
Standard	551	67.3%
Co-Requisite	42	69.0%
Co-Requisite Sections' Grade Distribution:		

A	B	C	D	F	W
31.0%	14.3%	23.8%	11.9%	7.1%	11.9%

Table I-6m. MATH 1813 (Preparation for Calculus) Fall 2019 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates

Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-generation student success rate (C or better)
Standard	21.3%	52.1%
Co-Requisite	23.8%	60.0%

Table I-6n. MATH 1813 (Preparation for Calculus) Spring 2020 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates and Co-Requisite Sections' Grade Distribution

Section Type	Enrollment	Success rate (C or better/P)
Standard	375	76.8%
Co-Requisite	9	55.6%
Co-Requisite Sections' Grade Distribution:		

A	B	C	D	F	W	P	NP
11.1%	22.2%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	22.2%	11.1%	22.2%

Table I-6o. MATH 1813 (Preparation for Calculus) Spring 2020 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates

Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-generation student success rate (C or better/P)
Standard	26.9%	70.3%
Co-Requisite	11.1%	(not reported: too small a population to protect privacy)

MATH 2144 Calculus I

Table I-6p. MATH 2144 (Calculus I) Fall 2019 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates and Co-Requisite Sections' Grade Distribution

Section Type	Enrollment	Success rate (C or better)
Standard	402	62.9%
Co-Requisite	45	77.8%

Co-Requisite Sections' Grade Distribution:					
A	B	C	D	F	W
8.9%	40.0%	28.9%	11.1%	2.2%	8.9%

Table I-6q. MATH 2144 (Calculus I) Fall 2019 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates

Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-generation student success rate (C or better)
Standard	17.1%	41.2%
Co-Requisite	8.9%	(not reported: too small a population to protect privacy)

Table I-6r. MATH 2144 (Calculus I) Spring 2020 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates and Co-Requisite Sections' Grade Distribution

Section Type	Enrollment	Success rate (C or better/P)
Standard	336	79.1%
Co-Requisite	18	77.8%

Co-Requisite Sections' Grade Distribution:							
A	B	C	D	F	W	P	NP
16.7%	22.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	38.9%	5.6%

Table I-6s. MATH 2144 (Calculus I) Spring 2020 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates

Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-generation student success rate (C or better/P)
Standard	16.7%	75.0%
Co-Requisite	16.7%	(not reported: too small of a population to protect privacy)

In most cases, 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. The main exception is in Spring 2020 MATH 1813, when we had a very small sample size, and students in that section are typically students with especially weak backgrounds, generally having done College Algebra elsewhere, often with a gap in time before taking Preparation of Calculus. We also had a shift in College Algebra, where previously students in both types of sections were performing at the same level each semester. Beginning in Fall 2019, we lowered the cut-off score required to get into a standard section of College Algebra, which left an overall weaker group of students in co-requisite sections. The students we allowed to move into standard sections of College Algebra did well in those sections, which opened more co-requisite seats for students, allowing the department to meet demand better. The overall success rate in Fall 2019 College Algebra was very similar to the rate in Fall 2018, so we think this was a beneficial change.

The OSU Department of Mathematics expanded 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 enrolled in co-requisite math classes in the Fall 2019 semester. We have 375 students enrolled in co-requisite sections in Fall 2020; the drop is a consequence of the lack of classroom space due to distancing requirements during the pandemic. We anticipate a return to previous levels once operations are back to normal.

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.

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.

For the 2019-20 academic year, Information Literacy was assessed, which is the first year of the new four-year cycle. Here is the current/upcoming cycle:

Current/Upcoming Cycle
1. **2019-20 | Information Literacy** (student artifacts) – **CURRENT REPORTING YEAR**
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 assessment of OSU's General Education 2019-20 cycle of Information Literacy was accomplished by evaluating written student artifacts by means of a modified version of the AAC&U's Information Literacy VALUE Rubric (for more information about the rubric, please refer to: https://uat.okstate.edu/assessment/files/genedreports/rubric_infolit_modified.pdf).

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

A partnership with the OSU Library was formed with UAT for completion of the Information Literacy General Education cycle. OSU Library contacted instructors they work closely with and who they thought might have an assignment eligible for artifact review. Student artifacts were collected by UAT and the library and compiled for review by the facilitator. UAT and the facilitator examined the assignment prompts of these artifacts to determine if they aligned with the modified AAC&U Information Literacy VALUE Rubric. Once the qualifying student artifacts were identified, the artifacts were split between two teams of two faculty raters (four in total). All reviewers and the facilitator were composed of experienced faculty who have served as previous general education reviewers or library staff who were considered topic experts. 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.

Because this was a pilot year of assessment on Information Literacy, artifacts were collected by the library who used their partnership with instructors they have worked with previously. Instructors of target courses were solicited for participation in submitting student artifacts to be used in the Information Literacy 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 the artifacts were to be collected, and assurance 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?

In the current monthly meeting discussion, CAGE agreed that the planned process for collecting Information Literacy student artifacts could be wider spread, meaning a larger net should be cast. Therefore, it was agreed that we should use the library's partnership with instructors as well as the each college associate dean from CAGE in order to identify potential courses that would produce artifacts fitting of the rubric. UAT is in the process of working with a subcommittee that includes the 2019-20 faculty raters, some members from CAGE, and representatives from the library on developing an institutional Information Literacy rubric, that is fitting for OSU and could yield better, more robust results. In short, since this is the first time we have administered this process (pilot), we will modify the process based on what we have learned such as broadening the scope and range of courses from more diverse colleges that we acquire artifacts from.

Analyses and Findings

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

In the assessment of Information Literacy artifacts, we used a slightly modified version of the Information Literacy VALUE Rubric. The rubric contains a four-point rating scale: Capstone (4), Milestones (3) and (2), and Benchmark (1). The student artifacts were assessed excluding one category, "Access Needed Information," because it was determined that it would not be possible to know the search strategies used by the student. The four categories used were:

- A. Determine the Extent of Information Needed,
- B. Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically,
- C. Use Information Effectively to Accomplish a Specific Purpose, and
- D. Access and Use Information Ethically and Legally

For more information about the above four categories or to view the Information Literacy VALUE rubric, please refer to:
https://uat.okstate.edu/assessment/files/genedreports/rubric_infolit_modified.pdf.

- Overall, 90.6% of the student artifacts received an overall rating of Milestones ($n = 125$), and 0.0% of student artifacts received an overall rating of Capstone ($n = 0$). In other words, the majority of students **met expectations** in Information Literacy artifacts.
- Below are the results for each rubric category:
    - A. Determine the Extent of Information Needed:
      94.8% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones ($n = 127$), and 2.2% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone ($n = 3$).
    - B. Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically:
      91.4% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones ($n = 126$), and 0.7% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone ($n = 1$).
    - C. Use Information Effectively to Accomplish a Specific Purpose:
      84.7% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones ($n = 117$), and 1.5% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone ($n = 2$).
    - D. Access and Use Information Ethically and Legally:
      75.3% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones ($n = 104$), and 5.8% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone ($n = 2$).

Further Analysis and Explanation

- Table 1 shows a distribution of the number of artifacts submitted, the number of artifacts rated, the number of artifacts included in the analysis, and which courses the artifacts came from. For this pilot year, all artifacts came from courses within the College of Arts and Sciences. In future assessments of Information Literacy, a broader, more diverse distribution will be acquired.

- Table 2 breaks down the number and percentages of artifacts used in the analysis based on the demographics of the students. Such demographics include Classification, College, Gender, and OSU GPA.

- Table 3 is the distribution of scores broken down by the specific rubric category, as well as the "Overall" rating distribution.

- Table 4 shows the distribution of rubric ratings based on demographic variables of the students whose artifacts were used in the analysis. The ratings are based on the "Overall" category rated by the reviewers. Demographic variables used here include Classification, College, and Gender.

Analysis tables follow.

Table 1. *Collection of Information Literacy Artifacts*

College[1]	Course Prefix and Number	Course Name	Number of Artifacts Submitted	Number of Artifacts Rated	Number of Artifacts Included in Analysis
CAS	ENGL1113	Composition I	299	58	58
	HIST1483	U.S. History to 1865	64	36	36
	POLS3983	Courts and Judicial Process	44	44	44
Total Number of Information Literacy Artifacts:			**407[2]**	**138**	**138**

Note: [1]Colleges: CAS = College of Arts and Sciences

[2]Although many artifacts were submitted, not all could be used for rating because they did not align with the rubric or did not fit page length criterion.

Table 2. *Student Demographics Associated with Information Literacy Artifacts, 2020*

		2020 # of artifacts (% of total)[2]
Class	Freshman	78 (56.5%)
	Sophomore	9 (6.5%)
	Junior	14 (10.1%)
	Senior	33 (23.9%)
	Total	*n* = 134
College[1]	AG	16 (11.6%)
	CAS	47 (34.1%)
	CEAT	9 (6.5%)
	EHS	22 (16.0%)
	SSB	24 (17.4%)
	UC	16 (11.6%)
	Total	*n* = 134
Gender	Female	72 (52.2%)
	Male	62 (44.9%)
	Total	*n* = 134
OSU GPA	<2.0	3 (2.2%)
	2.0 to 2.49	5 (3.6%)
	2.50 to 2.99	27 (19.6%)
	3.00 to 3.49	37 (26.8%)
	3.50 to 4.00	61 (44.2%)
	Missing	4 (2.9%)
	Total	*n* = 134

Note: [1]Colleges: AG = Ferguson College of Agriculture; CAS = College of Arts and Sciences; CEAT = College of Engineering, Architecture and Technology; EHS = Education and Human Sciences; SSB = Spears School of Business; UC = University College

[2]Four students could not be linked to demographic data.

Table 3. *Information Literacy Artifact Scores for Each Rubric Category, 2020*

Rubric Category	SCORE: *n* (%)				
	Benchmark	Milestones		Capstone	
	1	2	3	4	*N*
A[1,2]	4 (3.0)	63 (47.0)	64 (47.8)	3 (2.2)	134
B	11 (7.9)	63 (45.7)	63 (45.7)	1 (0.7)	138
C	19 (13.8)	68 (49.2)	49 (35.5)	2 (1.5)	138
D	32 (23.2)	70 (50.7)	34 (24.6)	2 (1.5)	138
Overall[3]	13 (9.4)	74 (53.6)	51 (37.0)	0 (0.0)	138

Note: [1] A = Determine the Extent of Information Needed; B = Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically; C = Use Information Effectively to Accomplish a Specific Purpose; D = Access and Use Information Ethically and Legally

[2] Although 138 artifacts were rated, 4 artifacts could not be used in analysis due to their lack of applicability to category A of the rubric.

[3] "Overall" was another category the reviewers rated; it is not a total or average of the previous table scores.

Table 4. *Information Literacy Artifact Scores – Breakdown of "Overall" Rating Category, 2020*

	SCORE: *n* (%)				
	Benchmark	Milestones		Capstone	
	1	2	3	4	*N*
Class					
Freshman	6(7.7)	46(59.0)	26(33.3)	0(0.0)	78
Sophomore	1(11.1)	6(66.7)	2(22.2)	0(0.0)	9
Junior	0(0.0)	7(50.0)	7(50.0)	0(0.0)	14
Senior	5(15.2)	12(36.4)	16(48.5)	0(0.0)	33
College[1]					
AG	1(6.3)	11(68.8)	4(25.0)	0(0.0)	16
CAS	5(10.6)	21(44.7)	21(44.7)	0(0.0)	47
CEAT	1(11.1)	6(66.7)	2(22.2)	0(0.0)	9
EHS	0(0.0)	11(50.0)	11(50.0)	0(0.0)	22
SSB	1(4.2)	11(45.8)	12(50.0)	0(0.0)	24
UC	4(25.0)	11(68.8)	1(6.3)	0(0.0)	16
Gender					
Male	7(11.3)	33(53.2)	22(35.5)	0(0.0)	62
Female	5(6.9)	38(52.8)	29(40.3)	0(0.0)	72
Total[2]	12(9.0)	71(53.0)	51(38.1)	0(0.0)	134

Note: [1] Colleges: AG = Ferguson College of Agriculture; CAS = College of Arts and Sciences; CEAT = College of Engineering, Architecture and Technology; EHS = Education and Human Sciences; SSB = Spears School of Business; UC = University College

[2] Four students could not be linked to demographic data.

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

The OSU Library initiated the assessment of Information Literacy and they are able to compare trends expected to occur with those nation-wide. Currently, since this is the first year of Information Literacy assessment, we do not have any other OSU student data on Information Literacy to compare with or track across years. However, Information Literacy will again be assessed in 2023-24 and we will be able to start comparing across years and looking for emerging trends. In the future, we will also have a broader scope. This year is the foundation upon which we will build this assessment process for Information Literacy. We are working on establishing a baseline for future cycles of Information Literacy.

II-7. Describe the evaluation of the general education assessment and any modifications 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).

- We will be communicating information to college instructors through the Associate Deans in the CAGE, as well as the library. Future artifacts will represent a variety of fields and disciplines.
- There has been discussion from the Information Literacy artifact review subcommittee about further modification of the Information Literacy VALUE Rubric and possibly creating our own OSU rubric. Also, an initiation of the promotion of solid Information Literacy assignments will be cultivated by the library.

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. All reports and plans are submitted through the Nuventive Improve software to streamline the faculty submission process and the assessment staff review process.
- 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 (17.0%),
  - Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) (9.2%),
  - Surveys (9.2%),
  - Oral Presentation (6.4%),
  - Rating of Student Skills (e.g. rubrics) (8.6%),
  - Review of Thesis, Dissertation, or Creative Component (8.6%),
  - Portfolio Review (4.3%),
  - Capstone Assignment (7.3%),
  - Course Exam(s) (5.8%),
  - Course Embedded Assignment (3.9%),
  - Course Projects (2.5%),
  - Internship (2.5%),
  - Review of Student Research (1.6%),
  - Projects & Assignments (1.3%), and
  - Performance or Jury (2.8%)

- Assessment plans must be updated every five years and reviewed at least once every five years within the department. 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 (https://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.

NOTE:"-" means no information was submitted for that component.
      "0" means information of zero was submitted for that component.

Table III.1. Program Outcomes Assessment
Ferguson College of Agriculture[1]

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Agribusiness	BSAG	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Survey	Capstone Assignment	132	88	16
Agricultural Communications	BSAG	Portfolio Review	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Portfolio Review	0	0	0
Agricultural Communications	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/Creative Component	Oral Presentation	1	1	1
Agricultural Economics	BSAG	Course Embedded Assignments	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Survey	12	132	88
Agricultural Economics	MS	Course Project	Rating of skills	Survey	9	10	10
Agricultural Economics	PhD	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certifications, or Professional Exam(s)	Oral Presentation	7	7	2
Agricultural Education	BSAG	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	30	20	17
Agricultural Education	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/Creative Component	Oral Presentation	3	3	3
Agricultural Education	PhD	Oral Presentation	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/Creative Component	5	5	5
Agricultural Leadership	BSAG	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Internship	-	15	15	-

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

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	Project & Assignments	83	25	50
Animal Science	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	Survey	6	6	6
Animal Science	PhD	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	Survey	0	0	0
Biochemistry & Molecular Biology	BSAG	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Course Project	Interviews	46	46	17
Biochemistry & Molecular Biology	MS	Presentation/ Performance	Review of Student Research	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	3	3	3
Biochemistry & Molecular Biology	PhD	Presentation/ Performance	Review of Student Research	Survey	12	12	5
Biosystems Engineering	BSBE	Survey	Capstone Assignment	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	27	25	4
Biosystems Engineering	MS	Rating of Skills	Interviews	Interviews	7	1	1
Biosystems Engineering	PhD	Rating of Skills	Survey	Interviews	14	3	3
Crop Science	PhD	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Rating of skills	Oral Presentation	6	6	6
Entomology	BSAG	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Analysis of written Artifacts	2	6	20

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	0	0	0
Entomology & Plant Pathology	MS	Oral Presentation	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Analysis of written Artifacts	2	-	2
Environmental Science	BSAG	Oral Presentation	Capstone Assignment	Other	16	16	12
Equine Enterprise Management	UCRT	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Course Project	Portfolio Review	12	12	12
Food Science	BSAG	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Internship	1	0	5
Food Science	MS	Survey	Survey	Survey	4	4	4
Food Science	PhD	Review of Student Research	Survey	Survey	1	1	1
General Agriculture: Agricultural Leadership	MAG	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	Course Project	0	0	-
Grassland Management	GCRT	Course Embedded Assignments	-	-	2	-	-
Horticulture	BSAG	Internship	Internship	Internship	5	5	5
Horticulture	MS	Rating of Skills	Rating of skills	Interviews	8	8	8

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
International Agriculture	MAG	Analysis of Written Artifacts	-	-	12	-	-
International Agriculture	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	General Outcome Observations	-	12	12	-
Landscape Architecture	BLA	Portfolio Review	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam	Portfolio Review	12	18	12
Landscape Management	BSAG	Internship	Survey	Survey	2	2	2
Natural Resource Ecology & Management	BSAG	Oral Presentation	Project & Assignments	Analysis of written Artifacts	No Data Submitted		
Natural Resource Ecology & Management	MS	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Presentation/ Performance	No Data Submitted		
Natural Resource Ecology & Management	PhD	Review of Student Research	Rating of skills	Analysis of written Artifacts	No Data Submitted		
Plant & Soil Sciences	BSAG	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Rating of Skills	19	11	12
Plant & Soil Sciences	MS	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Rating of skills	Oral Presentation	4	4	4
Plant Pathology	PhD	Oral Presentation	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Analysis of written Artifacts	1	0	1

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Soil Sciences	PhD	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Rating of skills	Oral Presentation	0	0	0
University Studies	BUS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Survey	4	4	4

Table III.1. Program Outcomes Assessment (continued)
College of Arts and Sciences[1]

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
American Studies	BA	No Report Submitted					
American Studies	BS	No Report Submitted					
Applied Statistics	MS	Course Exam(s)	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Exam(s)	2	3	1
Art History	MA	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	1	1	1
Art: Art History	BA	Oral Presentation	Oral Presentation	Oral Presentation	3	3	3
Art: Graphic Design	BFA	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	25	25	25
Art: Studio	BFA	No Report Submitted					
Art: Studio Art	BA	Portfolio Review	Portfolio Review	Analysis of written Artifacts	7	7	7
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 Report Submitted					
Big Data Analytics	GCRT	No Report Submitted					
Biochemistry	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	-	17	3	-

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

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Biological Science	BS	Other	Other	Analysis of Written Artifacts	30	61	36
Chemistry	MS	Oral Presentation	Survey	-	0	2	-
Chemistry	PhD	Oral Presentation	Rating of skills	Survey	17	-	33
Chemistry: ACS Approved	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Rating of Skills	-	2	6
Chemistry: Departmental Degree	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Rating of skills	Analysis of written Artifacts	9	2	-
Communication Science & Disorders	BS	Course Exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	198	65	133
Communication Science & Disorders	MS	Rating of Skills	Review of Student Research	Analysis of Written Artifacts	29	53	53
Computer Science	BS	Rating of Skills	Rating of Skills	Rating of Skills	27	17	16
Computer Science	MS	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	2	2	2
Computer Science	PhD	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	9	11	3
Creative Writing	MFA	Supervisor Evaluation	-	-	4	-	-
Economics	BA	Capstone Assignment	Survey	Analysis of written Artifacts	No Data Submitted		
Economics	BS	Capstone Assignment	Survey	Analysis of written Artifacts	No Data Submitted		

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
English	BA	Rating of Skills	Oral Presentation	Analysis of written Artifacts	28	28	8
English	MA	Rating of Skills	Oral Presentation	Rating of Skills	10	10	10
English	PhD	Rating of Skills	Oral Presentation	Survey	10	10	9
Environmental Science	UCRT	No Report Submitted					
French	BA	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Embedded Assignments	48	57	48
Geographic Information Systems	UCRT	No Report Submitted					
Geography	BA	Rating of Skills	Course Project	Rating of Skills	0	2	2
Geography	BS	Rating of Skills	Survey	Rating of Skills	12	0	2
Geography	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Course Embedded Assignments	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	7	9	3
Geography	PhD	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Course Embedded Assignments	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	4	1	2
Geology	BS	Presentation/ Performance	-	-	9	-	-
Geology	MS	Rating of Skills	Oral Presentation	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	12	12	7
Geology	PhD	Rating of Skills	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Review of Student Research	3	3	3

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Geospatial Information Sciences	BS	Rating of Skills	Rating of Skills	Survey	2	3	2
German	BA	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Embedded Assignments	55	40	51
Global Studies	BA	Rating of Skills	Rating of Skills	-	12	12	-
Graphic Design	MFA	Portfolio Review	Portfolio Review	Portfolio Review	3	3	3
History	BA	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	10	10	10
History	PhD	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	5	5	5
History	MA	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	5	5	5
Integrative Biology	MS	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Other	4	4	6
Integrative Biology	PhD	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Oral Presentation	Other	1	1	9
Interdisciplinary Toxicology	GCRT	No Report Submitted					
Mass Communication	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	-	4	4	-
Mathematics	BA	Analysis of Written Artifacts	General Outcome Observations	Analysis of Written Artifacts	0	0	0
Mathematics	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	12	12	12

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Mathematics	MS	Course Exam(s)	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Oral Presentation	12	8	6
Mathematics	PhD	Course Exam(s)	Project & Assignments	Oral Presentation	14	4	4
Medicinal and Biophysical Chemistry	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	-	3	3	-
Microbiology/ Cell & Molecular Biology	BS	Course Exam(s)	Course Project	Course Embedded Assignments	20	20	35
Microbiology/ Cell & Molecular Biology	MS	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Survey	-	3	-	-
Microbiology/ Cell & Molecular Biology	PhD	Other	Oral Presentation	-	20	20	-
Multidisciplinary Studies	BA	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	No Data Submitted		
Multidisciplinary Studies	BS	No Report Submitted					
Multimedia Journalism	BA	Survey	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Portfolio Review	1	167	5
Multimedia Journalism	BS	Survey	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Portfolio Review	2	167	5
Museum and Curatorial Studies	GCRT	No Report Submitted					

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Music	BA	No Report Submitted					
Music	BM	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Performance or Jury	Performance or Jury	0	8	-
Music	MM	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Oral Presentation	Performance or Jury	9	15	15
Music Education	BM	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Performance or Jury	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	0	21	21
Music Industry	BS	Internship	Performance or Jury		No Data Submitted		
Philosophy	BA	Rating of Skills	Rating of Skills	Rating of Skills	13	13	13
Philosophy	MA	Rating of Skills	Rating of Skills	Rating of Skills	4	4	4
Photonics	PhD	Other	Rating of Skills	Rating of Skills	2	4	3
Physics	BS	Other	Course Exam(s)	Other	40	54	28
Physics	MS	Rating of Skills	Review of Student Research	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	12	1	1
Physics	PhD	Rating of Skills	Rating of Skills	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	12	18	3
Physiology	BS	Other	Other	Analysis of written Artifacts	29	61	36
Plant Biology	BS	Course Exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of written Artifacts	6	1	1

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Plant Biology	MS	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	2	2	2
Plant Biology	PhD	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	0	0	0
Political Science	BA	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	25	25	25
Political Science	BS	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	25	25	25
Political Science	MA	Course Exam(s)	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	8	3	3
PreMedical Sciences	UCRT	No Report Submitted					
PreNursing	UCRT	No Report Submitted					
Psychology	BA	Course Exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	1467	226	226
Psychology	BS	Course Exam(s)	Course Exam(s)	Analysis of written Artifacts	1467	191	226
Psychology	MS	Portfolio Review	Portfolio Review	-	No Data Submitted		
Psychology	PhD	Portfolio Review	Portfolio Review	-	54	54	-
Sociology	BA	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of written Artifacts	14	14	12
Sociology	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of written Artifacts	30	30	5
Sociology	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of written Artifacts	5	5	5

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Sociology	PhD	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	5	5	5
Spanish	BA	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Embedded Assignments	279	255	187
Sports Media	BA	Survey	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Portfolio Review	3	167	5
Sports Media	BS	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Portfolio Review	Supervisor Evaluation	167	5	8
Statistics	BS	Course Exam(s)	Capstone Assignment	Course Exam(s)	4	7	9
Statistics	MS	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Course Exam(s)	Course Exam(s)	2	3	2
Statistics	PhD	Rating of Skills	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Other	5	2	1
Strategic Communication	BA	Survey	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Portfolio Review	7	167	5
Strategic Communication	BS	Survey	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Portfolio Review	23	167	5
Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages	GCRT	No Report Submitted					
Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages	UCRT	No Report Submitted					

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Theatre	BA	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Rating of skills	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	9	59	-
Theatre	MA	No Report Submitted					
University Studies	BUS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Survey	Analysis of Written Artifacts	21	21	21
Zoology	BS	Other	Other	Analysis of written Artifacts	30	61	36

Table III.1. Program Outcomes Assessment (continued)
College of Education and Human Sciences[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 with rubric	Review of student research with rubric	Analysis of Written Artifacts with rubric	47	41	41
Applied Educational Studies: Aviation and Space	EDD	Written artifact analysis with rubric	Oral presentation analysis with rubric	Written artifact analysis with rubric	10	1	14
Applied Exercise Sciences	BS	Internship	Internship	Internship	63	63	63
Aviation and Space	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts with rubric	Analysis of Written Artifacts with rubric	Analysis of Written Artifacts with rubric	15	10	20
Building Level Leadership	GCRT	No Report Submitted					
Career & Technical Education	BS	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Portfolio Review	Lesson Plan Project	7	4	4
Career and Technical Education	UCRT	No Report Submitted					
College Teaching	GCRT	Observation of teaching with rubric	-	-	9	-	-
Counseling	MS	Faculty rating	Survey	Survey	94	10	7
Counseling Psychology	PhD	Final grade in a general psychology course	Oral qualifying exam	Final grade in a research course	7	8	8

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

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Curriculum Studies	PhD	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Dissertation evaluation with rubric	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	1	1	-
Design, Housing and Merchandising	BSHS	Analysis of Written Artifacts - Faculty reviewers	Oral Presentation	Rubric and faculty raters	10	102	80
Design, Housing and Merchandising	MS	No Report Submitted					
Developmental Disabilities	GCRT	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	1	1	1
District Level Leadership	GCRT	No Report Submitted					
Early Child Care and Development	BSHS	No Report Submitted					
Education	EDS	No Report Submitted					
Education	PhD	No Report Submitted					
Education: School Psychology	EDS	Nationally Benchmarked Exam	Portfolio Review	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	No Data Submitted		
Educational and Psychological Measurements	GCRT	No Report Submitted					
Educational Leadership & Policy Studies: Educational Administration	PhD	No Report Submitted					

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Educational Leadership & Policy Studies: Higher Education	PhD	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Rating of skills	Analysis of written Artifacts	4	4	4
Educational Leadership Studies: College Student Development	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Rating of skills	Course Project	35	35	35
Educational Leadership Studies: Higher Education	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Internship	Course Project	6	6	6
Educational Leadership Studies: School Administration	MS	No Report Submitted					
Educational Psychology: Educational Psychology	MS	Application materials	Survey	Application materials	14	9	14
Educational Psychology: Educational Psychology	PhD	Survey	Entrance examination	Entrance examination	24	24	24
Educational Psychology: Research and Evaluation	MS	No Report Submitted					

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Educational Psychology: Research and Evaluation	PhD	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	3	3	3
Educational Technology	MS	Review of Portfolio	Review of Portfolio	Oral Presentation	9	9	9
Elementary Education	BS	Portfolio Review with rubric	Capstone Assignment	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	94	81	46
Elementary Math Specialist	GCRT	No Report Submitted					
Family and Consumer Sciences Education	MS	No Report Submitted					
Family Financial Planning	GCRT	No Report Submitted					
Family Financial Planning	MS	Presentation	multiple-choice quiz	Course Embedded Assignments	10	10	10
Family Financial Planning	UCRT	5-item practice exam	-	-	25	-	-
Gerontology	GCRT	No Report Submitted					
Health and Human Performance	MS	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Survey	1	9	0
Health Education and Promotion	BS	Portfolio Review by raters	Rating of Skills by supervisor	-	34	-	-
Health, Leisure & Human Performance:	PhD	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Other	Survey	5	5	5

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Health & Human Performance							
Health, Leisure & Human Performance: Leisure Studies	PhD	Successful completion of qualifying exam	Successful completion of thesis	-	3	0	-
Human Development and Family Science	BSHS	Senior Exit survey	Senior Exit Survey	Analysis of Written Artifacts with rubrics	55	55	55
Human Development and Family Science	MS	Rubric, unclear what is being rated	Analysis of Written Artifacts with rubric	-	1	20	-
Human Sciences: Design, Housing and Merchandising	PhD	No Report Submitted					
Human Sciences: Human Development and Family Science	PhD	Analysis of Written Artifacts with rubric	Analysis of Written Artifacts with rubric	Analysis of Written Artifacts with rubric	0	3	1
Infant Mental Health	GCRT	No Report Submitted					
Leisure Studies	MS	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Performance or Jury	Performance or Jury	10	10	10
Nursing	BSN	Analysis of written artifacts, discussion, course project, and comprehensive exam	Analysis of written artifacts, discussion, course project, and comprehensive exam	Analysis of written artifacts, discussion, course project, and comprehensive exam	24	18	20
Nutritional Sciences	BSHS	Project & Assignments	Group Project - Oral Presentation	-	116	47	-

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Nutritional Sciences	MS	Oral Presentation	Nationally Benchmarked Exam	-	10	13	-
Nutritional Sciences	PhD	Oral Presentation	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	-	2	3	-
Online Teaching	GCRT	Course Project with rubric	Course Project with rubric	-	9	9	-
Physical Education	BS	No Report Submitted					
Program Evaluation	GCRT	Final presentation with rubric	-	-	0	-	-
Recreational Management & Recreational Therapy	BS	Survey	Survey	-	95	95	-
School Administration	EDD	No Report Submitted					
School Library Certification	GCRT	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	-	-	0	-	-
School Psychology	PhD	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) with rubric	Rating of skills	-	4	29	-
Secondary Education	BS	Portfolio Review with rubric	Capstone Assignment with raters	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	38	19	32
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		

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Teaching	MAT	Portfolio Review with rubric	Portfolio Review with rubric	Supervisor Evaluation with rubric	1	1	1
Teaching, Learning and Leadership	MS	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	2	2	2
University Studies	BUS	Analysis of Written Artifacts with rubric	Analysis of Written Artifacts with rubric	Analysis of Written Artifacts with rubric	19	19	19
Workforce and Adult Education	GCRT	No Report Submitted					

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

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Aerospace Engineering	BSAE	Capstone Assignment	Course Embedded Assignments	Capstone Assignment	No Data Submitted		
Architectural Engineering	BEN	Capstone Assignment	Course Project	Course Project	12	12	12
Architecture	BAR	Performance or Jury	Performance or Jury	Survey	27	27	27
Chemical Engineering	BSCH	Survey	Other	Survey	55	25	55
Chemical Engineering	MS	Performance or Jury	Survey	Interviews	4	4	2
Chemical Engineering	PhD	Survey	Interviews	Performance or Jury	31	3	31
Civil Engineering	BSCV	No Report Submitted					
Civil Engineering	MS	Review of Student Research	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Presentation/ Performance	1	15	15
Civil Engineering	PhD	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Review of Student Research	Presentation/ Performance	5	5	-
Computer Engineering	BSCP	Capstone Assignment	Project & Assignments	Course Exam(s)	60	64	62
Construction Engineering Technology	BSET	Internship	Internship	Internship	54	54	54
Electrical Engineering	ME	No Report Submitted					

---

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

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Electrical Engineering	BSEE	Capstone Assignment	Project & Assignments	Capstone Assignment	60	28	60
Electrical Engineering	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Survey	4	19	0
Electrical Engineering	PhD	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	Analysis of written Artifacts	23	23	23
Electrical Engineering Technology	BSET	Project & Assignments	Capstone Assignment	Oral Presentation	16	18	18
Engineering and Technology Management	GCRT	No Report Submitted					
Engineering and Technology Management	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Course Project	No Data Submitted		
Fire & Emergency Management	PhD	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	3	3	3
Fire & Emergency Management Administration	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of written Artifacts	8	8	8
Fire Protection & Safety Engineering Technology	BSET	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	8	8	8
Fire Protection & Safety Engineering Technology	MSET	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	Course Embedded Assignments	5	5	19

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Industrial Engineering & Management	BSIE	Survey	Survey	Survey	24	24	24
Industrial Engineering & Management	MS	Survey	Survey	Survey	11	11	11
Industrial Engineering & Management	PhD	Survey	Survey	Survey	1	1	1
Integrative Design of Building Envelope	GCRT	No Report Submitted					
Materials Science and Engineering	MS	Oral Presentation	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Course Exam(s)	2	2	4
Materials Science and Engineering	PhD	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Oral Presentation	Course Exam(s)	1	1	3
Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering	MS	No Report Submitted					
Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering	PhD	No Report Submitted					
Mechanical Engineering	BSME	Capstone Assignment	Course Project	Course Embedded Assignments	No Data Submitted		
Mechanical Engineering Technology	BSET	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Capstone Assignment	Group Project	6	39	88
Petroleum Engineering	MS	Rating of Skills	Course Project	Oral Presentation	5	5	5

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Petroleum Engineering	PHD	No Report Submitted					
University Studies	BUS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Survey	Survey	6	6	6

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

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)	Course Exam(s)	202	300	90
Accounting	MS	No Report Submitted					
Business Administration	MBA	Course Embedded Assignments	Group Project	Nationally Benchmarked Exam	95	94	43
Business Administration	PhD	Performance or Jury with rubric	Completion of training module	Presentation/ Performance	18	6	8
Business Administration: Accounting	PhD	Evaluation of student work	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	5	1	3
Business Administration: Entrepreneurship	PhD	Performance or Jury with rubric	Completion of training module	Presentation/ Performance	18	6	8
Business Administration: Executive Research	PhD	Performance or Jury with rubric	Completion of training module	Presentation/ Performance	18	6	8
Business Administration: Finance	PhD	Performance or Jury with rubric	Completion of training module	Presentation/ Performance	18	6	8
Business Administration: Management	PhD	Performance or Jury with rubric	Completion of training module	Presentation/ Performance	18	6	8

---

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

Programs	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Business Administration: Management Information Systems	PhD	Performance or Jury with rubric	Completion of training module	Presentation/ Performance	18	6	8
Business Administration: Marketing	PhD	Performance or Jury with rubric	Completion of training module	Presentation/ Performance	18	6	8
Business Analytics and Data Science	MS	Exam(s)	Exam(s)	Exam(s)	41	44	1
Business Data Mining	GCRT	Certification exam	-	-	8	-	-
Customer Interface Excellence	UCRT	No Report Submitted					
Economics	BSBA	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	Course Exam(s)	337	390	529
Economics	MS	No Report Submitted					
Economics	PhD	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts with rubric	0	0	4
Entrepreneurship	BSBA	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	Course Exam(s)	337	390	529
Entrepreneurship	GCRT	No Report Submitted					
Finance	BSBA	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	Course Exam(s)	337	390	529
General Business	BSBA	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	Course Exam(s)	337	390	529
Health Analytics	GCRT	No Report Submitted					

Programs	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Hospitality and Tourism Management	BSHS	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	Course Exam(s)	337	337	390
Hospitality and Tourism Management	MS	Oral Presentation with rubric	End of course grades	-	8	8	-
Hospitality and Tourism Management	PHD	Rating of Skills with rubric	Rating of Skills with rubric	Rating of Skills with rubric	9	9	9
Human Resource Management	GCRT	No Report Submitted					
Information Assurance	GCRT	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Course Exam(s)	Course Project	4	4	4
International Business	BSBA	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	Course Exam(s)	337	390	529
Management	BSBA	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	Course Exam(s)	337	390	529
Management Information Systems	BSBA	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	Course Exam(s)	337	390	529
Management Information Systems	MS	Internship	Internship	Internship	13	13	13
Marketing	BSBA	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	Course Exam(s)	337	390	529
Marketing Analytics	GCRT	Course Exam(s)	-	-	2	-	-
NonProfit Management	GCRT	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Embedded Assignments	No Data Submitted		
Quantitative Financial Economics	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts with rubric	Analysis of Written Artifacts with rubric	-	5	5	-

Programs	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Sustainable Business Management	UCRT		No Report Submitted				
University Studies	BUS	Analysis of Written Artifacts - Rubric	Survey	Analysis of Written Artifacts - Rubric	7	7	7

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

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed #3
Bioinformatics	GCRT	No Report Submitted					
Environmental Science	MS	Survey	Survey	Survey	9	9	9
Environmental Science	PhD	Survey	Survey	Survey	0	0	0
Interdisciplinary Studies	MS	No Report Submitted					
Public Health	GCRT	No Report Submitted					
Public Health	MPH	No Report Submitted					
Veterinary Biomedical Science	MS	Course Exam(s)	Project & Assignments	Oral Presentation	11	3	3
Veterinary Biomedical Science	PhD	Course Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Project & Assignments	3	3	7

---

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

Table III.1. Program Outcomes Assessment (continued)
Global Studies[1]

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed #3
Global Issues	GCRT	No Report Submitted					
Global Studies	MS	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Internship	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	4	4	4
International Disaster and Emergency Management	GCRT	No Report Submitted					

---

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

Analyses and Findings

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

University Assessment and Testing has received 243 (82.09%) annual program outcomes assessment reports out of 296 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, Red, and Gray. 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; the color of red means that missing information or no report was provided by the program; and the color of gray means that the program communicated their reasoning for not having assessment data for the current academic year. This was largely due to complications related to the COVID-19 pandemic changing the structure of the school year as well as the current plans being set in place regarding effectively assessing certificate programs. The overall program percent averages for each color category are as follows: 64.46% of programs received green; 12.09% yellow; 9.05% of programs received red; and 14.39% of programs received gray in all five components.

Below are the overall analyses and findings from reviewing the program outcomes assessment reports received for the 2019-2020 academic year:

Student Learning Outcomes:

> Approximately 68.92% of programs received the color of green for having measurable/observable program student learning outcomes. Only a few issues/concerns were identified: among 14.53% of programs need to update or modify their student learning outcomes. In red, only 5.07% of programs had missing information in this component. Finally, 11.49% of programs were exempt from providing this information and were given a gray rating to reflect this.

Assessment Methods:

> Approximately 68.58% of programs received the color of green for having appropriate program assessment methods. Only a few issues/concerns were identified: among 12.84% of programs need to update or modify their assessment methods. In red, 5.74% of programs had missing information in this component. Lastly, 12.84% of programs were exempt from providing this information and were given a gray rating to reflect this.

Findings:

Approximately 67.57% of programs received the color of green for having useful program findings. Very few issues/concerns were identified: only 5.74% of programs need to update or modify their findings. In red, only 10.14% of programs had missing information in this component. 16.55% of programs were exempt from providing this information and were given a gray rating to reflect this.

Use of Findings:

Approximately 52.03% of programs received the color of green for having effective use of findings. Only a few issues/concerns were identified: among 12.84% of programs need to update or modify their use of findings. In red, 14.53% of programs had missing information in this component. And, 20.61% of programs were exempt from providing this information, due to having a restricted sample size, being interrupted or set back by the pandemic, or other reasons.

Annual Executive summary:

Approximately 65.20% of programs received the color of green for having an effective annual executive summary. Only a few issues/concerns were identified: among 14.53% of programs need to update or modify their executive summary. In red, 9.80% of programs had missing information in this component. Finally, 10.47% of programs were exempt from providing this information and were given a gray rating to reflect this.

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 2021, UAT will be working with programs that need assistance in modifying program student learning outcomes, creating more robust assessment methods, analyzing findings, and identifying the best strategies for use of findings 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 findings to strengthen the quality of student learning outcomes assessment.
- In the Spring of 2021, 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?

- The OSU Student Engagement Survey (SES) and the OSU Student Satisfaction Survey (SSS) were administered together during the Spring of 2020. In the section to follow, we will present combined demographic analysis, separate quantitative results, and combined qualitative results.

- Data was collected from both undergraduate and graduate students on the OSU-Stillwater and OSU-Tulsa campuses (including full- and part-time students).

OSU Student Engagement Survey (SES)

- This was a pilot year for the Student Engagement Survey, and the beginning of establishing a baseline using three consecutive years of survey administration.

- The survey is administered online using Qualtrics survey software. The SES consists of 25 five-point Likert scale items, five three-point Likert scale items, and one open-ended item designed to measure concepts regarding overall OSU student engagement experiences: Academic Effort, Higher Order Learning, Interaction, Supportive Environment, and Involvement.

OSU Student Satisfaction Survey (SSS)

- This was the last year of the Student Satisfaction Survey administration cycle for establishing a baseline using three consecutive years of data. We will discuss with AAIC and Instruction Council (IC) to determine the cycle of data collection for the future.

- 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 and Student Satisfaction – Overall Summary of Demographics

- Data collection yielded 8,563 (38.9%) responses, with 8,010 (36.4%) in the final data set
- Response Rates
  - College
    - College of Arts and Sciences: 39.2% (n = 2,058/5,251)
    - College of Education and Human Sciences: 26.3% (n = 1,057/4,015)
    - College of Engineering, Architecture and Technology: 37.5% (n = 1,407/3,756)
    - Ferguson College of Agriculture: 44.3% (n = 1,219/2,750)
    - Spears School of Business: 37.4% (n = 1,853/4,949)
    - University College: 28.5% (n = 300/1,051)
  - Classification:
    - Undergraduate: 35.2% (n = 6,516/18,500)
    - Graduate: 42.3% (n = 1,494/3,536)
- Demographics
  - Campus
    - Stillwater: 91.4% (n = 7,320); Stillwater/Tulsa: 5.8% (n = 461); Tulsa: 2.9% (n = 229)
  - Gender
    - Female: 60.1% (n = 4,816); Male: 39.9% (n = 3,194)
  - Reported Race
    - White: 63.6% (n = 5,091); Two or More Races: 9.5% (n = 762); International: 8.2% (n = 657); Hispanic: 8.0% (n = 640); American Indian or Alaska Native: 4.2% (n = 336); Black or African American: 3.8% (n = 305); Asian: 2.5% (n = 203); Unknown: 0.1% (n = 9); Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander: 0.1% (n = 7)
  - Class Level (Note: 84 students' classifications did not fit into one of the below six categories)
    - FR: 12.7% (n = 1,018); SO: 17.5% (n = 1,401); JR: 20.5% (n = 1,641); SR: 30.1% (n = 2,413); Master's: 9.7% (n = 779); Doctoral: 8.4% (n = 674)
  - Classification
    - Undergraduate: 81.3% (n = 6,516); Graduate: 18.7% (n = 1,494)
  - Full-Time/Part-Time Status
    - FT: 77.9% (n = 6,243); PT: 22.1% (n = 1,767)
  - Home State
    - OK: 68.8% (n = 5,514); TX: 12.8% (n = 1,022); KS: 1.4% (n = 116);
    - CA: 1.3% (n = 104); Other: 15.7% (n = 1,254)
- A total of 2,337 open-ended comments were recorded.

OSU Student Engagement Survey (SES)

- Overall reliability (Cronbach's alpha) is .900 for the four-factor model, indicating excellent internal consistency.
- Overall validity CFI is .821 for the four-factor model, both indicating a good fit.

Item Analysis

Overall Top 10 "Engaged" items *(Always and Often)***:**
- I attend my classes at OSU **(96.9%)**
- I spend enough time and make enough effort to learn at OSU **(92.8%)**
- I do my best regarding my responsibilities in group work at OSU **(92.7%)**
- I motivate myself to learn at OSU **(91.8%)**
- I feel safe on the OSU campus **(90.4%)**
- I try to be open to learning things that could potentially change the way I understand an issue or concept at OSU **(90.2%)**
- Overall, I feel good about being at OSU **(90.1%)**
- I am easily able to work with classmates from different backgrounds and cultures than my own at OSU **(88.5%)**
- I determine my learning goals at OSU **(86.0%)**
- I am comfortable being myself at OSU **(85.0%)**

Bottom 5 "Engaged" items *(Always and Often)***:**
- I discuss course topics, ideas, or concepts with an OSU professor outside of class **(39.2%)**
- I participate in OSU campus events **(41.6%)**
- I talk about my career plans with career services, faculty, or advisors at OSU **(53.0%)**
- I feel I am an important part of the OSU community **(58.9%)**
- I ask other students to help me understand course material at OSU **(60.4%)**

Top 5 "Disengaged" items *(Rarely or Never)***:**
- I discuss course topics, ideas, or concepts with an OSU professor outside of class **(30.7%)**
- I participate in OSU campus events **(24.5%)**
- I talk about my career plans with career services, faculty, or advisors at OSU **(19.0%)**
- I feel I am an important part of the OSU community **(15.2%)**
- I use OSU library resources on campus or online **(12.6%)**

Top 3 "Involved" items *(Yes)***:**
- I have been actively involved in an OSU student group or group in the community **(64.9%)**
- I have participated in a community-based project (e.g. volunteering) during my studies at OSU **(56.4%)**
- I have participated in an internship, part-time job, field experience, student teaching, or clinical placement while at OSU **(52.5%)**

Top 2 "Uninvolved" items *(No, with no intention)***:**
- I have participated in an OSU study abroad program **(54.3%)**
- I have worked with a faculty member on a research project at OSU **(40.1%)**

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

OSU Student Satisfaction Survey (SSS)

- Overall reliability (Cronbach's alpha) is .94 indicating excellent internal consistency.

Item Analysis

Overall Top 10 "Very Satisfied" and "Satisfied" items:
- Your safety and security on the OSU campus **(89.2%)**
- OSU health and fitness services **(88.8%)**
- Being a student at OSU **(87.8%)**
- Your intellectual growth at OSU **(87.2%)**
- OSU library services **(86.8%)**
- Availability of OSU faculty **(83.8%)**
- Pete's Pet Posse at OSU **(83.7%)**
- The quality of teaching at OSU **(83.2%)**
- The variety of activities for students at OSU **(82.3%)**
- OSU course registration process **(78.8%)**

Bottom 5 "Very Satisfied" and "Satisfied" items:
- Parking availability at OSU **(19.9%)**
- OSU food and dining options **(54.9%)**
- OSU financial aid received **(55.5%)**
- Your experience in OSU residence halls **(64.4%)**
- Gender identity inclusion on the OSU campus **(65.0%)**

Top 5 "Very Dissatisfied" and "Dissatisfied":
- Parking availability at OSU **(63.5%)**
- OSU food and dining options **(20.4%)**
- OSU financial aid received **(20.4%)**
- Your experience in OSU residence halls **(13.4%)**
- Availability of courses needed for your degree program at OSU **(9.8%)**

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. After the successful pilot administration of the valid and reliable SES instrument, we will continue to establish a baseline by administering the survey for two more consecutive years.
- The survey items for both the SES and SSS were based on theoretical and practical aspects of student engagement and satisfaction from research done in higher education.
- SES and SSS 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 the following administrations in 2019 and 2020, UAT will determine the ongoing cycle for the SSS with AAIC and IC.
- The OSU-Student Engagement Survey will continue to be administered in Spring of 2021 and 2022 in order to establish the three-year baseline.

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 2019-20:

Assessment Fees	**$796,794.64**
Assessment Salaries	**$423,107.55**
Distributed to Other Departments	**$177,027.00**
Operational Costs	**$166,383.26**
Total Expenditures	**$766,517.81**[1]

[1] Expenditures were slightly below collected fees as there was some assessment staff turnover during the academic year as well as some reduced operational expenses in Spring and Summer 2020 due to campus closings caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, which resulted in some savings in "Assessment Salaries" and "Operational Costs."