Oklahoma State University
*America's Brightest ORANGE*

# Annual Student Assessment Report 2021-2022

Prepared for
The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
November 2, 2022

Ryan Chung, Ph.D.
Director

Kelva Hunger, Ph.D.
Associate Director, Assessment and Analysis

James Knecht, MBA
Associate Director

Kaitlynn Holcomb, B.S.
Assessment Specialist

Robin Fitzgerald, B.A.
Assessment Specialist

Paola Sainz Sujet, M.S.
Statistical Analyst 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 4,487 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, 10 (0.22%) were required to enroll in developmental English courses, 26 (0.58%) in developmental reading courses, 195 (4.35%) in developmental mathematics courses, and 26 (0.58%) in developmental science courses.
- This was the pilot year of the new General Education cycle, Ethics and Professionalism. Ethics was measured with a student artifact review and Professionalism was measured with behavioral ratings.
    - There were 48 ethics artifacts and seven professionalism ratings submitted for review and analysis.
    - Because this was a pilot year for assessing Ethics and Professionalism, the number of artifacts and behavioral ratings achieved was not yet enough to use as evidence for decision-making.
- 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:
    - 4.0% of programs received purple, which indicates the item Greatly Exceeded Expectations,
    - 12.1% of programs received blue, which suggests the item Exceeded Expectations,
    - 33.9% of programs received green, which denotes the item Met Expectations,
    - 31.3% received yellow, which suggests the item Somewhat Met Expectations,
    - 5.3% received orange, which denotes the item Minimally Met Expectations,
    - 6.2% of programs received red, which indicates there was Missing Information, and
    - 7.2% 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 updating their five-year Assessment Plan or other restrictions throughout the academic year.

- In terms of student engagement, a total of 8,046 OSU students responded to the 2022 Student Engagement Survey (SES) survey with a 35.9% response rate. The top three "Engaged" responses were:
    - I attend my classes at OSU (94.0%)
    - I do my best regarding my responsibilities in group work at OSU (93.4%)
    - Overall, I feel good about being at OSU (91.6%)
- In terms of student satisfaction, 2020 was the third consecutive measurement year. Over the three years of data collection (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 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 streamlining the onboarding process for new program assessment coordinators and their training in the assessment management system, Nuventive Improvement Platform. This will provide OSU faculty and assessment coordinators more resources on utilizing 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.
- University Assessment and Testing conducted a five-year review of all programs and we will continue 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 continue to use results of valuable data collected from the internal assessment survey titled the OSU Outcomes Assessment Feedback Survey for discussion and decision-making. This survey was developed by UAT in collaboration with AAIC and was administered in Spring of 2022. It serves 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 2021-2022 (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 the following 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) 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).
- In the summer/fall 2021 enrollment cycle, OSU made changes to the ELPA process to allow for new, alternate, non-ACT/SAT PGI calculations and for the new non-stem PGI science calculation. These calculations can result in an additional means for clearing students for entry into college-level science courses, with the exception of Biology.

**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 mathematics remediation, the recommended course is UNIV 0123 (Pre College Algebra). Through summer 2022, for English remediation, the recommended course was UNIV 0133 (Basic Composition) and, for reading and science remediation, the recommended course was UNIV 0153 (Critical Content Reading and Scientific

Reasoning). Starting in Fall 2022, for English, reading, and science remediation, the recommended course is UNIV 0163 (Critical Reading with Science Reasoning and Writing).

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 2021-2022 (e.g., high school GPA, and CPT cut scores).**

In 2021-2022, 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). Initial 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 ALEKS cut scores may be found online at http://mathplacement.okstate.edu/. Cut scores are set by the OSU Department of Mathematics and are currently ten points lower than the cut scores for standard sections of MATH 1483 and MATH 1513 (but less than this for MATH 1813 and MATH 2144). 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 their 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.**

<u>Entry-Level (and Developmental) Placement Analyses and Findings:</u>
In 2021-2022, a total of 4,487 newly admitted and enrolled students (including all new freshmen regardless of earned credit hour totals, new transfers with less than 24 earned credit hours, and students whose first term was Summer 2021 who continued into Fall 2021) were assessed using the entry-level placement assessment process. As described above, during the summer/fall 2021 enrollment cycle, OSU made changes to the ELPA process to allow for new, alternate, non-ACT/SAT PGI calculations and for a new, non-stem PGI science calculation. These changes appear to have had significant effects on the number of students needing remediation in English, reading, and, especially, science. 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 2021-2022.

| Subject Area | # of Students with ACT sub-scores <19[1] | # of Students cleared for college-level coursework by ELPA |
|---|---|---|
| English | 711 | 706 |
| Mathematics | 1,147 | 1,040 |
| Reading | 488 | 442 |
| Science | 459 | 451 |

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: 590, Mathematics: 590, Reading: 590, Science: 1,103.

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 2021-2022 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 | 2 | 1 |
| Reading | 4 | 4 |

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. 353 new students with ACT Math scores below 19 cleared remediation requirements using the OSU Math Placement Exam (ALEKS) in 2021-2022.

After all entry-level assessment was completed, 218 students (4.86% of the total new students enrolled) were required to take at least one developmental (remedial) course. Of the 4,487 new students in 2021-2022, 10 (0.22%) were required to enroll in developmental English courses, 26 (0.58%) in developmental reading courses, 195 (4.35%) in developmental mathematics courses, and 26 (0.58%) in developmental science courses. Some students who initially were required to complete developmental classes later satisfied the requirement with transfer courses or by passing a secondary assessment. For this reason, the number of students who completed developmental courses may differ from the number of students required to do so. Table I-6c provides the number of students who enrolled in developmental courses for 2021-2022 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 2021-2022 (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) | 1 | 0 (0%) |
| UNIV 0153 (reading and science) | 75 | 65 (86.67%) |
| UNIV 0123 (mathematics) | 72 | 59 (81.94%) |

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). These I grades were counted among the Ds, Fs, and Ws in computing success rates, so it is possible that some true success rates will be marginally higher once these grades are resolved. No students in co-requisite sections received I grades.

## MATH 1483 Mathematical Functions and Their Uses

| Table I-6d. MATH 1483 (Math Functions) Fall 2021 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Section Type | | Enrollment | | Success Rate (C or better) | |
| Standard | | 186 | | 86.6% | |
| Co-requisite | | 113 | | 65.5% | |
| Fall 2020 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution | | | | | |
| A | B | C | D | F | W |
| 15.0% | 21.2% | 29.2% | 15.9% | 11.5% | 7.1% |

| Table I-6e. MATH 1483 (Math Functions) Fall 2021 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates | | |
|---|---|---|
| Section Type | Proportion of First-Generation Students | First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better) |
| Standard | 19.9% | 75.7% |
| Co-requisite | 28.3% | 71.9% |

| Table I-6f. MATH 1483 (Math Functions) Spring 2022 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Section Type | | Enrollment | | Success Rate (C or better) | |
| Standard | | 72 | | 81.9% | |
| Co-requisite | | 66 | | 89.4% | |
| Spring 2021 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution | | | | | |
| A | B | C | D | F | W |
| 19.7% | 43.9% | 25.8% | 4.5% | 3.0% | 3.0% |

| Table I-6g. MATH 1483 (Math Functions) Spring 2022 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates | | |
|---|---|---|
| Section Type | Proportion of First-Generation Students | First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better) |
| Standard | 19.4% | 85.7% |
| Co-requisite | 27.2% | 70.0% |

## MATH 1513 College Algebra

| Table I-6h. MATH 1513 (College Algebra) Fall 2021 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Section Type | | Enrollment | | Success Rate (C or better) | |
| Standard | | 476 | | 72.9% | |
| Co-requisite | | 179 | | 66.5% | |
| Fall 2020 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution | | | | | |
| A | B | C | D | F | W |
| 20.1% | 22.9% | 23.5% | 7.8% | 12.8% | 12.8% |

| Table I-6i. MATH 1513 (College Algebra) Fall 2021 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates | | |
|---|---|---|
| Section Type | Proportion of First-Generation Students | First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better) |
| Standard | 13.4% | 62.5% |
| Co-requisite | 17.9% | 62.5% |

| Table I-6j. MATH 1513 (College Algebra) Spring 2022 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Section Type | | Enrollment | | Success Rate (C or better) | |
| Standard | | 157 | | 63.1% | |
| Co-requisite | | 90 | | 54.4% | |
| Spring 2021 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution | | | | | |
| A | B | C | D | F | W |
| 11.1% | 18.9% | 24.4% | 10.0% | 18.9% | 16.7% |

| Table I-6k. MATH 1513 (College Algebra) Spring 2022 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates | | |
|---|---|---|
| Section Type | Proportion of First-Generation Students | First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better) |
| Standard | 14.0% | 50.0% |
| Co-requisite | 21.1% | 52.6% |

MATH 1813 Preparation for Calculus

| Table I-6l. MATH 1813 (Preparation for Calculus) Fall 2021 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Section Type | | Enrollment | | Success Rate (C or better) | |
| Standard | | 442 | | 62.7% | |
| Co-requisite | | 39 | | 61.5% | |
| Fall 2020 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution | | | | | |
| A | B | C | D | F | W |
| 20.5% | 25.6% | 15.4% | 5.1% | 7.7% | 25.6% |

| Table I-6m. MATH 1813 (Preparation for Calculus) Fall 2021 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates | | |
|---|---|---|
| Section Type | Proportion of First-Generation Students | First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better) |
| Standard | 17.9% | 54.4% |
| Co-requisite | 33.3% | 46.2% |

| Table I-6n. MATH 1813 (Preparation for Calculus) Spring 2022 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Section Type | | Enrollment | | Success Rate (C or better) | |
| Standard | | 331 | | 62.5% | |
| Co-requisite | | 12 | | 75.0% | |
| Spring 2021 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution | | | | | |
| A | B | C | D | F | W |
| 0.0% | 25.0% | 50.0% | 8.3% | 16.7% | 0.0% |

| Table I-6o. MATH 1813 (Preparation for Calculus) Spring 2022 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates | | |
|---|---|---|
| Section Type | Proportion of First-Generation Students | First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better) |
| Standard | 18.1% | 55.0% |
| Co-requisite | 33.3% | 75.0% |

## MATH 2144 Calculus I

| Table I-6p. MATH 2144 (Calculus I) Fall 2021 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Section Type | | Enrollment | | Success Rate (C or better) | |
| Standard | | 415 | | 54.9% | |
| Co-requisite | | 30 | | 70.0% | |
| Fall 2020 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution | | | | | |
| A | B | C | D | F | W |
| 26.7% | 30.0% | 13.3% | 16.7% | 6.7% | 6.7% |

| Table I-6q. MATH 2144 (Calculus I) Fall 2021 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates | | |
|---|---|---|
| Section Type | Proportion of First-Generation Students | First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better) |
| Standard | 17.1% | 31.0% |
| Co-requisite | 23.3% | 57.1% |

| Table I-6r. MATH 2144 (Calculus I) Spring 2022 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Section Type | | Enrollment | | Success Rate (C or better) | |
| Standard | | 288 | | 60.8% | |
| Co-requisite | | 14 | | 64.3% | |
| Spring 2021 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution. | | | | | |
| A | B | C | D | F | W |
| 21.4% | 28.6% | 14.3% | 0.0% | 14.3% | 21.4% |

| Table I-6s. MATH 2144 (Calculus I) Spring 2022 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates | | |
|---|---|---|
| Section Type | Proportion of First-Generation Students | First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better) |
| Standard | 17.7% | 51.0% |
| Co-requisite | 35.7% | 40.0% |

During the period covered by the above-presented data, instruction at OSU had begun to return closer to normal following the disruption caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. However, the effects of the pandemic continued to be felt in several ways. Due to continuing illnesses and the resulting isolation or quarantine of students, many instructors chose to stream their classes online to allow for remote participation even when the class was being offered primarily in person. Unfortunately, some students took this as an invitation to participate remotely even when they could have attended class in person and once this habit became established it proved very difficult to break. For most students, online instruction is not as effective as in-person instruction and so success rates dropped as a result. Moreover, many students (particularly those freshmen who were in high school in the 2020-2021 year) suffered learning loss as a result of pandemic disruptions and were not as well-prepared for success in their math courses as those in previous cohorts had been. These effects are visible in the data. So, while several success rates (in both standard and co-requisite sections) saw a decrease, we believe that we are still seeing the residual effects of several years of online instruction and learning loss. Moreover, some courses (such as Spring 1813) have only one co-requisite section, making it difficult to glean much from the associated numbers. Thus, in the absence of any long-term trends, and while we are still seeing the effects of instruction during the worst of the pandemic, we believe that keeping the cut scores where they are is the best course of action. If success percentages still see a decrease several years after an almost complete return to in-person instruction, then we may consider adjusting the co-requisite cutoffs implemented in the ALEKS test.

## 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 following cycle.

**Current Cycle**

- 2022 - Professionalism & Ethics
- 2023 - Written Communication & Critical Thinking

**Upcoming Cycle**

- 2024 - Diversity
- 2025 - Professionalism & Ethic
- 2026 - Information Literacy
- 2027 - Written Communication & Critical Thinking

Note: The above General Education cycle timeline is pending discussion and approval from the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education

In 2022, for the review of ethics artifacts, OSU used the newly developed OSU Ethical Reasoning Rubric. Artifacts rated with this rubric can receive ratings of '1' through '5' with '1' being beginner level and '5' being advanced. Oklahoma State University also expanded the institutional portfolio for professionalism beyond the assessment of student artifacts to include behavioral ratings by internship supervisors and faculty mentors overseeing students. Raters provided their assessment of the student's performance in 12 key areas identified in the OSU Professional Skills Rubric. Observations rated with this rubric can receive ratings of '1' through '5' with '1' being beginner level and '5' being advanced.

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

Following a review of the Spring 2022 course catalog, instructors of courses that were identified as potentially having a written assignment in ethics or curriculum related to professional development were solicited for participation in submitting student artifacts or behavioral ratings to be used. Instructors were contacted by their respective college CAGE representative and given information on what type of ethics assignment we would be able to use or what type of course or internship situation was applicable, the respective rubric, instructions on how to collect the ethics artifacts or how to submit professionalism ratings, and insurance that the ethics artifacts and professionalism ratings would be anonymized and in no way identifiable back to the student.

***Ethics - Student Artifact Review***

A call for student artifacts was sent out to all instructors of courses designated as having some element of ethics within the course content, as was stated in the online course catalog. 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 Ethical Reasoning Rubric used to rate the artifacts. Once the qualifying student artifacts were identified, the artifacts were provided to the team of faculty raters (two raters in total). The distribution of artifacts submitted, rated, and used for analysis can be found in Table II.1.

***Professionalism – Behavioral Rating Review***

A call for participation was sent out to all instructors of courses associated with an internship component or professionalism element according to the online course catalog. Instructors and supervisors interested in participating were sent an anonymous Qualtrics survey link to fill out for each student they were evaluating.

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

Currently UAT and CAGE recognize most undergraduate students do not understand or even know about General Education Assessment. To close the gap, a collaborative data transparency project between UAT and Institutional Research and Analytics (IRA) will undergo discussion in the near future.

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

Because this was a pilot year for assessing Ethics and Professionalism, the number of artifacts and behavioral ratings achieved was not yet enough to use as evidence for decision-making. The materials used to recruit participation for both categories had to be created, developed, reviewed, and approved before use and therefore the recruitment process did not begin until toward the end of the Spring semester and through the Summer of 2022. Future years of assessment of Ethics and Professionalism will likely lead to larger points of data because recruitment could begin during the Fall semester.

**Analyses and Findings**

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

***Ethics – Student Artifact Review***

In the assessment of ethics artifacts, four categories of the OSU Ethical Reasoning Rubric and the overall student ratings were assessed. The four categories were:

A. Ethical Knowledge
B. Ethical Issue Identification
C. Ethics in Different Contexts/Settings
D. Application of Ethical Perspectives

- Overall, 79.2% of the student artifacts were rated as '2' or '3' ($n$ = 38), and 14.6% of student artifacts were rated as '4' or '5' ($n$ = 7). In other words, the majority of students **met or exceeded expectations** in ethics artifacts.
- Below are the results for each rubric category:
  A. Ethical Knowledge:
     87.5% of the students' artifacts were rated as '2' or '3' ($n$ = 42), and 12.5% of the artifacts were rated as '4' or '5' ($n$ =6).
  B. Ethical Issue Identification:
     72.9% of the students' artifacts were rated as '2' or '3' ($n$ = 35), and 25.0% of the artifacts were rated as '4' or '5' ($n$ = 12).
  C. Ethics in Different Contexts/Settings:
     77.1% of the students' artifacts were rated as '2' or '3' ($n$ = 37), and 10.4% of the artifacts were rated as '4' or '5' ($n$ = 5).
  D. Application of Ethical Perspectives:
     68.8% of the students' artifacts were rated as '2' or '3' ($n$ = 33), and 12.5% of the artifacts were rated as '4' or '5' ($n$ = 6).

Analysis tables follow.

**Table II.1.** Collection of Ethics Artifacts

| College [1] | Course Prefix and Number | Course Name | Number of Artifacts Submitted[2] | Number of Artifacts Rated[3] | Number of Artifacts Included in Analysis |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CEAT | ECEN 4013 | Design of Engineering Systems | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| SSB | ACCT 4553 | Ethics for Public Accountants | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| **Total Number of Ethics Artifacts:** | | | | **48** | **48** |

**Table II.2.** Student Demographics Associated with Ethics Artifacts[4]

| Demographic Variable | Category | # of artifacts (% of total) |
|---|---|---|
| Class[5] | Senior | 77 (100.0) |
| | Total | *n* = 77 |
| College | AGRI | 1 (1.3) |
| | CEAT | 24 (30.4) |
| | SSB | 54 (68.4) |
| | Total | *n* = 79 |
| Gender | Female | 31 (38.8) |
| | Male | 49 (61.2) |
| | Total | *n* = 80 |
| OSU GPA | < 2.0 | 0 (0.0) |
| | 2.0 to 2.49 | 3 (3.7) |
| | 2.50 to 2.99 | 9 (11.1) |
| | 3.00 to 3.49 | 29 (35.8) |
| | 3.50 to 4.00 | 38 (46.9) |
| | Missing | 2 (2.5) |
| | Total | *n* = 81 |

[1] Colleges: CEAT = College of Engineering, Architecture, and Technology; SSB = Spears School of Business
[2] Although many artifacts were submitted, not all could be used for rating because they did not align with the rubric
[3] Although many artifacts were rated, not all could be used in analysis due to their lack of applicability to the rubric
[4] One student could not be tied to their demographic data and was left out of the following table.
[5] One artifact could not be assigned to any class because of missing information

**Table II.3.** Ethics Artifact Scores for each rubric category

| | SCORE: *n* (%) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | *n* |
| A[6] | 0 (0.0) | 19 (39.6) | 23 (47.9) | 5 (10.4) | 1 (2.1) | 48 |
| B | 1 (2.1) | 19 (39.6) | 16 (33.3) | 12 (25.0) | 0 (0.0) | 48 |
| C | 6 (12.5) | 21 (43.8) | 16 (33.3) | 5 (10.4) | 0 (0.0) | 48 |
| D | 9 (18.8) | 21 (43.8) | 12 (25.0) | 5 (10.4) | 1 (2.1) | 48 |
| Overall | 3 (6.3) | 20 (37.5) | 20 (41.7) | 6 (12.5) | 1 (2.1) | 48 |

***Professionalism – Behavioral Rating Review***

In the assessment of professionalism ratings, twelve categories of the OSU Professional Skills were assessed. The twelve categories were:

A. Interest in Learning
B. Judgment
C. Enthusiasm
D. Courtesy
E. Personal Appearance
F. Relationships with Other Employees
G. Integrity
H. Speed of Completing Responsibilities
I. Ability to perform without supervision
J. Willingness to receive guidance[7]
K. Dependability and Reliability
L. Thoroughness in Completing Tasks

- Overall, 42.9% of the student evaluations were rated as '2' or '3' (*n* = 3), and 57.1% of student evaluations were rated as '4' or '5' (*n* = 4). In other words, the majority of students met or exceeded expectations in professionalism evaluations.
- For all categories of the rubric, A through L, 100% of the students' evaluations were rated as'4' or '5' (*n* = 7) except for category C where 28.6% of the students' evaluations were rated as '2' or '3' (*n* = 2), and 71.4% of the evaluations were rated as '4' or '5' (*n* = 5).
  100.0% of the students' evaluations were rated as '4' or '5' (*n* = 7).

Analysis tables follow.

[6] A = Ethical Knowledge; B = Ethical Issue Identification; C = Ethics in Different Contexts/Settings; D = Application of Ethical Perspectives
[7] Excluded from data collection

**Table II.4.** Student Demographics Associated with Professionalism Behavioral Ratings

| Demographic Variable | Category | # of behavioral ratings (% of total) |
|---|---|---|
| Class | Sophomore | 1 (14.3) |
| | Junior | 1 (14.3) |
| | Senior | 5 (71.4) |
| | Total | *n* = 7 |
| Gender | Female | 5 (71.4) |
| | Male | 2 (28.6) |
| | Total | *n* = 7 |
| OSU GPA | < 2.0 | 0 (0.0) |
| | 2.0 to 2.49 | 1 (14.3) |
| | 2.50 to 2.99 | 1 (14.3) |
| | 3.00 to 3.49 | 1 (14.3) |
| | 3.50 to 4.00 | 4 (57.1) |
| | Total | *n* = 7 |

**Table II.5.** Professionalism Behavioral Ratings Scores for each rubric category

| | SCORE: *n* (%) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | *n* |
| A[8] | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 2 (28.6) | 5 (71.4) | 7 |
| B | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 5 (71.4) | 2 (28.6) | 7 |
| C | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 2 (28.6) | 3 (42.9) | 2 (28.6) | 7 |
| D | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 1 (14.3) | 6 (85.7) | 7 |
| E | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 3 (42.9) | 4 (57.1) | 7 |
| F | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 2 (28.6) | 5 (57.1) | 7 |
| G | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 1 (14.3) | 6 (85.7) | 7 |
| H | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 4 (57.1) | 3 (42.9) | 7 |
| I | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 4 (57.1) | 3 (42.9) | 7 |
| J[9] | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| K | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 4 (57.1) | 3 (42.9) | 7 |
| L | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 3 (42.9) | 4 (57.1) | 7 |
| Overall | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 3 (57.1) | 4 (57.1) | 7 |

[8] A = Interest in Learning; B = Judgment; C = Enthusiasm; D = Courtesy; E = Personal Appearance; F = Relationships with Other Employees; G = Integrity; H = Speed of Completing Responsibilities; I = Ability to perform without supervision; J = Willingness to receive guidance; K = Dependability and Reliability; L = Thoroughness in Completing Tasks

[9] This component was unintentionally excluded from the Qualtrics survey form. No data exists at this time.

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

This is the first year Ethics and Professionalism have been assessed. Because this was a pilot year, we do not yet have longitudinal data in these categories.

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

- Because this was a pilot year for assessing Ethics and Professionalism, the number of artifacts and behavioral ratings achieved was not yet enough to use as evidence for decision-making. The materials used to recruit participation for both categories had to be created, developed, reviewed, and approved before use and therefore the recruitment process did not begin until toward the end of the Spring semester and through the Summer of 2022. Future years of assessment of Ethics and Professionalism will likely lead to larger points of data because recruitment could begin during the Fall semester.
- 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).
- The CAGE will continue to discuss the newly created and implemented OSU Ethical Reasoning Rubric and OSU Professional Skills Rubric. Also, discussion will take place about the promotion of solid ethics assignments as well as recruitment for professionalism ratings.
- 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 (16.8%),
    - Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) (10.0%),
    - Oral Presentation (8.4%),
    - Surveys (7.8%),
    - Review of Thesis, Dissertation, or Creative Component (7.1%),
    - Other (6.8%),
    - Capstone Assignment (5.1%),
    - Rating of Skills (4.7%),
    - Portfolio Review (4.6%),
    - Course Embedded Assignment (4.3%),
    - Course Exam(s) (4.3%),
    - Presentation/Performance (2.7%),
    - Course Project (2.6%),
    - Projects & Assignments (2.5%),
    - Review of Student Research (2.5%),
    - Supervisor Evaluation (2.4%),
    - Internship (2.3%),
    - Performance or Jury (2.3%),
    - Interviews (2.0%),
    - Group Project (0.7%), and
    - Nationally Benchmarked Exam (0.3%).

- 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: Ferguson College of Agriculture[10]

| Program | Degree | Assessment Method #1 | Assessment Method #2 | Assessment Method #3 | Number Assessed #1 | Number Assessed #2 | Number Assessed #3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Agribusiness** | BSAG | Course Embedded Assignments | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Capstone Assignment | 157 | 125 | 39 |
| **Agricultural Communications** | BSAG | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Presentation/ Performance | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 52 | 30 | 38 |
| **Agricultural Communications** | MS | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | Review of Student Research | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| **Agricultural Economics** | BSAG | Course Embedded Assignment | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Capstone Assignment | 157 | 4 | 5 |
| **Agricultural Economics** | MS | Course Embedded Assignments | Rating of Skills | Interviews | 12 | 11 | 11 |
| **Agricultural Economics** | PhD | Course Embedded Assignments | Rating of Skills | Interviews | 12 | 11 | 11 |
| **Agricultural Education** | BSAG | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | 42 | 29 | 39 |
| **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/Dissertation/ Creative Component | Review of Student Research | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| **Agricultural Leadership** | BSAG | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Other | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 29 | 14 | 16 |
| **Animal Science** | BSAG | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Oral Presentation | 169 | 14 | 171 |

[10] The first three assessment methods are listed. Some programs reported additional assessment methods. For details, contact assessment@okstate.edu.

| Program | Degree | Assessment Method #1 | Assessment Method #2 | Assessment Method #3 | Number Assessed #1 | Number Assessed #2 | Number Assessed #3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Animal Science** | MS | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Oral Presentation | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| **Animal Science** | PhD | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Oral Presentation | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| **Biochemistry & MolecularBiology** | BSAG | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Course Project | 90 | 42 | 24 |
| **Biochemistry & MolecularBiology** | MS | Presentation/ Performance | Presentation/ Performance | Course Exam(s) | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| **Biochemistry & Molecular Biology** | PhD | Presentation/ Performance | Review of Student Research | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | 13 | 13 | 2 |
| **Biosystems Engineering** | BSBE | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Capstone Assignment | Interviews | 16 | 18 | 18 |
| **Biosystems Engineering** | MS | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | Supervisor Evaluation | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| **Biosystems Engineering** | PhD | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | Supervisor Evaluation | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| **Crop Science** | PhD | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | Rating of Skills | Oral Presentation | No Data Submitted | | |
| **Entomology** | BSAG | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 19 | 19 | 32 |
| **Entomology** | PhD | Oral Presentation | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Rating of Skills | 1 | 2 | 2 |

| Program | Degree | Assessment Method #1 | Assessment Method #2 | Assessment Method #3 | Number Assessed #1 | Number Assessed #2 | Number Assessed #3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Entomology & Plant Pathology** | MS | Oral Presentation | Oral Presentation | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 7 | 5 | 5 |
| **Environmental Science** | BSAG | Oral Presentation | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Capstone Assignment | 16 | 16 | 16 |
| **Food Science** | BSAG | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Oral Presentation | 16 | 16 | 16 |
| **Food Science** | MS | Survey | Survey | Survey | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| **Food Science** | PhD | Review of Student Research | Survey | Survey | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| **General Agriculture: Agricultural Leadership** | MAG | No Report Submitted – Program Developing/Revising Assessment Plan | | | | | |
| **Horticulture** | BSAG | Internship | Internship | Internship | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| **Horticulture** | MS | Rating of Skills | Rating of Skills | Rating of Skills | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| **International Agriculture** | MAG | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Other | Oral Presentation | 12 | 19 | 12 |
| **International Agriculture** | MS | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Other | Oral Presentation | 12 | 19 | 12 |
| **Landscape Architecture** | BLA | Portfolio Review | Portfolio Review | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | 10 | 10 | 14 |
| **Natural Resource Ecology & Management** | BSAG | Oral Presentation | Project & Assignment | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 53 | 53 | 53 |

| Program | Degree | Assessment Method #1 | Assessment Method #2 | Assessment Method #3 | Number Assessed #1 | Number Assessed #2 | Number Assessed #3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Natural Resource Ecology & Management** | MS | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| **Natural Resource Ecology & Management** | PhD | Review of Student Research | Rating of Skills | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| **Plant & Soil Sciences** | BSAG | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Rating of Skills | 16 | 15 | 13 |
| **Plant & Soil Sciences** | MS | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | Rating of Skills | Oral Presentation | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| **Plant Pathology** | PhD | Oral Presentation | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Rating of Skills | No Data Submitted | | |
| **Soil Sciences** | PhD | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | Rating of Skills | Oral Presentation | 4 | 4 | 4 |

**Table III.2.** Program Outcomes Assessment: 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 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| **American Studies** | BS | No Report Submitted – Low Enrollment | | | | | |
| **Applied Statistics** | MS | Course Exam(s) | Course Embedded Assignments | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | 8 | 2 | 2 |
| **Art: Art History** | BA | Oral Presentation | Capstone Assignment | Oral Presentation | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| **Art: Graphic Design** | BFA | Capstone Assignment | Capstone Assignment | Capstone Assignment | 28 | 28 | 28 |
| **Art: Studio Art** | BA | Portfolio Review | Portfolio Review | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| **Art: Studio Art** | BFA | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| **Art History** | MA | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| **Arts Administration** | BA | No Report Submitted | | | | | |
| **Biochemistry** | BS | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Oral Presentation | 40 | 4 | 4 |
| **Biological Science** | BS | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Other | Other | 86 | 340 | 340 |
| **Chemistry** | MS | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Supervisor Evaluation | - | 2 | 3 | - |
| **Chemistry** | PhD | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Supervisor Evaluation | Oral Presentation | 31 | 28 | 9 |

| Program | Degree | Assessment Method #1 | Assessment Method #2 | Assessment Method #3 | Number Assessed #1 | Number Assessed #2 | Number Assessed #3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Chemistry: ACS Approved** | BS | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Oral Presentation | 19 | 1 | 13 |
| **Chemistry: Departmental Degree** | BS | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Oral Presentation | 33 | 4 | 8 |
| **Communication Science & Disorders** | BS | Course Exam(s) | Review of Student Research | Survey | 342 | 30 | 8 |
| **Communication Science & Disorders** | MS | Nationally Benchmarked Exam | Survey | Review of Student Research | 26 | 34 | 14 |
| **Computer Science** | BS | Other | Other | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 36 | 38 | 23 |
| **Computer Science** | MS | No Report Submitted | | | | | |
| **Computer Science** | PhD | No Report Submitted | | | | | |
| **Creative Writing** | MFA | Supervisor Evaluation | Rating of Skills | - | 10 | 9 | - |
| **Economics** | BA | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Survey | Analysis of Written Artifacts | No Data Submitted | | |
| **Economics** | BS | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Survey | Analysis of Written Artifacts | No Data Submitted | | |
| **English** | BA | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Survey | 20 | 20 | 4 |
| **English** | MA | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Rating of Skills | Survey | 2 | 2 | 40 |
| **English** | PhD | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Rating of Skills | Survey | 34 | 34 | 40 |
| **French** | BA | Course Embedded Assignments | Course Embedded Assignments | Course Embedded Assignments | 26 | 37 | 10 |

| Program | Degree | Assessment Method #1 | Assessment Method #2 | Assessment Method #3 | Number Assessed #1 | Number Assessed #2 | Number Assessed #3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Geography** | BA | Course Embedded Assignments | Rating of Skills | Survey | No Data Submitted | | |
| **Geography** | BS | Rating of Skills | Other | Survey | 7 | 5 | 2 |
| **Geography** | MS | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Oral Presentation | Course Embedded Assignments | 7 | 2 | 6 |
| **Geography** | PhD | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Oral Presentation | Course Embedded Assignments | 8 | 1 | 4 |
| **Geology** | BS | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Course Embedded Assignments | Presentation/ Performance | 11 | 12 | 19 |
| **Geology** | MS | Survey | Oral Presentation | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| **Geology** | PhD | Survey | Oral Presentation | Review of Student Research | 5 | 5 | 31 |
| **Geospatial Information Sciences** | BS | Other | Other | Survey | 10 | 9 | 1 |
| **German** | BA | Course Embedded Assignments | Course Embedded Assignments | Course Embedded Assignments | 33 | 33 | 33 |
| **Global Studies** | BA | Rating of Skills | Rating of Skills | Rating of Skills | 18 | 18 | 12 |
| **Graphic Design** | MFA | Portfolio Review | Portfolio Review | Portfolio Review | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| **History** | BA | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 10 | 10 | - |
| **History** | PhD | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| **History: Public History** | MA | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 10 | 10 | 10 |

| Program | Degree | Assessment Method #1 | Assessment Method #2 | Assessment Method #3 | Number Assessed #1 | Number Assessed #2 | Number Assessed #3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Integrative Biology** | MS | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | Oral Presentation | Other | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| **Integrative Biology** | PhD | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | Oral Presentation | Other | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| **Mass Communication** | MS | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | 5 | 6 | 5 |
| **Mathematics** | BA | No Report Submitted | | | | | |
| **Mathematics** | BS | Analysis of Written Artifacts | - | - | No Data Submitted | | |
| **Mathematics** | MS | No Report Submitted | | | | | |
| **Mathematics** | PhD | Course Exam(s) | Project & Assignments | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | 11 | 5 | 6 |
| **Medicinal and Biophysical Chemistry** | BS | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Oral Presentation | 19 | 4 | 8 |
| **Microbiology/ Cell & Molecular Biology** | BS | Course Exam(s) | Course Project | Course Embedded Assignments | 20 | 10 | 50 |
| **Microbiology/ Cell & Molecular Biology** | MS | No Report Submitted | | | | | |
| **Microbiology/ Cell & Molecular Biology** | PhD | No Report Submitted | | | | | |
| **Multidisciplinary Studies** | BA | No Report Submitted – Assessment Personnel Changes | | | | | |

| Program | Degree | Assessment Method #1 | Assessment Method #2 | Assessment Method #3 | Number Assessed #1 | Number Assessed #2 | Number Assessed #3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Multidisciplinary Studies** | BS | No Report Submitted – Assessment Personnel Changes | | | | | |
| **Multimedia Journalism** | BA | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Survey | Portfolio Review | 101 | 5 | 5 |
| **Multimedia Journalism** | BS | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Survey | Portfolio Review | 101 | 5 | 5 |
| **Music** | BA | Course Exam(s) | Rating of Skills | Performance or Jury | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| **Music** | BM | Course Exam(s) | Course Exam(s) | Performance or Jury | 9 | 9 | 4 |
| **Music** | MM | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Oral Presentation | Performance or Jury | 12 | 14 | 14 |
| **Music Education** | BM | Course Exam(s) | Performance or Jury | Portfolio Review | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| **Music Industry** | BS | Course Exam(s) | Course Exam(s) | Portfolio Review | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| **Philosophy** | BA | No Report Submitted – Assessment Personnel Changes | | | | | |
| **Philosophy** | MA | No Report Submitted – Assessment Personnel Changes | | | | | |
| **Photonics** | PhD | Course Exam(s) | Rating of Skills | Rating of Skills | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| **Physics** | BS | Other | Course Exam(s) | Other | 35 | 98 | 35 |
| **Physics** | MS | Rating of Skills | Rating of Skills | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | 8 | 9 | 5 |
| **Physics** | PhD | Rating of Skills | Rating of Skills | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | 8 | 9 | 5 |

| Program | Degree | Assessment Method #1 | Assessment Method #2 | Assessment Method #3 | Number Assessed #1 | Number Assessed #2 | Number Assessed #3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Physiology** | BS | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Other | Other | 86 | 340 | 340 |
| **Plant Biology** | BS | Course Exam(s) | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 21 | 7 | 7 |
| **Plant Biology** | MS | Rating of Skills | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | Oral Presentation | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| **Plant Biology** | PhD | Rating of Skills | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Rating of Skills | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| **Political Science** | BA | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| **Political Science** | BS | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| **Political Science** | MA | Course Exam(s) | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | 12 | 0 | 0 |
| **Psychology** | BA | Course Exam(s) | Course Exam(s) | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 1,121 | 173 | 152 |
| **Psychology** | BS | Course Exam(s) | Course Exam(s) | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 1,121 | 173 | 152 |
| **Psychology** | MS | Portfolio Review | Portfolio Review | - | 21 | 21 | - |
| **Psychology** | PhD | Portfolio Review | Portfolio Review | - | 57 | 57 | - |
| **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 | 28 | 28 | 8 |
| **Sociology** | MS | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| **Sociology** | PhD | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 7 | 7 | 7 |

| Program | Degree | Assessment Method #1 | Assessment Method #2 | Assessment Method #3 | Number Assessed #1 | Number Assessed #2 | Number Assessed #3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Spanish** | BA | Course Embedded Assignments | Course Embedded Assignments | Course Embedded Assignments | 352 | 352 | 352 |
| **Sports Media** | BA | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Survey | Portfolio Review | 101 | 4 | 5 |
| **Sports Media** | BS | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Survey | Portfolio Review | 101 | 4 | 5 |
| **Statistics** | BS | Course Exam(s) | Capstone Assignment | Course Exam(s) | 9 | 5 | 5 |
| **Statistics** | MS | Oral Presentation | Course Exam(s) | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| **Statistics** | PhD | Rating of Skills | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Oral Presentation | 7 | 2 | 2 |
| **Strategic Communication** | BA | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Survey | Portfolio Review | 101 | 10 | 5 |
| **Strategic Communication** | BS | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Survey | Portfolio Review | 101 | 10 | 5 |
| **Theatre** | BA | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Supervisor Evaluation | Supervisor Evaluation | 37 | 28 | 32 |
| **Zoology** | BS | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Other | Other | 86 | 340 | 340 |

**Table III.3.** Program Outcomes Assessment: 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 | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Review of Student Research | 46 | 45 | 47 |
| **Applied Educational Studies: Aviation and Space** | EDD | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Oral Presentation | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | 18 | 7 | 23 |
| **Applied Exercise Sciences** | BS | Internship | Internship | Internship | 110 | 110 | 110 |
| **Aviation and Space** | MS | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 27 | 26 | 15 |
| **Career & Technical Education** | BS | No Report Submitted – Program Closing | | | | | |
| **Counseling** | MS | Rating of Skills | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Survey | 121 | 3 | 121 |
| **Design, Housing and Merchandising** | BSHS | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Oral Presentation | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 43 | 37 | 60 |
| **Design, Housing and Merchandising** | MS | Oral Presentation | Analysis of Written Artifacts | - | 5 | 27 | - |
| **Early Child Care and Development** | BSHS | No Report Submitted – Alternative Assessment Schedule Congruent with Great Plains IDEA | | | | | |
| **Education: School Psychology** | EDS | Nationally Benchmarked Exam | Portfolio Review | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | 4 | 5 | 4 |
| **Educational Leadership & Policy Studies: Educational Administration** | PhD | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Portfolio Review | Certification Exam | 2 | 2 | 2 |

| Program | Degree | Assessment Method #1 | Assessment Method #2 | Assessment Method #3 | Number Assessed #1 | Number Assessed #2 | Number Assessed #3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Educational Leadership & Policy Studies: Higher Education** | PhD | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Rating of Skills | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| **Educational Leadership Studies: College Student Development** | MS | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Rating of Skills | Course Project | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| **Educational Leadership Studies: Higher Education** | MS | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Rating of Skills | Course Project | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| **Educational Leadership Studies: School Administration** | MS | Portfolio Review | Certification Exam | - | 35 | 23 | - |
| **Educational Psychology: Educational Psychology** | MS | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| **Educational Psychology: Educational Psychology** | PhD | Survey | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 16 | 16 | 16 |
| **Educational Psychology: Research and Evaluation** | MS | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| **Educational Psychology: Research and Evaluation** | PhD | Review of Thesis/ Dissertation/Creative Component | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | 4 | 4 | 4 |

| Program | Degree | Assessment Method #1 | Assessment Method #2 | Assessment Method #3 | Number Assessed #1 | Number Assessed #2 | Number Assessed #3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Educational Technology** | MS | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | Oral Presentation | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| **Family and Consumer Sciences Education** | MS | No Report Submitted – Alternative Assessment Schedule Congruent with Great Plains IDEA | | | | | |
| **Family Financial Planning** | MS | No Report Submitted – Alternative Assessment Schedule Congruent with Great Plains IDEA | | | | | |
| **Health and Human Performance** | MS | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | Other | 4 | 4 | 9 |
| **Health, Leisure & Human Performance: Health & Human Performance** | PhD | No Report Submitted | | | | | |
| **Health, Leisure & Human Performance: Leisure Studies** | PhD | Performance or Jury | Capstone Assignment | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | 7 | 4 | 4 |
| **Human Development and Family Science** | BSHS | Survey | Rating of Skill | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 85 | 85 | 76 |
| **Human Development and Family Science** | MS | Other | Other | Other | 4 | 16 | 16 |
| **Human Sciences: Design, Housing and Merchandising** | PhD | No Report Submitted – Low Enrollment | | | | | |
| **Human Sciences: Human Development and Family Science** | PhD | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 0 | 2 | 0 |

| Program | Degree | Assessment Method #1 | Assessment Method #2 | Assessment Method #3 | Number Assessed #1 | Number Assessed #2 | Number Assessed #3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Leisure Studies** | MS | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Performance or Jury | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | 7 | 24 | 24 |
| **Nursing** | BSN | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Project & Assignments | Presentation/ Performance | 26 | 18 | 25 |
| **Nutritional Sciences** | BSHS | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Project & Assignments | Group Project | 60 | 82 | 46 |
| **Nutritional Sciences** | MS | Oral Presentation | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Nationally Benchmarked Exam | 11 | 19 | 9 |
| **Nutritional Sciences** | PhD | Oral Presentation | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Portfolio Review | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| **Physical Education** | BS | No Report Submitted – Program Closing | | | | | |
| **Recreational Management & Recreational Therapy** | BS | Rating of Skills | Rating of Skills | Survey | 27 | 20 | 27 |
| **School Administration** | EDD | Rating of Skills | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | 17 | 6 | 6 |
| **Social Foundations of Education** | MA | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| **Counseling Psychology** | PhD | Completion of Core Courses | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Final Grade in a Research Course | 9 | 8 | 9 |
| **Curriculum Studies** | PhD | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Dissertation Proposal | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| **Education** | PhD | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Research proposal | - | 0 | 3 | - |

| Program | Degree | Assessment Method #1 | Assessment Method #2 | Assessment Method #3 | Number Assessed #1 | Number Assessed #2 | Number Assessed #3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Education: Educational Administration** | EDS | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Portfolio Review | - | 6 | 6 | - |
| **Elementary Education** | BS | Portfolio Review | Capstone Assignment | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Public Health** | BS | Oral Presentation | Course Embedded Assignments | Project & Assignments | 16 | 46 | 36 |
| **School Psychology** | PhD | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Rating of Skills | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | 4 | 17 | 6 |
| **Secondary Education** | BS | Portfolio Review | Capstone Assignment | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Sports and Coaching Science** | BS | No Report Submitted – Program Closing | | | | | |
| **Teaching** | MAT | No Report Submitted – Program Closed | | | | | |
| **Teaching, Learning and Leadership** | MS | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | 6 | 40 | 6 |

**Table III.4.** Program Outcomes Assessment: 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 | 121 | 250 | 121 |
| **Architectural Engineering** | BEN | Capstone Assignment | Course Project | Course Project | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| **Architecture** | BAR | Performance or Jury | Performance or Jury | Performance or jury | 35 | 35 | 35 |
| **Chemical Engineering** | BSCH | Senior Exit Survey | Institutional Alumni Survey | Course Embedded Assignments | 45 | 24 | 45 |
| **Chemical Engineering** | MS | Performance or Jury | Survey | Interviews | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| **Chemical Engineering** | PhD | Performance or Jury | Survey | Interviews | 4 | 5 | 4 |
| **Civil Engineering** | BSCV | No Report Submitted | | | | | |
| **Civil Engineering** | MS | Review of Student Research | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | Presentation/ Performance | 15 | 15 | - |
| **Civil Engineering** | PhD | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | Review of Student Research | Presentation/ Performance | 5 | 5 | 6 |
| **Computer Engineering** | BSCP | Course Exam(s) | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Project & Assignments | 11 | 10 | 15 |
| **Construction Engineering Technology** | BSET | Internship | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Internship | 45 | 39 | 45 |
| **Electrical Engineering** | ME | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Survey | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| **Electrical Engineering** | BSEE | Course Exam(s) | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Project & Assignments | 28 | 21 | 25 |

| Program | Degree | Assessment Method #1 | Assessment Method #2 | Assessment Method #3 | Number Assessed #1 | Number Assessed #2 | Number Assessed #3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Electrical Engineering** | MS | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Survey | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| **Electrical Engineering** | PhD | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Oral Presentation | Survey | 11 | 11 | 141 |
| **Electrical Engineering Technology** | BSET | | | No Report Submitted | | | |
| **Engineering and Technology Management** | MS | | | No Report Submitted | | | |
| **Fire & Emergency Management** | PhD | Dissertation Defense | Dissertation Defense | Dissertation Defense | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| **Fire & Emergency Management Administration** | MS | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| **Fire Protection & Safety Engineering Technology** | BSET | Capstone Assignment | Capstone Assignment | Capstone Assignment | 62 | 62 | 62 |
| **Fire Protection & Safety Engineering Technology** | MSET | Course Exam(s) | Capstone Assignment | Capstone Assignment | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Industrial Engineering & Management** | BSIE | | | No Report Submitted | | | |
| **Industrial Engineering & Management** | MS | | | No Report Submitted | | | |
| **Industrial Engineering & Management** | PhD | | | No Report Submitted | | | |
| **Materials Science and Engineering** | MS | Oral Presentation | Oral Presentation | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | 2 | 2 | 0 |

| 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 | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| **Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering** | MS | Rating of Skills | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | 27 | 27 | 27 |
| **Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering** | PhD | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| **Mechanical Engineering** | BSME | Capstone Assignment | Course Project | Capstone Assignment | 151 | 200 | 190 |
| **Mechanical Engineering Technology** | BSET | Course Exam(s) | Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) | Capstone Assignment | 16 | 18 | 9 |
| **Petroleum Engineering** | MS | Rating of Skills | Course Project | Interviews | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| **Petroleum Engineering** | PhD | Rating of Skills | Course Exam(s) | Supervisor Evaluation | 10 | 10 | 10 |

**Table III.5.** Program Outcomes Assessment: Spears School of Business

| Program | 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) | 265 | 89 | 124 |
| **Accounting** | MS | Course Exam(s) | Course Embedded Assignments | Course Project | 28 | 42 | 45 |
| **Business Administration** | MBA | Presentation/ Performance | Course Embedded Assignments | Course Exam(s) | 36 | 22 | 22 |
| **Business Administration** | PhD | Performance or Jury | Completion of Training Course | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 15 | 52 | 38 |
| **Business Administration: Accounting** | PhD | Rating of Skill | Completion of Training | Review of Student Research | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| **Business Administration: Entrepreneurship** | PhD | Performance or Jury | Completion of Training Course | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 15 | 52 | 38 |
| **Business Administration: Executive Research** | PhD | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | Review of Student Research | Placement of Graduates | 22 | 8 | 8 |
| **Business Administration: Finance** | PhD | Performance or Jury | Completion of Training Course | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 15 | 52 | 38 |
| **Business Administration: Hospitality and Tourism Management** | PhD | Performance or Jury | Completion of Training Course | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 15 | 52 | 38 |
| **Business Administration: Management** | PhD | Performance or Jury | Completion of Training Course | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 15 | 52 | 38 |
| **Business Administration:** | PhD | Performance or Jury | Completion of Training Course | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 15 | 52 | 38 |

| Program | Degree | Assessment Method #1 | Assessment Method #2 | Assessment Method #3 | Number Assessed #1 | Number Assessed # 2 | Number Assessed # 3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Management Information Systems** | | | | | | | |
| **Business Administration: Marketing** | PhD | Performance or Jury | Completion of Training Course | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 15 | 52 | 38 |
| **Business Analytics and Data Science** | MS | Exam(s) | Exam(s) | Exam(s) | 81 | 82 | 61 |
| **Economics** | BSBA | Oral Presentation | | | 92 | | |
| **Economics** | PhD | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Oral Presentation | Survey | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| **Entrepreneurship** | BSBA | Oral Presentation | - | - | 92 | - | - |
| **Finance** | BSBA | Oral Presentation | - | - | 92 | - | - |
| **General Business** | BSBA | Oral Presentation | - | - | 92 | - | - |
| **Hospitality and Tourism Management** | BSBA | Oral Presentation | - | - | 92 | - | - |
| **Hospitality and Tourism Management** | MS | Oral Presentation | Coursework | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| **International Business** | BSBA | Oral Presentation | - | - | 92 | - | - |
| **Management** | BSBA | Oral Presentation | - | - | 92 | - | - |
| **Management Information Systems** | BSBA | Oral Presentation | - | - | 92 | - | - |

| Program | Degree | Assessment Method #1 | Assessment Method #2 | Assessment Method #3 | Number Assessed #1 | Number Assessed # 2 | Number Assessed # 3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Management Information Systems** | MS | Internship | Internship | Internship | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| **Marketing** | BSBA | Oral Presentation | - | - | 92 | - | - |
| **Quantitative Financial Economics** | MS | Analysis of Written Artifacts | Course Project | Analysis of Written Artifacts | 5 | 5 | 5 |

**Table III.6.** Program Outcomes Assessment: 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 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| **Environmental Science** | PhD | Survey | Survey | Survey | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| **Interdisciplinary Studies** | MS | Group Project | Portfolio Review | Capstone Assignment | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| **Public Health** | MPH | Course Project | Course Embedded Assignments | Analysis of Written Artifacts | No Data Submitted | | |

**Table III.7.** Program Outcomes Assessment: Global Studies

| Program | Degree | Assessment Method #1 | Assessment Method #2 | Assessment Method #3 | Number Assessed #1 | Number Assessed #2 | Number Assessed #3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Global Studies** | MS | Internship | Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component | Survey | 5 | 1 | 8 |

**Table III.8.** Program Outcomes Assessment: 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 | 45 | 45 | 45 |

## Analyses and Findings

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

University Assessment and Testing has received 222 (89.9%) 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: 4.0% of programs received purple; 12.1% of programs received blue; 33.9% of programs received green; 31.3% received yellow; 5.3% received orange; 6.2% of programs received red; and 7.2% of programs received gray.

The following table, Table III.9, 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:

- The 2020-2021 update to a five-point 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.9.** Institutional POA Summary – Five Year Comparison

| | | 2017-2018 | 2018-2019 | 2019-2020 | 2020-2021 | 2021-2022 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total programs[11] | 281 | 299 | 296 | 247 | 247 |
| | Completed reports | 204 (72.6%) | 269 (90.0%) | 244 (82.4%) | 217 (87.9%) | 222 (89.9%) |
| **Overall** | | | | | | |
| | GEE | - | - | - | 3.0% | 4.0% |
| | EE | 7.9% | 3.4% | 15.8% | 13.4% | 12.1% |
| | ME | 63.2% | 55.2% | 49.1% | 40.6% | 33.9% |
| | SME | 5.3% | 7.7% | 11.9% | 24.8% | 31.3% |
| | MME | - | - | - | 5.9% | 5.3% |
| | MI | 8.9% | 20.4% | 7.8% | 9.6% | 6.2% |
| | NA | 14.6% | 12.7% | 15.3% | 2.8% | 7.2% |
| **SLOs** | | | | | | |
| | GEE | - | - | - | 2.8% | 1.2% |
| | EE | 4.7% | 9.8% | 20.0% | 18.6% | 19.4% |
| | ME | 61.7% | 48.0% | 49.0% | 39.7% | 44.1% |
| | SME | 1.5% | 18.2% | 15.5% | 28.3% | 22.7% |
| | MME | - | - | - | 2.8% | 1.2% |
| | MI | 8.8% | 12.2% | 9.8% | 6.5% | 5.7% |
| | NA | 14.6% | 11.8% | 11.7% | 1.2% | 5.7% |
| **Methods** | | | | | | |
| | GEE | - | - | - | 1.2% | 1.2% |
| | EE | 8.4% | 2.0% | 19.0% | 17.8% | 11.3% |
| | ME | 61.3% | 66.6% | 51.0% | 43.3% | 42.1% |
| | SME | 6.7% | 5.4% | 12.8% | 22.7% | 29.1% |
| | MME | - | - | - | 7.3% | 4.9% |
| | MI | 8.8% | 13.5% | 4.5% | 6.5% | 5.7% |
| | NA | 14.6% | 12.5% | 12.8% | 1.2% | 5.7% |
| **Findings** | | | | | | |
| | GEE | - | - | - | 6.9% | 6.1% |
| | EE | 10.2% | 2.7% | 15.9% | 11.3% | 12.1% |
| | ME | 65.0% | 59.1% | 52.8% | 37.3% | 27.1% |
| | SME | 1.5% | 3.7% | 5.9% | 21.1% | 36.0% |
| | MME | - | - | - | 8.5% | 3.6% |
| | MI | 8.8% | 21.6% | 9.0% | 10.9% | 6.5% |
| | NA | 14.6% | 12.8% | 16.6% | 4.1% | 8.5% |
| **Use of Findings** | | | | | | |
| | GEE | - | - | - | 2.4% | 6.1% |
| | EE | 8.4% | 1.4% | 9.8% | 7.3% | 7.7% |
| | ME | 65.0% | 47.3% | 56.4% | 30.4% | 22.7% |
| | SME | 2.6% | 3.4% | 14.5% | 33.6% | 37.2% |
| | MME | - | - | - | 8.1% | 10.5% |
| | MI | 9.5% | 34.5% | 8.8% | 13.4% | 6.9% |
| | NA | 14.6% | 13.5% | 10.5% | 4.9% | 8.9% |

[11] During the 2020-2021 and 2021-2022 years, a total of 52 certificate programs were excluded from the counts.

**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 2023, 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 2023, 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 successfully conducted a five-year review of all programs to provide feedback on growth over the last five years of assessment. This also served 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 conducted an internal assessment survey titled the OSU Assessment Feedback Survey (AFS). This survey was also developed by UAT in collaboration with AAIC and was administered in Spring of 2022. The survey was 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 were distributed to all associate deans, department chairs, program directors, and program assessment coordinators through a disaggregated, public report in Fall of 2022. UAT will spend time in Spring 2023 meeting 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 AFS will contribute to the HLC Quality Initiative that is being proposed in Fall of 2022.

Additionally, guidelines on how to follow-up with missing program outcomes assessment reports were constructed. Details follow.

Purpose of Initiative: To increase transparency across the various levels of assessment-related personnel at OSU through a set of follow-up procedures to ensure that all OSU programs are not only complying with the expectations of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (OSRHE), but also experiencing the benefits of assessment through continuous program improvement, the Academic Program Review (APR), and future accreditation visits.

Timeline of follow-up procedures:

- After the Program Outcomes Assessment (POA) submission date, but prior to the lockdown of the Nuventive system at the end of the month, UAT will prepare a list of programs that are missing all or part of their yearly report.
    - A report is considered *fully missing* if there are no findings, use of findings, or annual executive summary sections entered into Nuventive.
    - This will be determined by the Homepage Checklist provided on the front page of each program within Nuventive. This checklist searches the program's yearly submitted information for the relevant assessment year per parameters set by UAT.
- The list of programs and the components they are missing will be provided to college assessment representatives the week after POA reports are due.
- Additionally, programs will be contacted individually via email regarding their missing component status to address any questions or concerns by UAT.
- Programs will have until the end of September to make changes so that they are in compliance and then can be properly reviewed by UAT.
- If a program cannot submit an annual report for any reason, the assessment coordinator can indicate the reason in Nuventive via the Annual Executive Summary.
    - Documenting this will provide historical context so that UAT can review the missing report with understanding; missing reports with communicated reasoning can often receive a gray score of N/A (Not Applicable) rather than the typical red score of Missing Information (MI).
    - In addition, by capturing a history of what happens in assessment each year (regardless of assessing data or not), an assessment history is then created which helps future program assessment coordinators with onboarding.
    - UAT also welcomes emails, phone calls, or one-on-one meetings to discuss these challenges.

    - However, the same challenges should not be maintained over consecutive years as assessment of student learning is imperative to the success of students and the program itself.
- Reasons for lack of report submission should be indicated in the Annual Executive Summary and can include but are not limited to:
    - Low student enrollment
        - The Annual Executive Summary provides a checkbox to indicate if there were "too few students to complete assessment."
    - Revising assessment plan
        - Program assessment plans should be reviewed and revised or re-approved every five years, at minimum. If it is a review year for the program, this should be indicated in the Annual Executive Summary.
    - Did not perform assessment due to other extenuating circumstances
        - For example, lack of faculty, course offerings, etc., this should be indicated in the Annual Executive Summary.
    - Did not perform assessment without proper cause
        - This reasoning will likely cause some concern and indicate further consultation needed with UAT.
- After the month of September and the corresponding grace period has passed, UAT will prepare a new report of missing programs and report components.
- This new list will be shared with the college assessment representatives, copying the Office of the Provost. College representatives will address the missing reports with the program and its coordinators. UAT will be available to be part of these conversations and any follow-up discussions as needed.
- College representatives will be encouraged to address the missing report with the program and its coordinators. UAT will be available to be part of these conversations and any follow-up discussions as needed.
- Any missing reports will also be communicated with the OSRHE via the annual report submitted in late fall.
- Finally, individual review scores and feedback will be shared with college assessment representatives and programs during the following spring semester. At this time, further conversations regarding compliance, issues with assessment, or strategies to improve assessment are encouraged.

**Section IV – Student Engagement and Satisfaction**
**Administration of Assessment**

The OSU Student Engagement Survey (SES) was administered for three consecutive years during the Spring semester of 2020, 2021, and 2022. The OSU Student Satisfaction Survey (SSS) was also administered for three consecutive years during the Spring semester of 2018, 2019, and 2020. A baseline of each survey was established by surveying for three consecutive years as well as the survey structure was validated. Moving forward, the two surveys of student engagement and satisfaction will be combined into one survey: the OSU Student Satisfaction and Engagement Survey (SSES) which will collect data on the two topics simultaneously.

In the section to follow, we will present information and results for the most recent Spring 2022 administration of the SES.

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

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

- The Spring 2022 administration of the Student Engagement Survey (SES) was the third 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.

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

Data collection yielded 8,433 (37.6%) responses, with 8,046 (35.9%) in the final data set.

- Response Rates
    - College
        - College of Arts and Sciences: 36.5% (*n* = 2,112)
        - College of Education and Human Sciences: 38.0% (*n* = 1,446)
        - College of Engineering, Architecture and Technology: 35.0% (*n* = 1,208)
        - Ferguson College of Agriculture: 40.0% (*n* = 1,122)
        - Global Studies: 41.4% (*n* = 12)
        - Spears School of Business: 33.7% (*n* = 1,777)
        - University College: 25.4% (*n* = 248)
    - Classification
        - Undergraduate: 33.8% (*n* = 6,265)
        - Graduate: 45.4% (*n* = 1,781)

Demographic Variables

- Campus
  - Stillwater: 89.5% (*n* = 7,204)
  - Stillwater/Tulsa: 7.6% (*n* = 615)
  - Tulsa: 2.8% (*n* = 227)
- Gender
  - Female: 61.2% (*n* = 4,928)
  - Male: 38.8% (*n* = 3,118)
- Race, Nationality, and Ethnicity
  - White or European American: 63.0% (*n* = 5,065)
  - Multiracial: 9.2% (*n* = 743)
  - Hispanic, Latin(a/o), or Latinx: 8.7% (*n* = 697)
  - International: 8.2% (*n* = 663)
  - Black or African American: 4.3% (*n* = 343)
  - Native American or Alaska Native: 4.1% (*n* = 333)
  - Asian or Asian American: 2.4% (*n* = 191)
  - Unknown: 0.1% (*n* = 7)
  - Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander: 0.1% (*n* = 4)
- Class Level
  (Note: 154 students' classifications did not fit into one of the below six categories)
  - Freshman: 13.7% (*n* = 1,080)
  - Sophomore: 18.0% (*n* = 1,418)
  - Junior: 20.4% (*n* = 1,613)
  - Senior: 26.4% (*n* = 2,083)
  - Masters: 12.5% (*n* = 986)
  - Doctoral: 9.0% (*n* = 712)
- Classification
  - Undergraduate: 77.9% (*n* = 6,265)
  - Graduate: 22.1% (*n* = 1,781)
- Full-Time/Part-Time Status
  - Full-time: 77.3% (*n* = 6,221)
  - Part-time: 22.7% (*n* = 1,825)
- Home State
  - Oklahoma: 66.0% (*n* = 5,307)
  - Texas: 13.6% (*n* = 1,095)
  - Kansas: 1.6% (*n* = 126)
  - California: 1.3% (*n* = 103)
  - Other: 17.6% (*n* = 1,415)

- A total of 2,418 open-ended comments were recorded.

**Reliability and Validity**

- 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.

## Item Analysis

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

- I attend my classes at OSU. **(94.0%)**
- I do my best regarding my responsibilities in group work at OSU. **(93.4%)**
- Overall, I feel good about being at OSU. **(91.6%)**
- I spend enough time and make enough effort to learn at OSU. **(91.5%)**
- I try to be open to learning things that could potentially change the way I understand an issue or concept at OSU. **(90.6%)**
- I motivate myself to learn at OSU. **(90.5%)**
- I feel safe on the OSU campus. **(90.2%)**
- I am easily able to work with classmates from different backgrounds and cultures than my own at OSU. **(90.2%)**
- I determine my learning goals at OSU. **(85.7%)**
- I am comfortable being myself at OSU. **(83.5%)**

**Top 5 "Disengaged" items** *(Rarely and Never)*

- I discuss course topics, ideas, or concepts with an OSU professor outside of class. **(35.2%)**
- I participate in OSU campus events. **(29.3%)**
- I talk about my career plans with career services, faculty, or advisors at OSU. **(20.8%)**
- I feel I sufficiently prepare for course examinations at OSU. **(18.6%)**
- I ask other students to help me understand course material at OSU. **(18.6%)**

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

- I have been actively involved in an OSU student group or group in the community. **(59.9%)**
- I have participated in an internship, part-time job, field experience, student teaching, or clinical placement while at OSU. **(48.9%)**
- I have participated in a community-based project (e.g. volunteering) during my studies at OSU. **(48.7%)**

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

- I have participated in an OSU study abroad program. **(61.6%)**
- I have worked with a faculty member on a research project at OSU. **(37.2%)**

Note: Frequency percentages were calculated without including missing responses.

***Student Engagement Survey – Multi-Year Comparison***

**Table IV.1. Item Analysis**

| Survey Item | Top Items with the HIGHEST Levels of Engagement | | | | | | | | | Associated Factor | p-value/Significance Level Effect Size (Cohen's d) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2020 | | | 2021 | | | 2022 | | | | | | |
| | Rank | "Always" & "Often" | "Rarely" & "Never" | Rank | "Always" & "Often" | "Rarely" & "Never" | Rank | "Always" & "Often" | "Rarely" & "Never" | | 2020 vs. 2021 | 2021 vs. 2022 | 2020 vs. 2022 |
| I attend my classes at OSU | 1 | 96.9% | 0.7% | 2 | 92.0% | 1.6% | 1 | 94.0% | 1.2% | Academic Effort | < .001*** Medium (.35) | -- | < .001*** Medium (.28) |
| I spend enough time and make enough effort to learn at OSU | 2 | 92.8% | 0.7% | 3 | 91.1% | 0.8% | 4 | 91.5% | 0.7% | Academic Effort | < .001*** Small (.20) | -- | < .001*** Small (.20) |
| I do my best regarding my responsibilities in group work at OSU | 3 | 92.7% | 2.0% | 1 | 93.3% | 2.1% | 2 | 93.4% | 1.6% | Academic Effort | -- | .034* Small (.07) | .035* Small (.08) |
| I motivate myself to learn at OSU | 4 | 91.8% | 1.0% | 6&7 | 88.9% | 1.0% | 6 | 90.5% | 0.9% | Academic Effort | < .001*** Medium (.23) | -- | < .001*** Medium (.24) |
| I feel safe on the OSU campus | 5 | 90.4% | 1.5% | 8 | 86.8% | 2.0% | 7&8 | 90.2% | 1.4% | Supportive Environment | < .001*** Small (.18) | .001*** Small (.11) | .029* Small (.07) |
| I try to be open to learning things that could potentially change the way I understand an issue or concept at OSU | 6 | 90.2% | 0.8% | 4 | 90.9% | 0.9% | 5 | 90.6% | 0.5% | Higher Order Learning | .008** Small (.09) | .039* Small (.07) | -- |
| Overall, I feel good about being at OSU | 7 | 90.1% | 2.0% | 6&7 | 88.9% | 2.2% | 3 | 91.6% | 1.5% | Supportive Environment | < .001*** Small (.12) | -- | .001*** Small (.11) |
| I am easily able to work with classmates from different backgrounds and cultures than my own at OSU | 8 | 88.5% | 2.0% | 5 | 90.5% | 1.7% | 7&8 | 90.2% | 1.7% | Higher Order Learning | .02* Small (.08) | -- | -- |

*Note*. *** = significant at $\alpha \leq .001$.
** = significant at $\alpha \leq .01$.
* = significant at $\alpha \leq .05$.
Cohen's *d* categories: Small, $d \leq .20$; Medium, $.20 < d < .80$; Large, $.80 \leq d < 1.3$; Very Large, $d \geq 1.3$.

**Table IV.2. Item Analysis**

| | Top Items with the HIGHEST Levels of Disengagement | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Survey Item* | 2020 | | | 2021 | | | 2022 | | | *Associated Factor* | *p-value/Significance Level Effect Size (Cohen's d)* | | |
| | *Rank* | *"Always" & "Often"* | *"Rarely" & "Never"* | *Rank* | *"Always" & "Often"* | *"Rarely" & "Never"* | *Rank* | *"Always" & "Often"* | *"Rarely" & "Never"* | | *2020 vs. 2021* | *2021 vs. 2022* | *2020 vs. 2022* |
| I discuss course topics, ideas, or concepts with an OSU professor outside of class | **1** | **30.7%** | **39.2%** | **1** | **35.6%** | **33.9%** | **1** | **35.2%** | **34.1%** | **Interaction** | **.012* Small (.09)** | **--** | **--** |
| I participate in OSU campus events | **2** | **24.5%** | **41.6%** | **2** | **34.5%** | **33.0%** | **2** | **29.3%** | **37.3%** | **Interaction** | **< .001*** Small (.20)** | **--** | **< .001*** Small (.20)** |
| I talk about my career plans with career services, faculty, or advisors at OSU | **3** | **19.0%** | **53.0%** | **3** | **20.7%** | **50.6%** | **3** | **20.8%** | **49.8%** | **Interaction** | **.025* Small (.07)** | **--** | **.002** Small (.11)** |
| I feel I am an important part of the OSU community | **4** | **15.2%** | **58.9%** | **5** | **17.3%** | **56.0%** | **5** | **15.3%** | **58.6%** | **Supportive Environment** | **<. 001*** Small (.13)** | **--** | **.001*** Small (.10)** |
| I ask other students to help me understand course material at OSU | **5** | **12.0%** | **60.4%** | **4** | **19.2%** | **50.7%** | **4** | **18.6%** | **51.4%** | **Interaction** | **< .001*** Medium (.23)** | **--** | **< .001*** Small (.20)** |

*Note*. *** = significant at $\alpha < .001$.
** = significant at $\alpha < .01$.
* = significant at $\alpha < .05$.
Cohen's *d* categories: Small, $d \leq .20$; Medium, $.20 < d < .80$; Large, $.80 \leq d < 1.3$; Very Large, $d \geq 1.3$.

**Interpreting Significant Differences**

Cohen's *d* was used to provide the "degree of the differences" among student responses in 2020, 2021, and 2022. Cohen's *d* is considered "small" if the value is less than or equal to 0.20 and "medium" if the value is greater than 0.20 and less than 0.80. Most significant differences among the highest and lowest engagement rated items are considered small differences, but three item comparisons obtained effect sizes of .20 or above and two item effect sizes nearly met this threshold.

**Table IV.3.**

| | Item with the LARGEST Cohen's *d* | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ***Survey Item*** | **2020** | | **2021** | | **2022** | | ***Associated Factor*** | ***Effect Size (Cohen's d)*** | | |
| | ***"Always" & "Often"*** | ***"Rarely" & "Never"*** | ***"Always" & "Often"*** | ***"Rarely" & "Never"*** | ***"Always" & "Often"*** | ***"Rarely" & "Never"*** | | ***2020 vs. 2021*** | ***2021 vs. 2022*** | ***2020 vs. 2022*** |
| I attend my classes at OSU | **96.9%** | **0.7%** | **92.0%** | **1.6%** | **94.0%** | **1.2%** | **Academic Effort** | **< .001*** Medium (.35)** | **--** | **< .001*** Medium (.28)** |
| I spend enough time and make enough effort to learn at OSU | **92.8%** | **0.7%** | **91.1%** | **0.8%** | **91.5%** | **0.7%** | **Academic Effort** | **< .001*** Small (.20)** | **--** | **< .001*** Small (.20)** |
| I motivate myself to learn at OSU | **91.8%** | **1.0%** | **88.9%** | **1.0%** | **90.5%** | **0.9%** | **Academic Effort** | **< .001*** Medium (.23)** | **--** | **< .001*** Medium (.24)** |
| I participate in OSU campus events | **24.5%** | **41.6%** | **34.5%** | **33.0%** | **29.3%** | **37.3%** | **Interaction** | **< .001*** Small (.20)** | **--** | **< .001*** Small (.20)** |
| I ask other students to help me understand course material at OSU | **12.0%** | **60.4%** | **19.2%** | **50.7%** | **18.6%** | **51.4%** | **Interaction** | **< .001*** Medium (.23)** | **--** | **< .001*** Small (.20)** |

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

Table IV.3 shows that the significant differences among responses across years 2020, 2021, and 2022 on the items: I attend my classes at OSU, I motivate myself to learn at OSU, and I ask other students to help me understand course material at OSU have a medium effect size and are substantially different responses for the years 2020 compared to 2021 and 2020 compared to 2022. Furthermore, the item, I spend enough time and make enough effort to learn at OSU, obtained a Cohen's $d = 0.20$ for both 2020 vs. 2021 and 2021 vs. 2022 which lies on the threshold between a small and medium difference. When visually comparing the percentages across years in Table 3, it is clear that the most significant differences lie between the responses collected in 2020 versus the other two administrations.

**Concluding Inferences**

In conclusion, student responses across the three years, 2020, 2021, and 2022, drastically differed. There were several significant differences among items between years, however, effect sizes were generally small with some exceptions within the Academic Effort and Interaction factors.

An important consideration regarding the three-year comparisons was the COVID-19 pandemic and its influence on engagement opportunities available at OSU between the years 2020 and 2021 as well as 2020 and 2022. The pandemic began impacting higher education following the Spring 2020 administration of the SES. As a result, a vast majority of engagement related activities were suspended, and classroom environments were moved to online formats. The effect can be observed in the different ranked orders of the items with highest engagement and disengagement and in the significant differences in student responses when comparing the years.

As the university began to increase on-campus activities and classes in 2022 following the COVID-19 pandemic, participants identified that they attended classes more frequently than they did in the peak of the pandemic in Spring 2021, but still not at the level observed in Spring 2020 prior to the start of the pandemic. Four out of the five items with the highest disengagement are associated with the "Interaction" factor, suggesting a reduced degree of interaction occurred between students and campus employees and engagement driven by campus events. Similarly, four items from the Academic Effort factor were consistently significantly different with effect sizes of 0.20 or above when comparing 2020 to 2021 and 2020 to 2022, suggesting a pattern of responses pre COVID-19 pandemic (2020) and during the pandemic (2021 and 2022).

Perhaps the most crucial takeaway from these findings is that when comparing responses from the years 2021 and 2022, items consistently do not significantly differ and effect sizes remain minimal on those few significant items. This could suggest that engagement levels remained consistent after the pandemic established the new norm in 2020 have not yet returned to the levels observed prior to the pandemic in the Spring 2020 administration.

**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 and an overall institution student satisfaction survey to gather more up-to-date data from OSU students in terms of their aspects of student engagement and satisfaction.
- The survey items for the SES and SSS were based on theoretical and practical aspects of student engagement and satisfaction from research done in higher education.
- SES and SSS items were reviewed by UAT and the Assessment & Academic Improvement Council (AAIC) and related units at OSU.
- Pending final endorsement of the combined SSES by AAIC in the November 2022 meeting, UAT will move forward with a Spring 2023 pilot administration.
- The SSES (pending final endorsement) will contain approximately 34 items on a 5-point Likert response scale with one open-ended item. Items will cover topics such as academic satisfaction, academic effort, feeling of connection toward OSU, interactions and involvement at OSU, and level of higher order learning.

## 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 2021-22:

| | |
|---|---|
| **Assessment Fees** | **$806,801.33** |
| **Assessment Salaries** | **$494,307.53** |
| **Distributed to Other Departments** | **$129,698.55** |
| **Operational Costs** | **$216,826.79** |
| **Total Expenditures**[12] | **$840,832.87** |

[12] Operational costs were above collected fees as there were new assessment software purchases made in the 2021-22 year.