Oklahoma State University
America's Brightest ORANGE

Annual Student Assessment Report
2020-2021

Prepared for
The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
November 12, 2021

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, M.S.
Assessment and Analysis Graduate Research Associate

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 4,339 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, 96 (2.2%) were required to enroll in developmental English courses, 69 (1.6%) in developmental reading courses, 155 (3.6%) in developmental mathematics courses, and 221 (5.1%) in developmental science courses.
- As the second year of the new General Education cycle, Diversity was measured during the 2020-2021 academic year with a student artifact review and institutional campus climate survey.
  - Overall, 47.3% of the student artifacts were rated as Milestones ($n = 123$), and 41.5% of student artifacts were rated as Capstone ($n = 108$). In other words, the majority of students met or exceeded expectations in diversity artifacts.
  - The top three items with the highest agreement from the institution-wide campus climate survey were:
    - At OSU, I am personally treated with respect by faculty and staff. (91.1% Strongly Agree/Agree)
    - When I graduate from OSU, I will be confident in my ability to work with individuals from different backgrounds and cultures than my own. (90.2% Strongly Agree/Agree)
    - In class at OSU, I am able to work with classmates with backgrounds and cultures different from my own. (89.4% Strongly Agree/Agree)
- 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 rubric level (a.k.a. color code) to each category. The overall program average percentages for each color category are as follows:
  - 3.0% of programs received purple, which indicates the item Greatly Exceeded Expectations,
  - 13.4% of programs received blue, which suggests the item Exceeded Expectations,
  - 40.6% of programs received green, which denotes the item Met Expectations,
  - 24.8% received yellow, which suggests the item Somewhat Met Expectations,
  - 5.6% received orange, which denotes the item Minimally Met Expectations,
  - 10.0% of programs received red, which indicates there was Missing Information, and
  - 2.8% of programs received gray, which denotes Not Applicable. This score was largely used for those who were unable to conduct their usual assessment processes due to COVID-19 or other restrictions throughout the academic year.

- In terms of student engagement, a total of 6,812 OSU students responded to the 2021 Student Engagement Survey (SES) survey with a 30.7% response rate. The top three "Engaged" responses were:
  - I do my best regarding my responsibilities in group work at OSU (93.3%)
  - I attend my classes at OSU (92.0%)
  - I spend enough time and make enough effort to learn at OSU (91.1%)
- In terms of student satisfaction, 2020 was the third consecutive measurement year. In the last three years (2018, 2019, and 2020), an average of 8,053 OSU students responded to the Student Satisfaction Survey (SSS) with a 35.6% response rate. On average, the top three "Satisfied" responses were:
  - 89.1% of students reported either "Very Satisfied" or "Satisfied" to "OSU health and fitness services."
  - 88.4% of students reported either "Very Satisfied" or "Satisfied" to "Your safety and security on the OSU Campus."
  - 88.3% of students reported either "Very Satisfied" or "Satisfied" to "OSU library services."

Next steps:
- In the coming year, UAT will continue to implement the assessment management system, Nuventive Improvement Platform, 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 Improvement Platform 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 onboarding faculty to the new assessment management system, Nuventive Improvement 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.
- We will conduct a five-year review of all programs to provide feedback on growth over the last five years of assessment. This will also serve to provide programs with individual feedback and information that can aid them in their APR preparations as needed.
- We will also conduct an internal assessment survey titled the OSU Outcomes Assessment Feedback Survey. This survey was also developed by UAT in collaboration with AAIC and will be administered in Spring of 2022. It will serve as the beginning of a larger movement to increase communication between programs and the assessment unit.
- In support of OSU's land-grant mission and heritage, UAT has expanded its services to include survey consultation and other consultation support for the OSU community. UAT will continue to expand these services to a larger community and build the support services.

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 2020-2021 (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 these 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 scores are updated regularly by the university).
   - 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 On-Campus 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 (best recorded ACT scores, high school GPAs [cumulative, core, and subject], high school class rank and size, and high school units),
- The student's PGI coefficients,
- Secondary testing (OSU placement exam) scores (if available);
- The curricular and performance deficiencies that require remediation based on the academic summary (i.e. enrollment restrictions), if any, 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 Analytics (IRA) and are distributed to students by the Office of First Year Success. Reports are also included in each student's academic 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 one year 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 25 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 2020-2021 (e.g., high school GPA, and CPT cut scores).

In 2020-21, 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 into co-requisite sections of MATH 1483 and MATH 1513 is determined solely on the basis of performance on the OSU Mathematics Placement Exam (ALEKS). Current cut scores may be found online at http://mathplacement.okstate.edu/. Cut scores are set by the OSU Department of Mathematics and cut scores for co-requisite sections are a little lower than cut scores for standard sections. Placement into co-requisite sections of MATH 1813 and MATH 2144 may also be based on placement scores. However, some students who are eligible for a standard section of these courses elect to enroll in a co-requisite section instead. Students considering this step talk with their academic advisor and also their instructor, the course coordinator, and/or the Associate Head of the Mathematics Department to help reach this decision. Both MATH 1813 and MATH 2144 also include readiness assessments given during the first week of classes that provide information to students about their level of preparation for the class. Students who seem unprepared for success in a standard section may be advised to switch to a co-requisite section, although the final decision is theirs.

OSU allows students who score at least 25 on the placement test to take a non-remedial math class. Students who score in the range 25-34 are eligible for co-requisite MATH 1483 and those who score in the range 30-39 are eligible for co-requisite MATH 1513. This contrasts with national guidelines which suggest that a score lower than 45 indicates that a student should be placed in a remedial class. Through its placement and co-requisite instruction system, OSU offers the opportunity for students to begin taking college-level math classes sooner.

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 the ACT On-Campus Exam, the OSU English Placement Exam, and/or the OSU Reading Placement Exam 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 at OSU.

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 2020-2021, a total of 4,339 newly admitted and enrolled students (all new freshmen and new transfers with less 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 2020-2021.

Subject Area	# of Students with ACT sub-scores <19[1]	# of Students cleared for college-level coursework by ELPA
English	556	460
Mathematics	947	800
Reading	356	295
Science	345	125
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: 49, Mathematics: 49, Reading: 49, Science: 575.		

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 Next-Generation Writing) or Reading (ACCUPLACER Next-Generation Reading) Placement tests for 2020-2021 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	1	0
Reading	13	2
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. 233 new students with ACT Math scores below 19 cleared remediation requirements using the OSU Math Placement Exam (ALEKS) in 2020-2021.

After all entry-level assessment was completed, 383 students (8.83% of the total new students enrolled) were required to take at least one developmental (remedial) course. Of the 4,339 new students in 2020-2021, 96 (2.21%) were required to enroll in developmental English courses, 69 (1.59%) in developmental reading courses, 155 (3.57%) in developmental mathematics courses, and 221 (5.09%) 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 2020-2021 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 2020-2021 (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)	30	23 (76.67%)
UNIV 0153 (reading and science)	185	142 (76.76%)
UNIV 0123 (mathematics)	79	54 (68.35%)
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, sections designated as standard are face-to-face sections of mathematics courses that are not co-requisite sections. Non-co-requisite sections taught online are excluded from this data and analysis because there are no online co-requisite sections. Online classes have a different student profile, different success rates, and different pedagogical challenges. Thus, including them would compromise the usefulness of the data and the validity of the analysis. For this reason, the total enrollments reported below are lower than the total number of students who took the indicated class in the indicated semester.

The Department regards a grade of C or better as representing success in a class and that is the definition used here. The reason for choosing this standard is that for most purposes C is the minimum grade that allows a student to progress in their program. Note that at the time this report was produced, a few students in the relevant populations still had grades of incomplete (I). Incomplete grades were excluded from the data and analysis since it is currently unknown whether the final grades will represent success.

MATH 1483 Mathematical Functions and Their Uses

Table I-6d. MATH 1483 (Math Functions) Fall 2020 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
Section Type		Enrollment		Success Rate (C or better)	
Standard		184		87.5%	
Co-requisite		112		78.6%	
Fall 2020 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
A	B	C	D	F	W
15.2%	25.9%	37.5%	3.6%	11.6%	6.25%

Table I-6e. MATH 1483 (Math Functions) Fall 2020 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates		
Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better)
Standard	12.5%	73.9%
Co-requisite	16.1%	61.1%

Table I-6f. MATH 1483 (Math Functions) Spring 2021 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
Section Type		Enrollment		Success Rate (C or better)	
Standard		99		86.9%	
Co-requisite		55		67.3%	
Spring 2021 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
A	B	C	D	F	W
20.0%	27.3%	20.0%	10.9%	9.1%	12.7%

Table I-6g. MATH 1483 (Math Functions) Spring 2021 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates		
Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better)
Standard	10.1%	80.0%
Co-requisite	18.2%	70.0%

MATH 1513 College Algebra

Table I-6h. MATH 1513 (College Algebra) Fall 2020 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
Section Type		Enrollment		Success Rate (C or better)	
Standard		429		76.5%	
Co-requisite		186		71.0%	
Fall 2020 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
A	B	C	D	F	W
22.0%	31.2%	17.7%	7.5%	10.8%	10.8%

Table I-6i. MATH 1513 (College Algebra) Fall 2020 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates		
Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better)
Standard	12.4%	64.2%
Co-requisite	21.0%	53.8%

Table I-6j. MATH 1513 (College Algebra) Spring 2021 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
Section Type		Enrollment		Success Rate (C or better)	
Standard		117		54.7%	
Co-requisite		87		49.4%	
Spring 2021 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
A	B	C	D	F	W
16.1%	16.1%	17.2%	4.6%	18.4%	27.6%

Table I-6k. MATH 1513 (College Algebra) Spring 2021 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates

Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better)
Standard	18.8%	45.5%
Co-requisite	28.7%	56.0%

MATH 1813 Preparation for Calculus

Table I-6l. MATH 1813 (Preparation for Calculus) Fall 2020 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution

Section Type	Enrollment	Success Rate (C or better)
Standard	434	63.6%
Co-requisite	48	62.5%
Fall 2020 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution		

A	B	C	D	F	W
18.8%	29.2%	14.6%	10.4%	8.3%	18.8%

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

Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better)
Standard	19.6%	57.6%
Co-requisite	22.9%	54.5%

Table I-6n. MATH 1813 (Preparation for Calculus) Spring 2021 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution

Section Type	Enrollment	Success Rate (C or better)
Standard	247	64.4%
Co-requisite	9	66.7%
Spring 2021 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution		

A	B	C	D	F	W
11.1%	44.4%	11.1%	0.0%	11.1%	22.2%

Table I-6o. MATH 1813 (Preparation for Calculus) Spring 2021 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates

Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better)
Standard	17.0%	57.1%
Co-requisite	22.2%	population too small to report

MATH 2144 Calculus I

Table I-6p. MATH 2144 (Calculus I) Fall 2020 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution

Section Type	Enrollment	Success Rate (C or better)
Standard	435	65.7%
Co-requisite	31	80.6%

Fall 2020 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
A	B	C	D	F	W
16.1%	32.2%	32.2%	3.2%	6.5%	9.7%

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

Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better)
Standard	17.5%	56.6%
Co-requisite	22.6%	57.1%

Table I-6r. MATH 2144 (Calculus I) Spring 2021 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution

Section Type	Enrollment	Success Rate (C or better)
Standard	241	55.2%
Co-requisite	5	80.0%

Spring 2021 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution (one I excluded)					
A	B	C	D	F	W
0.0%	20.0%	60.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Table I-6s. MATH 2144 (Calculus I) Spring 2021 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates

Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better)
Standard	17.4%	52.4%
Co-requisite	20.0%	population too small to report

During the entire period covered by the above-presented data, instruction at OSU was greatly affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. Classes were often being taught in unsuitable rooms that were chosen because they allowed for social distancing. Many students were ill themselves or had family members who were. There were economic and mental-health challenges stemming from the pandemic that impacted student success and well-being. The normal functions of the University were also affected, and so students had greater difficulty accessing resources and assistance that they may have needed. For example, the Mathematics Learning Success Center, a critical resource for student success in mathematics classes, was forced to operate primarily online for much of this period. The data suggest that these challenges were particularly significant for students in co-requisite sections and for first-generation students. (Note that these two populations are not independent: first-generation students are generally overrepresented in co-requisite sections.) Apart from MATH 2144 (Calculus I), students in co-requisite sections generally succeeded at rates

comparable to but a little lower than students in standard sections. On the basis of this data and in light of the disruptions caused by the pandemic, the Mathematics Department believes that the current placement criteria for enrollment in co-requisite sections are appropriate. We will continue to monitor success in co-requisite sections and make adjustments as needed, but, at present, we do not plan to alter the criteria for co-requisite placement.

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 2020-21 academic year, Diversity was assessed, which is the first assessment of diversity in the new four-year cycle. Here is the current/upcoming cycle:

Current/Upcoming Cycle
1. **2020-21 | Diversity** (student artifacts/survey) - **CURRENT REPORTING YEAR**
2. **2021-22 | Professionalism and Ethics** (student artifacts)
3. **2022-23 | Written Communication and Critical Thinking** (student artifacts)
4. **2023-24 | Information Literacy** (student artifacts)

The assessment of OSU's General Education 2020-21 cycle of Diversity was accomplished by evaluating written student artifacts by means of a customized rubric developed by OSU faculty raters and the Committee for Assessment of General Education called the OSU Diversity Rubric.

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

The 2021 CCS-S was conducted during the spring semester at Oklahoma State University. The CCS-S was administered to all students in the Stillwater and Tulsa campuses. A total of 5,436 students initially responded to the CCS-S, which was 24.0% of the target population ($N = 22,628$ students), and 4,857 responses (21.5%) were analyzed after data cleaning procedures. The CCSS contained 40 items asked on a 5-point agreement Likert scale. Topics of these items included inclusion, support, experience at OSU, belonging, 'D' course issues, working with and discussion with others, improvement, concern, and equity. There were also eight demographic items and one open-ended item which asked, "Do you have any other comments you would like to make about diversity, equity or inclusion at OSU?" For this open-ended question there were 1,204 responses.

Student Artifact Review

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

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

OSU Campus Climate Survey for Students (CCS-S)

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

> In order to gain a better understanding of the campus climate and your experience at Oklahoma State University, the OSU Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Task Force in collaboration with the Committee for the Assessment of General Education and University Assessment and Testing are conducting a short climate survey to learn about your experience at OSU. The survey will take **5-10 minutes** to complete and will provide meaningful and useful feedback to us**.**
> Your responses will contribute to the advancement of a welcoming and inclusive environment that appreciates and values all members of the University community.

By completing this survey, the students were entered for a chance to win one of ten $100 Bursar reimbursements. They were informed that the survey is completely voluntary and their responses were to remain confidential.

Student Artifact Review

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

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

OSU Campus Climate Survey for Students (CCS-S)

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

Student Artifact Review

In the current monthly meeting discussion, CAGE agreed that the planned process for collecting diversity student artifacts could be more efficient in terms of time consumption and quality of usable artifacts. UAT has worked with a subcommittee that included the 2018-19 faculty raters for diversity artifacts, some members from CAGE, and a representative from ID to develop an institutional diversity rubric, fitting for OSU, and that could yield better, more robust results. This subcommittee, along with CAGE developed and implemented the OSU Diversity Rubric. Additionally, CAGE put together an initiative that engaged diversity instructors to produce student artifacts that better aligned with OSU general education assessment and the corresponding OSU Diversity Rubric.

Analyses and Findings

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

OSU Campus Climate Survey for Students (CCS-S)

Important demographic information is below:

Classification[1] (*n* = 4,857)
- 12.1% of participants were Freshmen (*n* = 565),
- 18.0% of participants were Sophomores (*n* = 842),
- 20.2% of participants were Juniors (*n* = 944),
- 27.1% of participants were Seniors (*n* = 1,266),
- 11.2% of participants were Masters students (*n* = 521), and
- 11.3% of participants were Doctoral students (*n* = 528).

Campus: (*n* = 4,857)
- 90.3% of participants were affiliated with the Stillwater campus (*n* = 4,385),
- 7.0% of participants were affiliated with the Stillwater and Tulsa campuses (*n* = 342), and
- 2.7% of participants were affiliated with the Tulsa campus (*n* = 130).

Reported Gender[2]: (*n* = 4,367)
- 61.2% of participants responded Female (*n* = 2,674)
- 35.4% responded Male (*n* = 1,545),
- 1.5% responded Other (*n* = 65),
- 0.8% responded 'Prefer not to answer' (*n* = 37),
- 0.4% responded Transgender woman (*n* = 19),
- 0.3% responded Non-binary (*n* = 15),
- 0.2% responded Gender non-conforming (*n* = 8), and
- 0.1% responded Transgender man (*n* = 4).

Reported Sexual Orientation[2]: (*n* = 4,352)
- 82.2% of participants responded Heterosexual/Straight (*n* = 3,577),
- 8.0% responded Bisexual (*n* = 347),
- 2.7% responded Other (*n* = 116),
- 1.9% responded Prefer not to answer (*n* = 82),
- 1.7% responded Gay (*n* = 75),
- 1.7% responded Questioning (*n* = 74),
- 1.3% responded Lesbian (*n* = 56), and
- 0.6% responded Queer (*n* = 25).

---

[1] 191 students could not be classified into one of the prescribed categories. The extraneous categories included Professional students, Graduate Certificate, Special Graduate, and Special Undergraduate

[2] Response options for these items were edited or added halfway through the data collection period. This could account for a lower total number of responses for some response options

Reported Religion: (*n* = 4,366)
- 47.7% of participants responded Christian - Protestant (*n* = 2,083),
- 23.0% responded No religious affiliation (*n* = 1,006),
- 14.7% responded Christian - Catholic (*n* = 641),
- 3.7% responded Prefer not to answer (*n* = 162),
- 3.7% responded Other (*n* = 161),
- 2.5% responded Hindu (*n* = 107),
- 2.4% responded Muslim (*n* = 103),
- 1.2% responded Buddhist (*n* = 51),
- 0.8% responded Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints (*n* = 33), and
- 0.4% responded Jewish (*n* = 19).

Reported Marital Status: (*n* = 4,358)
- 75.7% of participants responded Single (*n* = 3,298),
- 12.4% of participants responded Married (*n* = 541),
- 7.6% of participants responded Not married but living with a partner (*n* = 333),
- 1.5% of participants responded Divorced (*n* = 65),
- 1.3% of participants responded Other (*n* = 58),
- 1.1% of participants responded Prefer not to answer (*n* = 49),
- 0.2% of participants responded Widowed (*n* = 9), and
- 0.1% of participants responded Separated (*n* = 5).

Race, Ethnicity, or Nationality: (*n* = 4,857)
- 61.1% of participants were reported as White or European American (*n* = 2,967),
- 9.5% were reported as Multiracial (*n* = 462),
- 9.3% were reported as International (*n* = 450),
- 8.8% were reported as Hispanic, Latin(a/o), or Latinx (*n* = 428),
- 4.8% were reported as Black or African American (*n* = 233),
- 3.6% were reported as Native American or Alaska Native (*n* = 176),
- 2.7% were reported as Asian or Asian American (*n* = 130),
- 0.1% were reported as Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (*n* = 6), and
- 0.1% were reported as Unknown (*n* = 5).

Reported Disability: (*n* = 4,369)

- No: 95.1%; n = 4,155
- Yes: 4.9%; n = 214
  - **Of those who responded "Yes": Multiple response item**
    - 27.6% of participants responded Psychological and Mental Health (n = 98),
    - 14.9% responded Physical Disability (n = 53),
    - 14.4% responded Chronic Illness (n = 51),
    - 9.0% responded Learning Disability (n = 32),
    - 6.5% responded Hearing Loss and Deafness (n = 23),
    - 6.2% responded Other (n = 22),
    - 5.9% responded Vision Loss and Blindness (n = 21),
    - 4.5% responded Autism (n = 16),
    - 3.9% responded Memory Loss (n = 14),
    - 3.4% responded Prefer not to answer (n = 12),
    - 2.0% responded Intellectual Disability (n = 7), and
    - 1.7% responded Speech and Language Disorder (n = 6)

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

Model Fit: Reliability & Validity

Overall Model Fit
(*n* = 4,857 → *n* = 4,078 after cases with missing values were excluded)

Reliability: The model was found to be reliable (40 items; Cronbach's Alpha = 0.732).

- The overall model of OSU CCS-E included nine factors: 1) Inclusion/Support, 2) Experience at OSU, 3) Belonging, 4) D-Course Issues, 5) Working with Others, 6) Improvement, 7) Concern, 8) Discussion with Others, and 9) Equity.

Validity: Validity of the overall model indicates that the model is a good fit to the data. Model fit indices support this:

- The Comparative Fit Index (CFI) is a value between 0 and 1 and is considered *acceptable* if it is greater than 0.90. CFI for this model is 0.92 and considered *good*.
- Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) ranges from 0 to 1 and a value of 0.08 or less is indicative of an *acceptable* model fit. RMSEA for this model is 0.055 and is *good*.
- The Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) ranges from 0 to 1 and a value of 0.08 or less indicates an *acceptable* model. The SRMR for this model is 0.080 and therefore indicates an *acceptable* fit.

Highest or Lowest Ranking Items (*n* = 4,857)

Top 10 Positively-Rated Items:

- At OSU, I am personally treated with respect by faculty and staff. **(91.1% Strongly Agree/Agree)**
- When I graduate from OSU, I will be confident in my ability to work with individuals from different backgrounds and cultures than my own. **(90.2% Strongly Agree/Agree)**
- In class at OSU, I am able to work with classmates with backgrounds and cultures different from my own. **(89.4% Strongly Agree/Agree)**
- I believe that meaningful interactions with individuals different from me is an essential part of my college education at OSU. **(88.3% Strongly Agree/Agree)**
- At OSU, I am personally treated with respect by peers. **(87.6% Strongly Agree/Agree)**
- At OSU, I am able to work well with my peers/classmates in class. **(85.7% Strongly Agree/Agree)**
- There is a fellow student at OSU that I feel comfortable turning to if I need support. **(83.2% Strongly Agree/Agree)**
- At OSU, I have opportunities for academic success that are similar to those of my classmates. **(82.3% Strongly Agree/Agree)**
- At OSU, I feel that I personally have experienced discrimination. **(80.0% Strongly Disagree/Disagree)**
- It is important for OSU's leaders to talk about racial and ethnic issues to help work through and solve the problems. **(79.2% Strongly Agree/Agree)**

Top 5 Negatively-Rated Items:

- I hesitate to talk about issues of diversity at OSU because of the fear of offending others. **(31.4% Strongly Agree/Agree)**
- I participate in OSU campus events often. **(29.3% Strongly Disagree/Disagree)**
- At OSU, in the past year, I have witnessed insulting or disparaging remarks about someone's ethnic background. **(22.9% Strongly Agree/Agree)**
- At OSU, I feel that I personally have experienced being ignored. **(22.8% Strongly Agree/Agree)**
- At OSU, I feel that I personally have experienced exclusion/isolation. **(66.5% Strongly Agree/Agree)**

Student Artifact Review

In the assessment of diversity artifacts, four categories of the OSU Diversity Rubric and the overall student ratings were assessed. The four categories were:

        A. Knowledge of Cultural Context,
        B. Conceptual Understanding,
        C. Values Diversity, and
        D. Attitudes

In the assessment, which included all students, reliability was tested by calculating Cronbach's Alpha. The resulting statistic suggested that the scale's reliability is "Excellent" (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.927; $n = 224$).

- Overall, 47.3% of the student artifacts were rated as Milestones ($n = 123$), and 41.5% of student artifacts were rated as Capstone ($n = 108$). In other words, the majority of students **met or exceeded expectations** in diversity artifacts.
- Below are the results for each rubric category:
  A. <u>Knowledge of Cultural Context</u>
     55% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones ($n = 143$), and 32.7% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone ($n = 85$).
  B. <u>Conceptual Understanding:</u>
     56.2% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones ($n = 146$), and 31.9% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone ($n = 83$).
  C. <u>Values Diversity:</u>
     43.9% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones ($n = 114$), and 40.3% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone ($n = 105$).
  D. <u>Attitudes:</u>
     37.7% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones ($n = 98$), and 48.8% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone ($n = 127$).

Analysis tables follow.

Table 1. *Collection of Diversity Artifacts*

College[3]	Course Prefix and Number	Course Name	General Education Designation (if any)[4]	Number of Artifacts Submitted[5]	Number of Artifacts Rated[6]	Number of Artifacts Included in Analysis
CAS	AMST 3503	Television and American Society	D, H	21	18	18
	ANTH 3353	Cultural Anthropology	I, S	18	17	17
	SOC 1113	Introductory Sociology	S	82	9	9
	SOC 3133	Racial and Ethnic Relations	D, S	41	30	30
	SOC 4213	Sociology of Sexualities	S	30	10	10
	SOC 4653	Gender and the Middle East	I, S	37	30	15
CEHS	FFP 2613	Financial Perspectives throughout the United States	D, S	27	19	19
	HDFS 2123	Developmental Disabilities: Issues Across the Lifespan	D	78	18	9
	HLTH 3113	Health Issues in Diverse Populations	D	21	20	20
	HLTH 3201	Health in Special Populations	D	82	47	45
	RMRT 2443	Contemporary Issues in Diversity	D, S	115	39	38
SSB	MSIS 3931	Diversity Impacts in Information Systems	D	76	3	3
Total Number of Diversity Artifacts:				**628**	**260**	**233**

---

[3] Colleges: CAS = College of Arts and Sciences; CEHS = College of Education and Human Sciences; SSB = Spears School of Business

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

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

[6] Although many artifacts were rated, not all could be used in analysis due to their lack of applicability to the rubric

Table 2. *Student Demographics Associated with Diversity Artifacts, 2007-2021*

		2007-2013 # of artifacts (% of total)	2016 # of artifacts (% of total)	2019 # of artifacts (% of total)	**2021 # of artifacts (% of total)**	Combined # of artifacts (% of total)
Class[7]	Freshman	45 (9.6)	24 (32.8)	7 (5.3)	**49 (21.2)**	125 (13.8)
	Sophomore	118 (25.1)	8 (10.9)	38 (28.8)	**69 (29.9)**	233 (25.7)
	Junior	162 (34.4)	24 (32.8)	42 (31.8)	**66 (28.6)**	294 (32.4)
	Senior	146 (31.0)	17 (23.2)	45 (34.1)	**47 (20.3)**	255 (28.1)
	Total	*n* = 471	*n* = 73	*n* = 132	***n* = 231**	*N* = 907
College[8]	CAS	181 (38.4)	27 (36.9)	41 (31.1)	**107 (46.1)**	356 (39.1)
	AGRI	28 (5.9)	22 (30.1)	21 (15.9)	**13 (5.6)**	84 (9.2)
	CEAT	50 (10.6)	3 (4.1)	6 (4.5)	**20 (8.6)**	79 (8.7)
	CEHS	151 (31.8)	9 (12.3)	55 (41.7)	**53 (22.8)**	268 (29.4)
	SSB	28 (5.9)	9 (12.3)	6 (4.5)	**27 (11.6)**	70 (7.7)
	UC	35 (7.4)	3 (4.1)	3 (2.3)	**12 (5.2)**	53 (5.8)
	Total	*n* = 473	*n* = 73	*n* = 132	***n* = 232**	*N* = 910
Gender	Female	255 (54.1)	25 (34.2)	101 (76.5)	**161 (69.4)**	542 (59.7)
	Male	216 (45.9)	48 (65.7)	31 (23.5)	**71 (30.6)**	366 (40.3)
	Total	*n* = 471	*n* = 73	*n* = 132	***n* = 232**	*N* = 908
OSU GPA	< 2.0	28 (5.9)	2 (2.7)	3 (2.3)	**4 (1.7)**	37 (4.0)
	2.0 to 2.49	70 (14.9)	3 (4.1)	11 (8.3)	**15 (6.5)**	99 (10.8)
	2.50 to 2.99	118 (25.1)	15 (20.5)	35 (26.5)	**34 (14.7)**	202 (22.0)
	3.00 to 3.49	126 (26.6)	19 (26.0)	33 (25.0)	**55 (23.7)**	233 (25.4)
	3.50 to 4.00	130 (27.6)	34 (46.5)	50 (37.9)	**124 (53.4)**	338 (36.8)
	Missing	10 (2.1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	**0(0)**	10 (1.1)
	Total	*n* = 482	*n* = 73	*n* = 132	***n* = 232**	*N* = 919

---

[7] One artifact could not be assigned to any class because of missing information

[8] Colleges: CAS = College of Arts and Sciences; AGRI = Ferguson College of Agriculture; CEAT = College of Engineering, Architecture and Technology; CEHS = College of Education and Human Sciences; SSB = Spears School of Business; UC = University College

Table 3. *Diversity Artifact Scores, 2020*

	SCORE: *n* (%)					
	Benchmark	Milestones		Capstones		
	1	2	3	4	5	*n*
Class						
Freshman	0 (0.0)	1 (2.0)	26 (53.1)	18 (36.7)	4 (8.2)	49
Sophomore	2 (3.0)	6 (9.0)	29 (43.3)	25 (37.3)	5 (7.5)	67
Junior	1 (1.4)	10 (14.5)	24 (34.8)	29 (42.0)	5 (7.2)	69
Senior	0 (0.0)	5 (10.6)	20 (42.6)	17 (36.2)	5 (10.6)	47
College[9]						
CAS	0 (0.0)	7 (6.5)	39 (36.4)	47 (43.9)	14 (13.1)	107
CEAT	0 (0.0)	4 (20.0)	7 (35.0)	6 (30.0)	3 (15.0)	20
CEHS	1 (1.9)	7 (13.2)	31 (58.5)	13 (24.5)	1 (1.9)	53
AGRI	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (15.4)	11 (84.6)	0 (0.0)	13
SSB	2 (7.4)	4 (14.8)	15 (55.6)	5 (18.5)	1 (3.7)	27
UC	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	5 (41.7)	7 (58.3)	0 (0.0)	12
Gender						
Male	1 (1.4)	9 (12.7)	27 (38.0)	28 (39.4)	6 (8.5)	71
Female	2 (1.2)	13 (8.1)	72 (44.7)	61 (37.9)	13 (8.1)	161
Overall	3 (1.3)	22 (9.5)	99 (42.7)	89 (38.4)	19 (8.2)	232

Table 4. *Diversity Artifact Scores for each rubric category, 2021*

	SCORE: *n* (%)					
	Benchmark	Milestones		Capstones		
	1	2	3	4	5	*n*
A[10]	5 (2.1)	25 (10.7)	118 (50.6)	60 (25.8)	25 (10.7)	233
B	4 (1.7)	40 (17.2)	106 (45.5)	70 (30.0)	13 (5.6)	233
C[11]	5 (2.2)	16 (7.1)	98 (43.8)	82 (36.6)	23 (10.3)	224
D[12]	0 (0)	8 (3.6)	90 (40.0)	89 (39.6)	38 (16.9)	225
Overall	3 (1.3)	22 (9.4)	101 (43.2)	89 (38.0)	19 (8.1)	234

[9] Colleges: CAS = College of Arts and Sciences; CEAT = College of Engineering, Architecture and Technology; CEHS = College of Education and Human Sciences; AGRI = Ferguson College of Agriculture; SSB = Spears School of Business; UC = University College

[10] A = Knowledge of Cultural Context; B = Conceptual Understanding; C = Values Diversity D = Attitudes

[11] Nine artifacts could not be used in analysis due to their lack of applicability to category C of the rubric

[12] Eight artifacts could not be used in analysis due to their lack of applicability to category D of the rubric

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

OSU Campus Climate Survey for Students (CCS-S)

The CCS-S was administered in spring 2019 and again in spring 2021. By administering the survey for a second time, we are beginning to establish a baseline and track student self-reported climate at OSU. Student performance on the survey will be tracked by developing a Campus Climate Survey for Students Comparison Report. In this report, student performance will be compared and analyzed based on the multiple years of data.

Student Artifact Review

The instructors of courses with the designation of 'D,' 'H,' 'I,' or 'S' were solicited for participation in submitting student artifacts. The number of artifacts used for analysis has been tracked in Table 2 from 2007 to 2013, 2016, 2019, and 2021. Student performance cannot currently be tracked based on student artifact ratings because different rubrics have been used, making comparison inadvisable. However, a diversity assessment subcommittee underwent meetings to collaborate and develop an OSU diversity rubric which will be used every time we are assessing diversity, making student performance tracking across years possible.

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

- In an effort to streamline assessment of diversity, the Campus Climate Survey for Students will continue to be administered to OSU students for each diversity assessment cycle year in order to establish a baseline and track progress at OSU across years. The next year for assessment of diversity will be during the 2024-2025 academic year so the next survey administration will be in spring of 2025. By collecting responses from all students, we will be able to improve upon the existing CCS-S which will provide OSU with the ability to measure progress and effectiveness of diversity initiatives. With this information, OSU will be able to address any issues or concerns effectively.
- The diversity artifact review subcommittee will continue to discuss the newly created and implemented OSU Diversity Rubric. Also, discussion will take place about an initiation of the promotion of solid diversity assignments will be competitively offered with a stipend to approved instructors of qualifying courses.
- We will continue to streamline the General Education assessment for each cycle and eventually integrate the information in the Nuventive Improvement Platform system for ease of distribution and transparency of information. This will also make longitudinal comparisons and examination of trends much easier.

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 Improvement Platform 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 (16.5%),
  - Surveys (11.6%),
  - Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) (9.5%),
  - Capstone Assignment (8.5%),
  - Oral Presentation (7.2%),
  - Course Exam(s) (6.9%),
  - Review of Thesis, Dissertation, or Creative Component (6.7%),
  - Rating of Skills (5.7%),
  - Portfolio Review (5.6%),
  - Supervisor Evaluation (3.2%),
  - Course Embedded Assignment (2.8%),
  - Presentation/Performance (2.5%),

- o   Review of Student Research (2.4%),
- o   Performance or Jury (2.2%),
- o   Interviews (2.1%),
- o   Internship (2.0%),
- o   Course Project (1.7%),
- o   Projects & Assignments (1.4%),
- o   Nationally Benchmarked Exam (1.2%), and
- o   Group Project (0.5%).

- 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 will be available through public pages created within Nuventive Improvement Platform.
- 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. Certificates were excluded from the tables until a robust process for assessing certificates is established institution wide.

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

Table III.1. Program Outcomes Assessment[13]

Ferguson College of Agriculture

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	139	53	53
Agricultural Communications	BSAG	Portfolio Review	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Rating of Skills	0	0	0
Agricultural Communications	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Oral presentation	4	4	4
Agricultural Economics	BSAG	Course Embedded Assignments	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Survey	13	139	53
Agricultural Economics	MS	Course Embedded Assignments	Rating of skills	Interviews	12	8	8
Agricultural Economics	PhD	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Oral presentation	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	6	1	6
Agricultural Education	BSAG	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	42	35	42
Agricultural Education	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of student research	3	3	3
Agricultural Education	PhD	Oral presentation	Review of Thesis/Dissertations/ Creative Component	Analysis of Written Artifacts	1	1	1
Agricultural Leadership	BSAG	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Other	-	20	17	-

---

[13] 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	Internship	78	86	30
Animal Science	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral presentation	Survey	4	4	4
Animal Science	PhD	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral presentation	Survey	2	2	0
Biochemistry & Molecular Biology	BSAG	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Course project	Interviews	238	30	23
Biochemistry & Molecular Biology	MS	Presentation/ Performance	Review of student research	Presentation/Performance	5	5	2
Biochemistry & Molecular Biology	PhD	Presentation/Performance	Review of student research	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	10	13	2
Biosystems Engineering	BSBE	Survey	Other	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	27	20	20
Biosystems Engineering	MS	Rating of Skills	Interviews	Interviews	11	0	0
Biosystems Engineering	PhD	Rating of Skills	Survey	Interviews	1	1	1
Crop Science	PhD	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Rating of skills	Oral presentation	4	4	4
Entomology	BSAG	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	18	17	18

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Entomology	PhD	Oral presentation	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Rating of Skills	0	2	0
Entomology & Plant Pathology	MS	Oral presentation	Oral presentation	Analysis of Written Artifacts	10	4	4
Environmental Science	BSAG	Oral presentation	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Capstone Assignment	18	18	18
Food Science	BSAG	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Internship	3	14	6
Food Science	MS	Survey	Survey	Survey	3	3	3
Food Science	PhD	Review of Student Research	Survey	Survey	1	1	1
General Agriculture: Agricultural Leadership	MAG	Analysis of Written Artifacts	-	-	0	-	-
Horticulture	BSAG	Internship	Internship	Internship	5	5	5
Horticulture	MS	Rating of Skills	Rating of skills	Rating of Skills	11	11	11
International Agriculture	MAG	Oral presentation	Project & Assignments	Other	12	12	25
International Agriculture	MS	Oral presentation	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Other	12	12	25
Landscape Architecture	BLA	Portfolio Review	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Portfolio Review	15	16	15

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Natural Resource Ecology & Management	BSAG	Oral presentation	Project & Assignments	Project & Assignments	13	140	89
Natural Resource Ecology & Management	MS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	-	-	4	-	-
Natural Resource Ecology & Management	PhD	Review of Student Research	-	-	0	-	-
Plant & Soil Sciences	BSAG	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Rating of Skills	20	0	13
Plant & Soil Sciences	MS	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Rating of skills	Oral presentation	10	10	10
Plant Pathology	PhD	Oral presentation	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Oral presentation	0	0	1
Soil Sciences	PhD	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Rating of skills	Oral presentation	9	9	9

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

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
American Studies	BA	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	13	13	13
American Studies	BS	No Report Submitted					
Applied Statistics	MS	Course Exam(s)	Course Exam(s)	Course Exam(s)	4	3	4
Art: Art History	BA	Oral presentation	Oral presentation	Oral presentation	3	3	3
Art: Graphic Design	BFA	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	14	14	14
Art: Studio Art	BA	Portfolio Review	Portfolio Review	Portfolio Review	10	8	8
Art: Studio Art	BFA	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	9	9	9
Art History	MA	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	2	2	2
Arts Administration	BA	No Report Submitted					
Biochemistry	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	35	7	35
Biological Science	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Other	Other	36	45	45
Chemistry	MS	No Report Submitted					
Chemistry	PhD	Rating of Skills	Supervisor Evaluation	Analysis of Written Artifacts	15	26	20
Chemistry: ACS Approved	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Rating of Skills	10	10	12

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Chemistry: Departmental Degree	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Rating of Skills	20	20	2
Communication Science & Disorders	BS	Course Exam(s)	Review of student research	Survey	104	25	80
Communication Science & Disorders	MS	Nationally Benchmarked Exam	Survey	Review of student research	29	28	9
Computer Science	BS	Other	Other	Other	95	55	62
Computer Science	MS	No Report Submitted					
Computer Science	PhD	No Report Submitted					
Creative Writing	MFA	Supervisor Evaluation	Rating of skills	-	4	4	-
Economics	BA	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	-	6	8	-
Economics	BS	No Report Submitted					
English	BA	Other	Other	Other	23	23	9
English	MA	Other	Other	Other	1	1	1
English	PhD	Other	Survey	Rating of Skills	17	47	17
French	BA	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Embedded Assignments	52	69	48
Geography	BA	Rating of Skills	Other	Other	0	2	0

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Geography	BS	Rating of Skills	Other	Other	4	15	6
Geography	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral presentation	Course Embedded Assignments	5	2	2
Geography	PhD	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral presentation	Course Embedded Assignments	7	4	4
Geology	BS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Course Embedded Assignments	Presentation/Performance	12	12	18
Geology	MS	No Report Submitted					
Geology	PhD	No Report Submitted					
Geospatial Information Sciences	BS	Other	Other	Other	7	15	3
German	BA	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Embedded Assignments	42	42	42
Global Studies	BA	Rating of Skills	Rating of skills	Rating of Skills	25	14	13
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	8	8	8
History	PhD	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	7	7	7
History	MA	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	7	7	7
Integrative Biology	MS	Other	Other	Other	3	2	9
Integrative Biology	PhD	Other	Oral presentation	Other	3	1	8

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Mass Communication	MS	No Report Submitted					
Mathematics	BA	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	1	1	1
Mathematics	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	17	17	17
Mathematics	MS	Course Exam(s)	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Oral presentation	12	3	3
Mathematics	PhD	Course Exam(s)	Other	Project & Assignments	13	5	4
Medicinal and Biophysical Chemistry	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	6	4	6
Microbiology/ Cell & Molecular Biology	BS	Course Exam(s)	Course project	Course Embedded Assignments	20	0	48
Microbiology/ Cell & Molecular Biology	MS	No Report Submitted					
Microbiology/ Cell & Molecular Biology	PhD	No Report Submitted					
Multidisciplinary Studies	BA	Other	Other	Other	3	3	3
Multidisciplinary Studies	BS	Other	Other	Other	3	3	3
Multimedia Journalism	BA	Survey	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Survey	8	123	8

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Multimedia Journalism	BS	Survey	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Survey	8	123	8
Music	BA	Course Exam(s)	Rating of skills	Performance or jury	4	4	4
Music	BM	Course Exam(s)	Course Exam(s)	-	13	13	-
Music	MM	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Oral presentation	Performance or jury	13	8	8
Music Education	BM	Course Exam(s)	Performance or Jury	Course Exam(s)	23	23	23
Music Industry	BS	Course Exam(s)	Course Exam(s)	Internship	5	5	5
Philosophy	BA	Rating of Skills	Survey	Rating of Skills	5	5	5
Philosophy	MA	Rating of Skills	Survey	Rating of Skills	5	5	5
Photonics	PhD	Course Exam(s)	Rating of skills	Rating of Skills	4	5	3
Physics	BS	Other	Course Exam(s)	Other	40	74	26
Physics	MS	Rating of Skills	Rating of skills	Review of student research	9	27	2
Physics	PhD	Rating of Skills	Rating of skills	Other	9	27	5
Physiology	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Other	Other	36	23	23
Plant Biology	BS	Course Exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	27	9	9
Plant Biology	MS	Other	Other	Other	2	2	1
Plant Biology	PhD	Other	Other	Other	3	3	1
Political Science	BA	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	12	12	12
Political Science	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
Political Science	MA	Course Exam(s)	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	9	4	4
Psychology	BA	Course Exam(s)	Course Exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	1820	395	395
Psychology	BS	Course Exam(s)	Course Exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	1820	395	395
Psychology	MS	Portfolio Review	Portfolio Review	-	27	27	-
Psychology	PhD	Portfolio Review	Portfolio Review	-	59	59	-
Sociology	BA	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	9	9	2
Sociology	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	46	46	10
Sociology	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	1	2	2
Sociology	PhD	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	4	4	4
Spanish	BA	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Embedded Assignments	377	377	377
Sports Media	BA	Survey	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Survey	6	123	6
Sports Media	BS	Survey	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Survey	6	123	6
Statistics	BS	Course Exam(s)	Capstone Assignment	Course Exam(s)	4	3	10
Statistics	MS	Other	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Course Exam(s)	2	2	1

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Statistics	PhD	Rating of Skills	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Course Embedded Assignments	0	4	10
Strategic Communication	BA	Survey	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Portfolio Review	13	123	5
Strategic Communication	BS	Survey	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Portfolio Review	13	123	5
Theatre	BA	Other	Other	Other	4	56	75
Zoology	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Other	Other	37	30	27

Table III.1. Program Outcomes Assessment (continued)
College of Education and Human Sciences

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	Review of student research	Analysis of Written Artifacts	50	45	45
Applied Educational Studies: Aviation and Space	EDD	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral presentation	Analysis of Written Artifacts	12	3	11
Applied Exercise Sciences	BS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Internship	Performance or jury	0	49	0
Aviation and Space	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	24	10	18
Career & Technical Education	BS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Portfolio Review	Portfolio Review	0	0	0
Counseling	MS	Rating of Skills	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	84	1	20
Design, Housing and Merchandising	BSHS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	General Outcome Observations	Oral presentation	50	39	58
Design, Housing and Merchandising	MS	Oral presentation	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	18	11	3
Early Child Care and Development	BSHS	No Report Submitted					
Education: School Psychology	EDS	Nationally Benchmarked Exam	Portfolio Review	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/Creative Component	4	8	8

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Educational Leadership & Policy Studies: Educational Administration	PhD	No Report Submitted					
Educational Leadership & Policy Studies: Higher Education	PhD	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Rating of Skills	Analysis of Written Artifacts	10	10	10
Educational Leadership Studies: College Student Development	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Rating of Skills	Course Project	16	16	16
Educational Leadership Studies: Higher Education	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Rating of skills	Internship	3	3	3
Educational Leadership Studies: School Administration	MS	No Report Submitted					
Educational Psychology: Educational Psychology	MS	Qualification exams	Qualification exams	Qualification exams	9	9	9
Educational Psychology: Educational Psychology	PhD	Survey	Qualification Exam	Qualification exam	18	18	18

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	MS	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	No Data Submitted		
Educational Psychology: Research and Evaluation	PhD	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	No Data Submitted		
Educational Technology	MS	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Other	23	23	23
Family and Consumer Sciences Education	MS	No Report Submitted					
Family Financial Planning	MS	No Report Submitted					
Health and Human Performance	MS	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	9	4	9
Health, Leisure & Human Performance: Health & Human Performance	PhD	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Other	Survey	9	7	5
Health, Leisure & Human Performance: Leisure Studies	PhD	Performance or Jury	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	-	3	1	-
Human Development and Family Science	BSHS	Survey	Other	Analysis of Written Artifacts	39	70	70

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Human Development and Family Science	MS	Other	Other	Other	4	43	41
Human Sciences: Design, Housing and Merchandising	PhD	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Presentation/ Performance	Analysis of Written Artifacts	1	1	1
Human Sciences: Human Development and Family Science	PhD	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	0	3	0
Leisure Studies	MS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Performance or Jury	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	10	15	-
Nursing	BSN	Other	Other	Other	33	28	25
Nutritional Sciences	BSHS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Project & Assignments	Group Project	78	101	52
Nutritional Sciences	MS	Oral presentation	Nationally Benchmarked Exam	-	3	11	-
Nutritional Sciences	PhD	Oral Presentation	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	1	4	4
Physical Education	BS	No Report Submitted					
Recreational Management & Recreational Therapy	BS	Rating of Skills	Rating of skills	-	123	127	-
School Administration	EDD	No Report Submitted					

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Social Foundations of Education	MA	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Thesis	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	1	0	1
Counseling Psychology	PhD	Final grade in a general psychology course	Oral qualifying exam	Final grade in a research course	7	7	7
Curriculum Studies	PhD	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Other	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	1	-	-
Education	PhD	No Report Submitted					
Education: Educational Administration	EDS	No Report Submitted					
Elementary Education	BS	Portfolio Review	Capstone Assignment	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	91	79	99
Public Health	BS	Portfolio Review	Rating of skills	Oral presentation	35	29	35
School Psychology	PhD	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Rating of skills	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	7	21	7
Secondary Education	BS	Portfolio Review	Capstone Assignment	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	29	30	35
Sports and Coaching Science	BS	Internship	-	-	0	-	-
Teaching	MAT	Portfolio Review	Portfolio Review	Supervisor Evaluation	2	2	2
Teaching, Learning and Leadership	MS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	5	7	5

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

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	79	79	79
Architectural Engineering	BEN	Capstone Assignment	Course project	Course project	10	10	10
Architecture	BAR	Performance or Jury	Performance or Jury	-	54	54	-
Chemical Engineering	BSCH	Other	Survey	-	-	58	-
Chemical Engineering	MS	Performance or Jury	Survey	Interviews	1	1	1
Chemical Engineering	PhD	Performance or Jury	Survey	Interviews	4	4	7
Civil Engineering	BSCV	No Report Submitted					
Civil Engineering	MS	No Report Submitted					
Civil Engineering	PhD	No Report Submitted					
Computer Engineering	BSCP	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	60	60	60
Construction Engineering Technology	BSET	Internship	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Internship	47	63	47
Electrical Engineering	ME	Analysis of written artifacts	Analysis of written artifacts	Survey	1	1	141
Electrical Engineering	BSEE	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	60	60	60
Electrical Engineering	MS	Analysis of written artifacts	Analysis of written artifacts	Survey	5	5	141
Electrical Engineering	PhD	Analysis of written artifacts	Oral presentation	Analysis of Written Artifacts	6	6	6

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Electrical Engineering Technology	BSET	Course Exam(s)	Project & Assignments	Course Exam(s)	21	15	8
Engineering and Technology Management	MS	Analysis of written artifacts	Analysis of written artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	-	-	-
Fire & Emergency Management	PhD	Other	Other	Other	3	3	3
Fire & Emergency Management Administration	MS	Analysis of written artifacts	Analysis of written artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	13	13	13
Fire Protection & Safety Engineering Technology	BSET	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	27	27	27
Fire Protection & Safety Engineering Technology	MSET	Course Exam(s)	Course Exam(s)	Capstone Assignment	6	4	4
Industrial Engineering & Management	BSIE	Survey	Survey	Course Embedded Assignments	11	11	11
Industrial Engineering & Management	MS	Survey	Survey	Survey	4	4	4
Industrial Engineering & Management	PhD	Survey	Survey	Survey	2	2	2
Materials Science and Engineering	MS	Oral presentation	Oral presentation	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	1	1	1

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Materials Science and Engineering	PhD	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Oral presentation	Course Exam(s)	1	1	2
Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering	MS	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Rating of skills	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	-	-	-
Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering	PhD	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	-	-	-
Mechanical Engineering	BSME	Capstone Assignment	Course project	Capstone Assignment	190	100	190
Mechanical Engineering Technology	BSET	Course Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Capstone Assignment	19	45	20
Petroleum Engineering	MS	Rating of Skills	Course project	Interviews	-	-	-
Petroleum Engineering	PHD	No Report Submitted					
Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering	PhD	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	-	-	-

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

Programs	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Accounting	BSBA	Course Exam(s)	Course Exam(s)	Course Exam(s)	251	126	66
Accounting	MS	Course Exam(s)	Course Exam(s)	Course project	28	35	40
Business Administration	PhD	Performance or Jury	Other	Analysis of Written Artifacts	15	27	21
Business Administration: Accounting	PhD	Other	Other	Analysis of Written Artifacts	3	2	2
Business Administration: Entrepreneurship	PhD	Performance or Jury	Other	Analysis of Written Artifacts	15	27	21
Business Administration: Executive Research	PhD	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of student research	Other	8	10	75
Business Administration: Finance	PhD	Performance or Jury	Other	Analysis of Written Artifacts	15	27	21
Business Administration: Hospitality and Tourism Management	PhD	Performance or Jury	Other	Analysis of Written Artifacts	15	27	21
Business Administration: Management	PhD	Performance or Jury	Other	Analysis of Written Artifacts	15	27	21

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	Other	Analysis of Written Artifacts	15	27	21
Business Administration: Marketing	PhD	Performance or Jury	Other	Analysis of Written Artifacts	15	27	21
Business Analytics and Data Science	MS	Exam(s)	Exam(s)	Project & Assignments	42	7	29
Economics	BSBA	Course Exam(s)	Nationally Benchmarked Exam	Course Exam(s)	615	462	459
Economics	PhD	Comprehensive, certification, or professional exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	0	0	0
Entrepreneurship	BSBA	Course Exam(s)	Nationally Benchmarked Exam	Course Exam(s)	615	462	459
Finance	BSBA	Course Exam(s)	Nationally Benchmarked Exam	Course Exam(s)	615	462	459
General Business	BSBA	Course Exam(s)	Nationally Benchmarked Exam	Course Exam(s)	615	462	459
Hospitality and Tourism Management	BSBA	Course Exam(s)	Nationally Benchmarked Exam	Course Exam(s)	615	462	459
Hospitality and Tourism Management	MS	Oral presentation	Other	Review of Thesis	5	8	0
International Business	BSBA	Course Exam(s)	Nationally Benchmarked Exam	Course Exam(s)	615	462	459
Management	BSBA	Course Exam(s)	Nationally Benchmarked Exam	Course Exam(s)	615	462	459

Programs	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Management Information Systems	BSBA	Course Exam(s)	Nationally Benchmarked Exam	Course Exam(s)	615	462	459
Management Information Systems	MS	Internship	Internship	Internship	8	8	8
Marketing	BSBA	Course Exam(s)	Nationally Benchmarked Exam	Course Exam(s)	615	462	459
Quantitative Financial Economics	MS	Other	Oral presentation	Analysis of Written Artifacts	5	0	5

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

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed #3
Environmental Science	MS	Survey	Survey	Survey	6	-	-
Environmental Science	PhD	Survey	Survey	Survey	No Data Submitted		
Interdisciplinary Studies	MS	No Report Submitted					
Public Health	MPH	Project & Assignments	Group Project	Internship	No Data Submitted		

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

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed #3
Global Studies	BA	Rating of Skills	Rating of Skills	Rating of Skills	25	14	13
Global Studies	MS	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Other	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	7	10	7

Table III.1. Program Outcomes Assessment (continued)
University Studies

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed #3
University Studies	BUS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	85	81	85

Analyses and Findings

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

University Assessment and Testing has received 217 (87.85%) annual program outcomes assessment reports out of 247 programs from eight colleges. This number excludes certificate programs due to the ongoing process of establishing institution wide assessment procedures to address certificates. 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 reviewed using the new five-point annual review rubric. The new rubric was created with the intention of providing more detailed feedback and suggestions to programs completing assessment each year. In particular, the creation of two new ratings, Minimally Met Expectations and Greatly Exceeded Expectations, serve the purpose of differentiating between levels of success in assessment on the higher end and areas of struggle that might require more support on the lower end. The new rubric is based on the following color-coded system: Purple, Blue, Green, Yellow, Orange, Red, and Gray.

- **Purple** – Greatly Exceeded Expectations (GEE) – went far above and beyond what is expected of a program report
- **Blue** – Exceeded Expectations (EE) – went even further than what is expected from a report
- **Green** – Met Expectations (ME) – met the expectations set forth for an annual assessment report
- **Yellow** – Somewhat Met Expectations (SME) – some issues or concerns were identified in the content of the report components
- **Orange** – Minimally Met Expectations (MME) – sections were filled out, but there were substantial issues or concerns identified in the content of the report components
- **Red** – Missing Information (MI) – missing information or no report was provided by the program
- **Gray** – Not Applicable (NA) – program communicated their reasoning for not having assessment data for the current academic year

The overall program percent averages for each color category are as follows: 3.0% of programs received purple; 13.4% of programs received blue; 40.6% of programs received green; 24.8% received yellow; 5.6% received orange; 10.0% of programs received red; and 2.8% of programs received gray.

Table III.2 provides a longitudinal comparison of Program Outcomes Assessment scores over the last five years. It is important to point out the following discrepancies between the years due to updates within the rubric and information provided in the table:

- This year's update of the rubric has created two new scores (GEE and MME) that are not reflected in prior years.
- The total number of programs and total number of completed reports for this year are substantially lower due to the exclusion of certificates from this report. This exclusion is temporary as OSU works to create an institution-wide assessment process to address the specific needs of certificate programs.

Table III.2   Longitudinal Summary of Assessment Report Reviews

		2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021
	Total programs[14]	273	281	299	296	247
	Completed reports	224 (82.1%)	204 (72.6%)	269 (90.0%)	244 (82.4%)	217 (87.9%)
Reviews	GEE	-	-	-	-	3.0%
	EE	-	7.9%	3.4%	15.8%	13.4%
	ME	70.0%	63.2%	55.2%	49.1%	40.6%
	SME	1.2%	5.3%	7.7%	11.9%	24.8%
	MME	-	-	-	-	5.9%
	MI	12.3%	8.9%	20.4%	7.8%	9.6%
	NA	16.5%	14.6%	12.7%	15.3%	2.8%
SLOs	GEE	-	-	-	-	2.8%
	EE	-	4.7%	9.8%	20.0%	18.6%
	ME	70.5%	61.7%	48.0%	49.0%	39.7%
	SME	1.9%	1.5%	18.2%	15.5%	28.3%
	MME	-	-	-	-	2.8%
	MI	11.2%	8.8%	12.2%	9.8%	6.5%
	NA	16.4%	14.6%	11.8%	11.7%	1.2%
Methods	GEE	-	-	-	-	1.21%
	EE	-	8.4%	2.0%	19.0%	17.8%
	ME	72.4%	61.3%	66.6%	51.0%	43.3%
	SME	0.0%	6.7%	5.4%	12.8%	22.7%
	MME	-	-	-	-	7.3%
	MI	11.2%	8.8%	13.5%	4.5%	6.5%
	NA	16.4%	14.6%	12.5%	12.8%	1.2%
Findings	GEE	-	-	-	-	6.9%
	EE	-	10.2%	2.7%	15.9%	11.3%
	ME	70.2%	65.0%	59.1%	52.8%	37.3%
	SME	1.9%	1.5%	3.7%	5.9%	21.1%
	MME	-	-	-	-	8.5%
	MI	11.6%	8.8%	21.6%	9.0%	10.9%
	NA	16.4%	14.6%	12.8%	16.6%	4.1%
Use of Findings	GEE	-	-	-	-	2.4%
	EE	-	8.4%	1.4%	9.8%	7.3%
	ME	66.8%	65.0%	47.3%	56.4%	30.4%
	SME	1.1%	2.6%	3.4%	14.5%	33.6%
	MME	-	-	-	-	8.1%
	MI	15.3%	9.5%	34.5%	8.8%	13.4%
	NA	16.8%	14.6%	13.5%	10.5%	4.9%

---

[14] During the 2020-2021 year, a total of 52 certificate programs were excluded from the count.

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 November 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 2022, 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 2022, UAT will meet with programs that received orange or yellow (one or more components scored below expectations) and/or red (missing components or report) in one or more of the categories in their report review 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 or greatly exceeded expectation on their program outcomes assessment report and all other programs to provide a source of internal support.
- In Spring of 2022, UAT will conduct a five-year review of all programs to provide feedback on growth over the last five years of assessment. This will also serve to provide programs with individual feedback and information that can aid them in their Academic Program Review preparations as needed. The Five-Year Review Rubric has been developed by UAT for these purposes and is crafted to fit the needs of programs at OSU.
- In addition to the five-year review, UAT will conduct an internal assessment survey titled the OSU Outcomes Assessment Feedback Survey (OAFS). This survey was also developed by UAT in collaboration with AAIC and will be administered in Spring of 2022. The survey will be distributed to all current, previous, and potential future assessment personnel employed at OSU. It will serve as the beginning of a larger movement to increase communication between programs and the assessment unit. The results of the survey will be distributed to all associate deans, department chairs, program directors, and program assessment coordinators through a disaggregated, public report. UAT will then meet with all programs to further discuss any concerns or beneficial improvements that came to light by way of the survey.
- Both the five-year review and the OAFS will contribute to the Quality Initiative.

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 during the Spring of 2021 and 2020, respectively. 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)

- The Spring 2021 administration of the Student Engagement Survey (SES) was the second annual administration of the survey for establishing a baseline using three consecutive years of data.
- The survey is administered online using Qualtrics online survey software. The SES consisted 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)

- Spring 2020 was the last year of the Student Satisfaction Survey administration cycle for establishing a baseline using three consecutive years of data.
- The survey is administered online using Qualtrics survey software. The SSS consisted 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 7,299 (32.9%) responses, with 6,812 (30.7%) in the final data set.

- Response Rates
  - College
    - Center for Health Sciences: 27.1% ($n = 26$)
    - College of Arts and Sciences: 32.1% ($n = 1,773$)
    - College of Education and Human Sciences: 32.9% ($n = 1,235$)
    - College of Engineering, Architecture and Technology: 27.5% ($n = 993$)
    - Ferguson College of Agriculture: 36.2% ($n = 986$)
    - Global Studies: 46.4% ($n = 13$)
    - Graduate College: 34.0% ($n = 72$)
    - Spears School of Business: 29.6% ($n = 1,505$)
    - University College: 17.9% ($n = 209$)

  - Classification
    - Undergraduate: 28.9% ($n = 5,342$)
    - Graduate: 39.5% ($n = 1,470$)

- Demographics
  - Campus
    - Stillwater: 88.6% ($n = 6,036$)
    - Stillwater/Tulsa: 8.5% ($n = 576$)
    - Tulsa: 2.9% ($n = 200$)

  - Gender
    - Female: 61.9% ($n = 4,216$)
    - Male: 38.1% ($n = 2,596$)

  - Race, Nationality, and Ethnicity
    - White or European American: 63.8% ($n = 4,343$)
    - Multiracial: 9.9% ($n = 672$)
    - Hispanic, Latin(a/o), or Latinx: 8.4% ($n = 570$)
    - International: 7.5% ($n = 510$)
    - Black or African American: 4.1% ($n = 280$)
    - Native American or Alaska Native: 3.9% ($n = 265$)
    - Asian or Asian American: 2.3% ($n = 157$)
    - Unknown: 0.1% ($n = 8$)
    - Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander: 0.1% ($n = 7$)

- o Class Level (Note: 119 students' classifications did not fit into one of the below six categories)
  - Freshman: 13.0% ($n = 871$)
  - Sophomore: 18.7% ($n = 1,252$)
  - Junior: 20.0% ($n = 1,337$)
  - Senior: 27.3% ($n = 1,830$)
  - Masters: 11.1% ($n = 740$)
  - Doctoral: 9.9% ($n = 663$)

- o Classification
  - Undergraduate: 78.4% ($n = 5,342$)
  - Graduate: 21.6% ($n = 1,470$)

- o Full-Time/Part-Time Status
  - Full-time: 76.7% ($n = 5,222$)
  - Part-time: 23.3% ($n = 1,590$)

- o Home State
  - Oklahoma: 66.9% ($n = 4,559$)
  - Texas: 14.0% ($n = 955$)
  - Kansas: 1.7% ($n = 114$)
  - California: 1.4% ($n = 98$)
  - Other: 15.9% ($n = 1,086$)

- A total of 1,714 open-ended comments were recorded.

Reliability and Validity

Student Engagement Survey
- Overall reliability for OSU Student Engagement Survey (SES) (Cronbach's alpha) is 0.90 for the four-factor model, indicating excellent internal consistency. Overall validity CFI is 0.90 for the four-factor model, both indicating a good fit.

Student Satisfaction Survey
- Both reliability (Cronbach's alpha = 0.94) and validity of the survey items and model structure were verified through advanced statistical analyses (Exploratory Factor Analysis/Confirmatory Factor Analysis). One general factor (Satisfaction) and 4 specific factors (Academic, Campus Life, Campus Services, and Diversity) were confirmed.

Student Engagement Survey

Item Analysis

Top 10 "Engaged" items (*Always and Often*):

- I do my best regarding my responsibilities in group work at OSU **(93.3%)**
- I attend my classes at OSU **(92.0%)**
- I spend enough time and make enough effort to learn at OSU **(91.1%)**
- I try to be open to learning things that could potentially change the way I understand an issue or concept at OSU **(90.9%)**
- I am easily able to work with classmates from different backgrounds and cultures than my own at OSU **(90.5%)**
- Overall, I feel good about being at OSU **(88.9%)**
- I motivate myself to learn at OSU **(88.9%)**
- I feel safe on the OSU campus **(86.8%)**
- I determine my learning goals at OSU **(85.2%)**
- I try to understand someone else's view by imagining how an issue looks from his/her perspective at OSU **(84.2%)**

Top 5 "Disengaged" items (*Rarely or Never)***:**

- I discuss course topics, ideas, or concepts with an OSU professor outside of class **(35.6%)**
- I participate in OSU campus events **(34.5%)**
- I use OSU library resources on campus or online **(21.4%)**
- I talk about my career plans with career services, faculty, or advisors at OSU **(20.7%)**
- I ask other students to help me understand course material at OSU **(19.2%)**

Top 3 "Involved" items (*Yes)***:**

- I have been actively involved in an OSU student group or group in the community **(60.0%)**
- I have participated in a community-based project (e.g. volunteering) during my studies at OSU **(50.5%)**
- I have participated in an internship, part-time job, field experience, student teaching, or clinical placement while at OSU **(46.1%)**

Top 2 "Uninvolved" items (*No, with no intention)*:

- I have participated in an OSU study abroad program **(59.6%)**
- I have worked with a faculty member on a research project at OSU **(38.9%)**

Note: Frequency percentages were calculated without including missing responses.

Student Satisfaction Survey

Item Analysis

Table IV.1.

Top 10 items with the HIGHESTS Levels of Satisfaction

Survey Item	2018		2019		2020		Associated Theme	Effect Size (Cohen's d)		
	"Satisfied" & "Very Satisfied"	"Dissatisfied" & "Very Dissatisfied"	"Satisfied" & "Very Satisfied"	"Dissatisfied" & "Very Dissatisfied"	"Satisfied" & "Very Satisfied"	"Dissatisfied" & "Very Dissatisfied"		2018 vs. 2019	2018 vs. 2020	2019 vs. 2020
Your safety and security on the OSU campus	87.8%	2.6%	88.1%	2.7%	89.3%	2.7%	Campus Life	--	--	--
OSU health and fitness services	88.6%	2.0%	89.9%	1.7%	88.8%	1.7%	Campus Services	**Small (.06)	--	--
Being a student at OSU	88.9%	2.8%	87.2%	3.7%	87.8%	3.2%	Academic	***Small (.03)	***Small (.09)	--
Your intellectual growth at OSU	87.1%	3.4%	86.0%	3.8%	87.1%	3.0%	Academic	--	**Small (.09)	***Small (.10)
OSU library services	88.9%	1.2%	89.1%	1.3%	86.8%	1.6%	Campus Services	--	--	--
Availability of OSU faculty	84.2%	3.8%	83.9%	3.6%	83.8%	3.5%	Academic	--	--	--
The quality of teaching at OSU	84.0%	3.8%	83.8%	5.3%	83.2%	4.3%	Academic	*Small (.04)	--	--
The variety of activities for students at OSU	83.9%	3.6%	82.3%	3.6%	82.2%	4.1%	Campus Life	***Small (.06)	**Small (.08)	--
OSU course registration process	73.0%	9.3%	75.8%	7.8%	78.8%	6.2%	Campus Services	**Small (.06)	***Small (.20)	***Small (.11)
Your sense of belonging at OSU	76.9%	8.1%	76.5%	8.7%	76.5%	7.8%	Campus Life	--	*Small (.05)	--

Note. ***** = significant at ***p* < .001**.

* = significant at ***p* < .01**.

* = significant at ***p* < .05**.

Cohen's d categories: Small, **d ≤ .20**; Medium, **.20 < d < .80**; Large, **.80 ≤ d < 1.3**; Very Large, **d ≥ 1.3.**

Table IV.2.

Bottom 5 Items with the LOWEST Levels of Satisfaction							Effect Size (Cohen's d)		
	2018		2019		2020				
Survey Item	"Satisfied" & "Very Satisfied"	"Dissatisfied" & "Very Dissatisfied"	"Satisfied" & "Very Satisfied"	"Dissatisfied" & "Very Dissatisfied"	"Satisfied" & "Very Satisfied"	"Dissatisfied" & "Very Dissatisfied"	Associated Theme	2018 vs. 2019	2018 vs. 2020	2019 vs. 2020
Parking availability at OSU	18.5%	65.2%	18.0%	67.4%	19.9%	63.6%	Campus Services	--	--	--
OSU food and dining options	53.2%	19.7%	54.6%	21.8%	54.9%	20.3%	Campus Life	--	--	--
OSU financial aid received	60.6%	18.2%	57.5%	20.5%	55.5%	20.4%	Campus Services	***Small (.08)	--	*Small (.06)
Gender identity inclusion on the OSU campus	62.9%	7.1%	62.2%	8.1%	65.0%	6.6%	Diversity	--	--	--
Your experience in OSU residence halls	63.8%	12.7%	62.6%	13.9%	64.4%	13.4%	Campus Life	**Small (.07)	**Small (.11)	--

Note. *** = significant at $p < .001$.
** = significant at $p < .01$.
* = significant at $p < .05$.
Cohen's d categories: Small, **d ≤ .20**; Medium, **.20 < d < .80**; Large, **.80 ≤ d < 1.3**; Very Large, **d ≥ 1.3.**

Table IV. 3.

	Top 5 Items with the HIGHEST Levels of Dissatisfaction							Effect Size (Cohen's d)		
	2018		2019		2020		Associated Theme	2018 vs. 2019	2018 vs. 2020	2019 vs. 2020
Survey Item	"Satisfied" & "Very Satisfied"	"Dissatisfied" & "Very Dissatisfied"	"Satisfied" & "Very Satisfied"	"Dissatisfied" & "Very Dissatisfied"	"Satisfied" & "Very Satisfied"	"Dissatisfied" & "Very Dissatisfied"				
Parking availability at OSU	18.5%	65.2%	18.0%	67.4%	19.9%	63.6%	Campus Services	--	--	--
OSU food and dining options	53.2%	19.7%	54.6%	21.8%	54.9%	20.3%	Campus Life	--	--	--
OSU financial aid received	60.6%	18.2%	57.5%	20.5%	55.5%	20.4%	Campus Services	***Small (.08)	--	*Small (.06)
Your experience in OSU residence halls	63.8%	12.7%	62.6%	13.9%	64.4%	13.4%	Campus Life	**Small (.07)	**Small (.11)	--
OSU academic advising	79.3%	9.2%	71.5%	13.0%	76.3%	9.2%	Campus Services	***Small (.20)	***Small (.20)	--

Note. *** = significant at *p* < .001.
** = significant at *p* < .01.
* = significant at *p* < .05.
Cohen's *d* categories: Small, *d* ≤ .20; Medium, .20 < *d* < .80; Large, .80 ≤ *d* < 1.3; Very Large, *d* ≥ 1.3.

Interpreting Significant Differences

Cohen's *d* was used to provide the "degree of the differences" among student responses in 2018, 2019, and 2020. Cohen's *d* is considered "small" if the value is less than or equal to 0.20. All significant differences among the highest and lowest satisfaction rated items are considered small differences. This means that students responded to the survey similarly across all three years. The item with the largest Cohen's *d* value is below:

Table IV. 4.

	Items with the LARGEST Cohen's *d*									
	2018		2019		2020			*Effect Size (Cohen's d)*		
Survey Item	*"Satisfied" & "Very Satisfied"*	*"Dissatisfied" & "Very Dissatisfied"*	*"Satisfied" & "Very Satisfied"*	*"Dissatisfied" & "Very Dissatisfied"*	*"Satisfied" & "Very Satisfied"*	*"Dissatisfied" & "Very Dissatisfied"*	*Associated Theme*	*2018 vs. 2019*	*2018 vs. 2020*	*2019 vs. 2020*
OSU academic advising	79.3%	9.2%	71.5%	13.0%	76.2%	9.2%	Campus Services	***Small (.20)	***Small (.20)	--
OSU course registration process	73.0%	9.3%	75.8%	7.8%	78.8%	6.2%	Campus Services	**Small (.06)	***Small (.20)	***Small (.11)

Note. ******* = significant at *p* < **.001**.
** = significant at *p* < **.01**.
* = significant at *p* < **.05**.
Cohen's *d* categories: Small, *d* ≤ **.20**; Medium, **.20** < *d* < **.80**; Large, **.80** ≤ *d* < **1.3**; Very Large, *d* ≥ **1.3**.

According to Table IV.4, the differences among 2018, 2019, and 2020 student scores on the items, *OSU academic advising* and *OSU course registration process*, are significant; however, the difference is still classified as small. Cohen's *d* is 0.20 for this item which lies on the threshold between a small and medium difference. When visually comparing the percentages among years in Table 4, it is clear that the responses between years did not drastically differ.

Concluding Inferences

In conclusion, student responses across the three years, 2018, 2019, and 2020, did not drastically differ. There were some significant differences among items between years, however, effect sizes were generally very small. OSU's design for measuring student satisfaction is to pilot the OSU Student Satisfaction Survey for three consecutive years, followed by distribution of the survey every other year or every two years; the final timeline will be discussed in Assessment & Academic Improvement Council (AAIC).

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 one more consecutive year.
- The survey items for the SES 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.
- The OSU-Student Engagement Survey will continue to be administered in Spring of 2022 in order to establish the three-year baseline.

Section V – 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 2020-21:

Assessment Fees	**$798,480.81**
Assessment Salaries	**$456,474.59**
Distributed to Other Departments	**$157,498.65**
Operational Costs	**$183,809.91**
Total Expenditures	**$797,783.15**[1]

[1] Expenditures were slightly below collected fees as there were some minor reductions in operational expenses in the 2020-21 year due to the COVID-19 pandemic.