Oklahoma State University
America's Brightest ORANGE

Annual Student Assessment Report 2022-2023

Prepared for
The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
November 15, 2023

Ryan Chung, Ph.D.
Assistant Vice Provost for Accreditation, Assessment, and Testing

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

James Knecht, MBA
Associate Director

Kaitlynn Holcomb, B.S.
Assessment Coordinator

Cat Bertucci, 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 4,871 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, 15 (0.31%) were required to enroll in developmental English courses, 32 (0.66%) in developmental reading courses, 261 (5.36%) in developmental mathematics courses, and 26 (0.53%) in developmental science courses.
- Written Communication and Critical Thinking were reviewed using artifacts collected from identified courses and were rated using the newly developed OSU Written Communication and OSU Critical Thinking Rubrics.
    - There were 299 written communication artifacts and 142 critical thinking artifacts rated and included in analysis.
    - Moving forward, new methods to assess written communication artifacts will be discussed in the Committee for the Assessment of General Education (CAGE) including a short form of written communication. A new procedure will be established before the next review cycle for Written Communication and Critical Thinking.
- 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:
    - 1.7% of programs received purple, which indicates the item Greatly Exceeded Expectations,
    - 8.3% of programs received blue, which suggests the item Exceeded Expectations,
    - 37.7% of programs received green, which denotes the item Met Expectations,
    - 27.9% received yellow, which suggests the item Somewhat Met Expectations,
    - 5.7% received orange, which denotes the item Minimally Met Expectations,
    - 7.8% of programs received red, which indicates there was Missing Information, and
    - 10.9% 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 satisfaction and engagement, a total of 5,566 OSU students responded to the 2023 pilot of the Student Satisfaction and Engagement Survey (SSES) survey with a 25.0% response rate.
    - The top four "Satisfied" responses were:
        - 87.3% of students reported either "Very Satisfied" or "Satisfied" to "Your intellectual growth at OSU."
        - 86.6% of students reported either "Very Satisfied" or "Satisfied" to "The quality of teaching at OSU."
        - 85.9% of students reported either "Very Satisfied" or "Satisfied" to "Availability of OSU faculty."
        - 85.3% of students reported either "Very Satisfied" or "Satisfied" to "Being a student at OSU."
    - The top three "Engaged" responses were:
        - 97.1% of students reported either "Always" or "Often" to "I do my best regarding my responsibilities in group work at OSU."
        - 95.0% of students reported either "Always" or "Often" to "I spend enough time and make enough effort to learn at OSU."
        - 94.4% of students reported either "Always" or "Often" to "I attend my classes at OSU."

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.
- UAT is currently carrying out an initiative to meet with each individual academic program to provide direct feedback and foster connections with assessment personnel throughout the university. This is to further establish a culture of assessment within each college and the wider university community.
- In collaboration with the Provost's Office, UAT will work to facilitate university level projects supporting the upcoming HLC accreditation visit in 2026. These include the continuous work on the Quality Initiative, establishing an update Academic Program Review process, and beginning to plan and support the reaccreditation preparation efforts.
- 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 2022-2023 (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 are 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 2022-2023, 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 2022-2023, a total of 4,871 newly admitted and enrolled students (including all new freshmen and new transfers with less than 24 earned credit hours) were assessed using the entry-level placement assessment process. Table I-6a shows the number of enrolled students who had performance deficiencies in each subject area based on ACT scores (or converted SAT scores) and the number of students who were cleared for college-level coursework using ELPA.

Table I-6a. Number of enrolled new students with ACT subscores below 19 in each subject area and the number of students who were cleared for college-level coursework by ELPA in 2022-2023.

Subject Area	# of Students with ACT sub-scores <19[1]	# of Students cleared for college-level coursework by ELPA
English	819	806
Mathematics	1,320	1,168
Reading	577	561
Science	532	517

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: 758, Mathematics: 757, Reading: 759 , Science: 1,449.
NOTE: Missing subscore counts for English, Mathematics, and Reading are normally identical but are not this year due to some data anomalies. One student had only English and math subscores for the ACT, and one student had an SATR EBRW score that is below the lowest possible value, resulting in missing values for both English and Reading subscores..

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 2022-2023 placement and pass numbers and rates.

Subject Area	# of Enrolled Students who took an ACCUPLACER test[1]	# of Students who passed an ACCUPLACER and were cleared for college-level coursework
English	1	1
Reading	1	0

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. 279 new students with ACT Math scores below 19 cleared remediation requirements using the OSU Math Placement Exam (ALEKS) in 2022-2023.

After all entry-level assessment was completed, 277 students (5.69 %) of the total new students enrolled) were required to take at least one developmental (remedial) course. Of the 4,871 new students in 2022-2023, 15 (0.31 %) were required to enroll in developmental English courses, 32 (0.66 %) in developmental reading courses, 261 (5.36%) in developmental mathematics courses, and 26 (0.53%) 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 2022-2023 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 2022-2023 (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)	2	1 (50%)
UNIV 0153 (reading and science)	0	No 2022-2023 enrollment in this course.
UNIV 0123 (mathematics)	93	46 (49.46%)
UNIV 0163 (English, reading, and science)	120	87 (72.5%)

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.

MATH 1483 Mathematical Functions and Their Uses

Table I-6d. MATH 1483 (Math Functions) Fall 2022 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
Section Type		Enrollment		Success Rate (C or better)	
Standard		172		84.3%	
Co-requisite		118		85.6%	
Fall 2022 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
A	B	C	D	F	W
34.7%	39.0%	11.9%	5.1%	6.8%	2.5%

Table I-6e. MATH 1483 (Math Functions) Fall 2022 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates		
Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better)
Standard	19.8%	67.6%
Co-requisite	12.7%	100.0%

Table I-6f. MATH 1483 (Math Functions) Spring 2023 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
Section Type		Enrollment		Success Rate (C or better)	
Standard		111		79.3%	
Co-requisite		58		74.1%	
Spring 2023 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
A	B	C	D	F	W
22.4%	25.9%	25.9%	5.2%	3.4%	17.2%

Table I-6g. MATH 1483 (Math Functions) Spring 2023 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates		
Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better)
Standard	14.4%	56.3%
Co-requisite	19.0%	63.6%

MATH 1513 College Algebra

Table I-6h. MATH 1513 (College Algebra) Fall 2022 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
Section Type		Enrollment		Success Rate (C or better)	
Standard		479		70.4%	
Co-requisite		212		62.7%	
Fall 2022 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
A	B	C	D	F	W
17.0%	24.1%	21.7%	13.7%	11.8%	11.3%

Table I-6i. MATH 1513 (College Algebra) Fall 2022 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates		
Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better)
Standard	13.8%	56.1%
Co-requisite	23.6%	58.0%

Table I-6j. MATH 1513 (College Algebra) Spring 2023 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
Section Type		Enrollment		Success Rate (C or better)	
Standard		216		61.1%	
Co-requisite		94		60.6%	
Spring 2023 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
A	B	C	D	F	W
16.0%	22.3%	22.3%	6.4%	11.7%	21.3%

Table I-6k. MATH 1513 (College Algebra) Spring 2023 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates		
Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better)
Standard	16.7%	58.3%
Co-requisite	18.1%	58.8%

MATH 1813 Preparation for Calculus

Table I-6l. MATH 1813 (Preparation for Calculus) Fall 2022 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
Section Type		Enrollment		Success Rate (C or better)	
Standard		501		65.9%	
Co-requisite		35		77.1%	
Fall 2022 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
A	B	C	D	F	W
28.6%	22.9%	25.7%	2.9%	11.4%	8.6%

Table I-6m. MATH 1813 (Preparation for Calculus) Fall 2022 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates		
Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better)
Standard	20.4%	50.0%
Co-requisite	20.0%	42.9%

Table I-6n. MATH 1813 (Preparation for Calculus) Spring 2023 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
Section Type		Enrollment		Success Rate (C or better)	
Standard		380		66.1%	
Co-requisite		27		66.7%	
Spring 2023 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
A	B	C	D	F	W
7.4%	25.9%	33.3%	22.2%	0.0%	11.1%

Table I-6o. MATH 1813 (Preparation for Calculus) Spring 2023 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates		
Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better)
Standard	20.5%	56.4%
Co-requisite	18.5%	60.0%

MATH 2144 Calculus I

Table I-6p. MATH 2144 (Calculus I) Fall 2022 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
Section Type		Enrollment		Success Rate (C or better)	
Standard		384		67.2%	
Co-requisite		27		85.2%	
Fall 2022 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
A	B	C	D	F	W
25.9%	29.6%	29.6%	0.0%	11.1%	3.7%

Table I-6q. MATH 2144 (Calculus I) Fall 2022 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates		
Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better)
Standard	12.2%	53.2%
Co-requisite	22.2%	100.0%

Table I-6r. MATH 2144 (Calculus I) Spring 2023 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
Section Type		Enrollment		Success Rate (C or better)	
Standard		310		64.8%	
Co-requisite		10		80.0%	
Spring 2023 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution (one I excluded)					
A	B	C	D	F	W
10.0%	30.0%	40.0%	10.0%	0.0%	10.0%

Table I-6s. MATH 2144 (Calculus I) Spring 2023 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates		
Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better)
Standard	13.5%	47.6%
Co-requisite	10.0%	100.0%

The data presented above shows, overall, an improvement over the data of the last appraisal period. With one exception, any decreases in success percentages were minor (on the order of 2 – 3 percent). The largest decrease was in the corequisite success rate for MATH 1483 in the Spring. However, upon comparing with the previous appraisal period, we see that the enrollment in the standard sections increased, whereas the enrollment in the corequisite sections decreased slightly. So we believe the change in the success rate can be largely attributed to more students testing into the standard sections rather than the corequisites. This could also be a consequence of Spring being the "off" semester, with a majority of the better-prepared students taking the course in the Fall. Indeed, the corequisite success rate for 1483 in the Fall showed a massive jump of just over 20%. Other corequisite sections also saw a large increase in success rates: Fall 1813 corequisite success rates jumped 15%, and both semesters' 2144 corequisite success rates climbed about 16%. Thus, we believe that we may be finally seeing some mitigation of the learning loss caused by the remote and hybrid modes of instruction during the COVID-19 pandemic. We therefore believe that the current ALEKS cutoff scores are working well in identifying the proper student cohorts for standard and corequisite sections of these four lower-division math courses.

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

- 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 was approved by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education in 2023.

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

The general education assessment process is organized by faculty on the Committee for the Assessment of General Education (CAGE) and facilitated by staff in University Assessment and Testing (UAT). Critical Thinking and Written Communication artifacts were reviewed by OSU faculty reviewers.

Three faculty reviewer positions were available in the assessment process: one for Critical Thinking assessment (146 artifacts) and two for Written Communication assessment (300 artifacts). One reviewer served for both Critical Thinking (146 artifacts) and Written Communication (150 artifacts) and one additional reviewer served for Written Communication (150 artifacts).

Critical Thinking and Written Communication were defined as:

- **Critical Thinking** is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.
- **Written Communication** is the development and expression of ideas in writing. Written communication involves learning to work in many genres and styles. It can involve working with many different writing technologies, and mixing texts, data, and images. Written communication abilities develop through iterative experiences across the curriculum.

In 2023, for the review of written communication and critical thinking artifacts, OSU used the newly developed OSU Written Communication and OSU Critical Thinking Rubrics. Artifacts rated with this rubric can receive ratings of '1' through '5' with '1' being beginner level and '5' being advanced. All general education assessment rubrics are posted on the UAT website: https://uat.okstate.edu/assessment/assessgenedrubrics.html

A call for student artifacts was sent to all instructors of courses identified as having some element of written communication or critical thinking; this was determined by examining the course content from the OSU Course Catalogue as well as targeting some Capstone and Senior courses and some courses with a General Education designation of 'D,' 'S,' 'H,' or 'I' since there are writing guidelines associated with these designations. Student artifacts were collected by UAT and compiled for review by the facilitator. University Assessment and Testing and the facilitator examined the assignment prompts and some of the artifacts to determine if they provided the opportunity to utilize either of the OSU rubrics used to rate the artifacts. Once the qualifying student artifacts were identified, the artifacts were anonymized and then provided to faculty raters. The distribution of artifacts submitted, rated, and used for analysis can be found in Tables II.1 through II.8.

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

Student artifacts are collected from instructors which stem from a course assignment. It is assumed that the students in class are sufficiently motivated to do well on the course assignment for the result of acquiring a satisfactory courses grade. However, 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. Additionally, the General Education Working Group (GEWG) is revising General Education at OSU with this consideration.

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

With the ongoing revision of General Education at OSU to further align with the new Strategic Plan, there is an expectation that assessment of General Education will need to be evaluated to determine its relevance and alignment with the modified General Education system.

Additionally, CAGE is discussing a method to assess more short-form artifacts of Written Communication, such as professional cover letters, memos, emails, etc. that is more representative of the writing tasks students will face within their careers. This new process will accompany the current method of assessing Written Communication and will be established before the next cycle in 2027.

Analyses and Findings

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

Written Communication – Student Artifact Review

In the assessment of written communication artifacts, five categories of the OSU Written Communication Rubric and the overall student ratings were assessed. The five categories were:

A. Context of and Purpose for Writing
B. Content Development
C. Organization
D. Style and Mechanics
E. Sources and Evidence

- Overall, 82.6% of the student artifacts were rated as '3,' '4,' or '5' (n = 248). In other words, the majority of students **met or exceeded expectations** in written communication artifacts.
- Below are the results for each rubric category:

A. Context of and Purpose for Writing:
89.4% of the students' artifacts were rated as '3,' '4,' or '5' (n = 268).
B. Content Development:
77.3% of the students' artifacts were rated as '3,' '4,' or '5' (n = 232).
C. Organization:
76.4% of the students' artifacts were rated as '3,' '4,' or '5' (n = 229).
D. Style and Mechanics:
78.4% of the students' artifacts were rated as '3,' '4,' or '5' (n = 235).
E. Sources and Evidence:
86.6% of the students' artifacts were rated as '3,' '4,' or '5' (n = 259).

Analysis tables follow.

Table 1. *Written Communication Artifact Distribution*

College [1]	Course Prefix and Number	Course Name	General Education Designation (if any)[2]	Number of Artifacts Submitted[3]	Number of Artifacts Rated	Number of Artifacts Included in Analysis
AG	AGCM 3203	Oral Communications in Agricultural Sciences & Natural Resources	S	98	97	97
CAS	ENGL 3453	History of American Film	H	9	9	9
CEAT	ARCH 4173	History and Theory of Skyscraper Design	H	21	21	21
CEHS	HLTH 3113	Health Issues in Diverse Populations	D	23	23	23
SSB	MGMT 3013	Fundamentals of Management	S	687	150	150
Total Number of Written Communication Artifacts:				**838**	**300**	**300**

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

[2] Designations: D= Diversity, H = Humanities, S = Social and Behavioral Sciences

[3] Although many artifacts were submitted, not all could be used for rating because they did not align with the rubric. In the case of MGMT, 150 artifacts were randomly selected across all sections.

Table 2. *Student Demographics Associated with Participation in Written Communication Assessment*

Demographic Variable	Levels	Number of Artifacts (% of Total)
Class	Freshman	19 (6.3)
	Sophomore	103 (34.3)
	Junior	88 (29.3)
	Senior	90 (30.0)
	Total	*n =300*
College[4]	AG	99 (33.0)
	CAS	35 (11.7)
	CEAT	24 (8.0)
	CEHS	24 (8.0)
	PS	1 (0.3)
	SSB	115 (38.3)
	UC	2 (0.7)
	Total	*n =300*
Gender	Female	146 (48.7)
	Male	154 (51.3)
	Total	*n =300*
OSU GPA	< 2.0	2 (0.7)
	2.0 to 2.49	20 (6.7)
	2.50 to 2.99	69 (23.0)
	3.00 to 3.49	101 (33.7)
	3.50 to 4.00	108 (36.0)
	Total	*n =300*

[4] Colleges: AG = Ferguson College of Agriculture; CAS = College of Art and Sciences; CEAT = College of Engineering Architecture and Technology; CEHS = College of Education and Human Sciences; PS = College of Professional Studies; SSB = Spears School of Business; UC = University College.

Table 3. *Written Communication Artifact Score Distribution*[5]

	SCORE: *n* (%)					
	1	2	3	4	*5*	*n*
Class						
Freshman	1 (5.6)	1 (5.6)	8 (44.4)	7 (38.9)	1 (5.6)	18
Sophomore	0 (0.0)	15 (17.0)	35 (39.8)	38 (43.2)	0 (0.0)	88
Junior	2 (1.9)	18 (17.5)	42 (40.8)	38 (36.9)	3 (2.9)	103
Senior	3 (3.3)	11 (12.2)	30 (33.3)	41 (45.6)	5 (5.6)	90
College[6]						
AG	1 (1.0)	15 (15.2)	42 (42.4)	41 (41.4)	0 (0.0)	99
CAS	2 (5.7)	8 (22.9)	15 (42.9)	9 (25.7)	1 (2.9)	35
CEAT	0 (0.0)	1 (4.2)	8 (33.3)	12 (50.0)	3 (12.5)	24
CEHS	0 (0.0)	1 (4.2)	8 (33.3)	13 (54.2)	2 (8.3)	24
PS	0 (0.0)	1 (100)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1
SSB	3 (2.6)	19 (16.5)	42 (36.5)	48 (41.7)	3 (2.6)	115
UC	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100)	0 (0.0)	1
Gender						
Female	2 (1.4)	21 (14.5)	54 (37.2)	64 (44.1)	4 (2.8)	145
Male	4 (2.6)	24 (15.6)	61 (39.6)	60 (39.0)	5 (3.2)	154
Overall	6 (2.0)	45 (15.0)	115 (38.5)	124 (41.5)	9 (3.0)	299

Table 4. *Written Communication Artifact Scores by Rubric Category*

	SCORE: *n* (%)					
	1	2	3	4	5	*n*
A[7]	2 (0.7%)	30 (10.0%)	122 (40.7%)	131 (43.7%)	15 (5.0%)	300
B	10 (3.3%)	58 (19.3%)	124 (41.3%)	94 (31.3%)	14 (4.7%)	300
C	4 (1.3%)	67 (22.3%)	128 (42.7%)	89 (29.7%)	12 (4.0%)	300
D	14 (4.7%)	51 (17.0%)	129 (43.0%)	101 (33.7%)	5 (1.7%)	300
E[8]	9 (3.0%)	31 (10.4%)	73 (24.4%)	139 (46.5%)	47 (15.7%)	299
Overall	7 (2.3%)	45 (15.0%)	115 (38.3%)	124 (41.3%)	9 (3.0%)	300

[5] Demographic Information from one student was missing so it was not included in the analysis.

[6] Colleges: AG = Ferguson College of Agriculture; CAS = College of Arts and Sciences; CEAT = College of Engineering Architecture and Technology; CEHS = College of Education and Human Sciences; PS = Political Sciences; SSB = Spears School of Business; UC = University College.

[7] A = Context of and Purpose for Writing; B = Content Development; C = Organization D = Style and Mechanics; E = Sources and Evidence; F = Overall

[8] One artifact was not included in the results in E due to an erroneous rating.

Critical Thinking – Student Artifact Review

In the assessment of critical thinking artifacts, five categories of the OSU Critical Thinking Rubric and the overall student ratings were assessed. The five categories were:

A. Explanation of issues and/or summary of problem/question
B. Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis)
C. Use and assessment of supporting evidence
D. Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences)
E. Assessment of the key assumptions and consideration of the influence of context

- Overall, 61.27% of the student artifacts were rated as '3,' '4,' or '5' (n = 87). In other words, the majority of students **met or exceeded expectations** in critical thinking artifacts.
- Below are the results for each rubric category:

  A. Explanation of issues and/or summary of problem/question:
  81.6% of the students' artifacts were rated as '3,' '4,' or '5' (n = 116).
  B. Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis):
  63.3% of the students' artifacts were rated as '3,' '4,' or '5' (n = 90).
  C. Use and assessment of supporting evidence:
  69.0% of the students' artifacts were rated as '3,' '4,' or '5' (n = 98).
  D. Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences):
  54.2% of the students' artifacts were rated as '3,' '4,' or '5' (n = 77).
  E. Assessment of the key assumptions and consideration of the influence of context:
  54.9% of the students' artifacts were rated as '3,' '4,' or '5' (n = 78).

Analysis tables follow.

Table 5. *Critical Thinking Artifact Distribution*

College[9]	Course Prefix and Number	Course Name	General Education Designation (if any)[10]	Number of Artifacts Submitted [11]	Number of Artifacts Rated[12]	Number of Artifacts Included in Analysis
AG	AGCM 3203	Oral Communications in Agricultural Sciences & Natural Resources	S	98	93	93
CAS	ENGL 3453	History of American Film	H	9	7	6
CEAT	ARCH 4173	History and Theory of Skyscraper Design	H	21	21	21
CEHS	HLTH 3113	Health Issues in Diverse Populations	D	23	23	22
Total Number of Critical Thinking Artifacts:				**151**	**144**	**142**

[9] Colleges: Colleges: AG = Ferguson College of Agriculture; CAS = College of Arts and Sciences; CEAT = College of Engineering Architecture and Technology; CEHS = College of Education and Human Sciences.

[10] Designations: D= Diversity, H = Humanities, S = Social and Behavioral Sciences.

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

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

Table 6. *Student Demographics Associated with Participation in Critical Thinking Assessment*

Demographic Variable	Levels	Number of Artifacts (% of Total)
Class	Freshman	15 (10.6)
	Sophomore	37 (26.1)
	Junior	51 (35.9)
	Senior	39 (27.5_
	Total	*n =142*
	AG	83 (58.5)
	CAS	21 (14.8)
	CEAT	22 (15.5)
	CEHS	12 (8.5)
	SSB	3 (2.1)
	UC	1 (0.7)
	Total	*n =142*
Gender	Female	80 (56.3)
	Male	62 (43.7)
	Total	*n = 142*
OSU GPA	< 2.0	1 (0.7)
	2.0 to 2.49	12 (8.5)
	2.50 to 2.99	23 (16.2)
	3.00 to 3.49	53 (37.3)
	3.50 to 4.00	53 (37.3)
	Total	*n = 142*

Table 7. *Critical Thinking Artifact Score Distribution*

	SCORE: *n* (%)					
	1	2	3	4	*5*	*n*
Class						
Freshman	0 (0.0)	5 (33.3)	6 (40.0)	3 (20.0)	1 (6.7)	15
Sophomore	9 (17.6)	14 (27.5)	13 (25.5)	12 (23.5)	3 (5.9)	51
Junior	1 (2.7)	13 (35.1)	13 (35.1)	9 (24.3)	1 (2.7)	37
Senior	3 (7.7)	10 (25.6)	10 (25.6)	15 (38.5)	1 (2.6)	39
College[13]						
AG	11 (13.3)	28 (33.7)	21 (25.3)	19 (22.9)	4 (4.8)	83
CAS	0)0.0)	8 (38.1)	5 (23.8)	8 (38.1)	0 (0.0)	21
CEAT	0 (0.0)	5 (22.7)	11 (50.0)	5 (22.7)	1 (4.5)	22
CEHS	2 (16.7)	0 (0.0)	5 (41.7)	4 (33.3)	1 (8.3)	12
SSB	0 (0.0)	1 (33.3)	0 (0.0)	2 (66.7)	0 (0.0)	3
UC	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (100)	0 (0.0)	1
Gender						
Female	6 (7.5)	24 (30.0)	26 (32.5)	23 (28.7)	1 (1.3)	80
Male	7 (11.3)	18 (29.0)	16 (25.8)	16 (25.8)	5 (8.1)	62
Overall	13 (9.1)	42 (29.6)	42 (29.6)	39 (27.5)	6 (4.2)	142

Table 8. *Critical Thinking Artifact Scores by Rubric Category*

	SCORE: *n* (%)					
	1	2	3	4	5	*n*
A[14]	2 (1.4%)	24 (16.9%)	59 (41.5%)	51 (35.9%)	6 (4.2%)	142
B	14 (9.9%)	38 (26.8%)	47 (33.1%)	33 (23.2%)	10 (7.0%)	142
C	1 (0.7%)	43 (30.3%)	51 (35.9%)	41 (28.9%)	6 (4.2%)	142
D	27 (19.0%)	38 (26.8%)	38 (26.8%)	34 (23.9%)	5 (3.5%)	142
E	16 (11.3%)	48 (33.8%)	50 (35.2%)	25 (17.6%)	3 (2.1%)	142
Overall	13 (9.2%)	42 (29.6%)	42 (29.6%)	39 (27.5%)	6 (4.2%)	142

[13] Colleges: Colleges: AG = Ferguson College of Agriculture; CAS = College of Arts and Sciences; CEAT = College of Engineering Architecture and Technology; CEHS = College of Education and Human Science; SSB = Spears School of Business; UC = University College.

[14] A = Explanation of issues and/or summary of the problem/question; B = Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis); C = Use of assessment of supporting evidence; D = Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences); E = Assessment of the key assumptions and consideration of the influence of context; F = Overall

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

Student performance cannot currently be tracked based on student artifact ratings because different rubrics have been used, making comparison inadvisable. However, CAGE collaborated in meetings to develop the OSU Written Communication Rubric and the OSU Critical Thinking Rubric which is planned to be used during the next written communication and critical thinking assessment cycle in 2027, ideally, making student performance tracking across years possible.

Examining wholistic results, conclusions could be drawn, across the years, that students tend to score sufficiently well in written communication and critical thinking, and somewhat better in written communication. This is one of the reasons why we are looking to adjust the method for assessing written communication in order to explore how students are doing in a more short-form of written communication.

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

- Due to the institutional adjustments to General Education at OSU to further align with the new Strategic Plan, there is an expectation that assessment of General Education will need to be evaluated to determine its relevance and alignment with the modified General Education system.
- The CAGE is discussing a method to assess more short-form artifacts of Written Communication, such as professional cover letters, memos, emails, etc. that is more representative of the writing tasks students will face within their careers. This new process will accompany the current method of assessing Written Communication and will be established before the next cycle in 2027.
- 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 Written Communication and OSU Critical Thinking rubrics.

- General Education assessment for each cycle will continue to be streamlined and will continue to integrate general education information into 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 (19.3%),
    - Survey (11.4%),
    - Oral Presentation (8.6%),
    - Review of Thesis, Dissertation, or Creative Component (7.5%),
    - Capstone Assignment (6.7%),
    - Rating of Skills (6.4%),
    - Course Exam(s) (6.1%),
    - Other (5.5%),
    - Course Embedded Assignments (4.7%),
    - Course Project (3.4%),
    - Projects & Assignments (3.1%),
    - Presentation/Performance (3.0%),
    - Portfolio Review (2.7%),
    - Review of Student Research (2.5%),
    - Performance or Jury (2.0%),
    - Internship (1.8%),
    - Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) (1.5%),
    - Supervisor Evaluation (1.4%),
    - Interviews (1.2%),
    - Group Project (0.9%), and
    - Nationally Benchmarked Exam (0.2%).

- 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[15]

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	178	134	32
Agricultural Communications	BSAG	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Presentation/ Performance	Analysis of Written Artifacts	45	28	37
Agricultural Communications	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Student Research	4	4	4
Agricultural Economics	BSAG	Course Embedded Assignments	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Course Embedded Assignments	178	4	5
Agricultural Economics	MS	Course Embedded Assignments	Presentation/ Performance	Interviews	14	6	6
Agricultural Economics	PhD	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Oral Presentation	9	12	9
Agricultural Education	BSAG	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	33	36	8
Agricultural Education	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Student Research	2	2	2
Agricultural Education	PhD	Oral Presentation	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Student Research	6	6	6
Agricultural Leadership	BSAG	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Other	Analysis of Written Artifacts	28	12	28
Animal Science	BSAG	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	167	255	255

[15] 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	Survey	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	6	6	6
Animal Science	PhD	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	5	5	5
Biochemistry & MolecularBiology	BSAG	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Course Project	172	70	25
Biochemistry & MolecularBiology	MS	Presentation/ Performance	Review of Student Research	-	3	3	-
Biochemistry & Molecular Biology	PhD	Presentation/ Performance	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Interviews	16	4	16
Biosystems Engineering	BSBE	Other	Comprehensive, Certificate, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certificate, or Professional Exam(s)	12	11	11
Biosystems Engineering	MS	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Supervisor Evaluation	4	2	4
Biosystems Engineering	PhD	Comprehensive, Certificate, or Professional Exam(s)	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Supervisor Evaluation	4	7	4
Crop Science	PhD	No Report Submitted – Low Student Enrollment					
Entomology	BSAG	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	9	12	42

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Entomology	PhD	Oral Presentation	Rating of Skills	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	1	2	2
Entomology & Plant Pathology	MS	Oral Presentation	Oral Presentation	Analysis of Written Artifacts	7	7	5
Environmental Science	BSAG	Capstone Assignment	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Project & Assignments	16	16	20
Food Science	BSAG	No Report Submitted – Low Student Enrollment					
Food Science	MS	Survey	Survey	Survey	3	3	3
Food Science	PhD	Review of Student Research	Survey	Survey	1	2	2
General Agriculture: Agricultural Leadership	MAG	No Report Submitted – Low Student Enrollment					
Horticulture	BSAG	Internship	Internship	Internship	19	19	19
Horticulture	MS	Rating of Skills	Rating of Skills	Group Project	14	14	18
International Agriculture	MAG	Oral Presentation	Oral Presentation	Project & Assignments	12	12	12
International Agriculture	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	Other	12	12	14
Landscape Architecture	BLA	Rating of Skills	Rating of Skills	Rating of Skills	25	25	25

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Natural Resource Ecology & Management	BSAG	Oral Presentation	Project & Assignments	Project & Assignments	44	68	72
Natural Resource Ecology & Management	MS	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Analysis of Written Artifacts	7	7	7
Natural Resource Ecology & Management	PhD	No Report Submitted – Low Student Enrollment					
Plant & Soil Sciences	BSAG	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Rating of Skills	18	18	6
Plant & Soil Sciences	MS	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Rating of Skills	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	10	10	10
Plant Pathology	PhD	No Report Submitted – Low Student Enrollment					
Soil Sciences	PhD	No Report Submitted – Low Student Enrollment					

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 Sign Language	BA	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Embedded Assignments	No Data Submitted		
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 Student Enrollment					
Applied Statistics	MS	Course Exam(s)	Course Exam(s)	Course Embedded Assignments	1	7	12
Art: Art History	BA	Oral Presentation	Capstone Assignment	Oral Presentation	3	3	3
Art: Graphic Design	BFA	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	29	29	29
Art: Studio Art	BA	Portfolio Review	Portfolio Review	Analysis of Written Artifacts	7	7	7
Art: Studio Art	BFA	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	4	4	4
Art History	MA	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	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	-	-	48	-	-
Biological Science	BS	Other	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Other	No Data Submitted		
Chemistry	MS	No Report Submitted					

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Chemistry	PhD			No Report Submitted			
Chemistry: ACS Approved	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts		No Data Submitted	
Chemistry: Departmental Degree	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts		No Data Submitted	
Communication Science & Disorders	BS	Course Exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	328	59	59
Communication Science & Disorders	MS	Nationally Benchmarked Exam	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	15	40	40
Computer Science	BS	Course Embedded Assignments	Presentation/ Performance	Course Exam(s)	73	77	77
Computer Science	MS			No Report Submitted			
Computer Science	PhD			No Report Submitted			
Creative Writing	MFA	Supervisor Evaluation	Rating of Skills	Survey	4	4	36
Economics	BA	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Survey	Analysis of Written Artifacts		No Data Submitted	
Economics	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Capstone Assignment	Analysis of Written Artifacts	7	0	7
English	BA	Other	Other	Survey	15	15	8
English	MA	Rating of Skills	Supervisor Evaluation	Survey	1	2	36
English	PhD	Other	Rating of Skills	Survey	23	23	36

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
French	BA	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Embedded Assignments	37	36	31
Geography	BA	Course Embedded Assignments	Rating of Skills	Oral Presentation	0	0	0
Geography	BS	Rating of Skills	Other	Other	8	1	7
Geography	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	Course Embedded Assignments	7	5	6
Geography	PhD	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	Course Embedded Assignments	8	5	4
Geology	BS	No Report Submitted					
Geology	MS	Survey	Oral Presentation	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	13	13	13
Geology	PhD	Survey	Survey	Review of Student Research	5	5	5
Geospatial Information Sciences	BS	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Embedded Assignments	Portfolio Review	8	19	0
German	BA	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Embedded Assignments	39	39	39
Global Studies	BA	Rating of Skills	Rating of Skills	Rating of Skills	15	14	11
Graphic Design	MFA	Portfolio Review	Portfolio Review	Portfolio Review	3	3	3
History	BA	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	10	10	10
History	PhD	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	5	5	5
History: 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	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	Other	3	4	7
Integrative Biology	PhD	Comprehensive Exam	Oral Presentation	Other	1	2	2
Mass Communication	MS	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	15	13	13
Mathematics	BA	No Report Submitted					
Mathematics	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	4	19	19
Mathematics	MS	No Report Submitted					
Mathematics	PhD	Course Exam(s)	Other	Project & Assignments	No Data Submitted		
Medicinal and Biophysical Chemistry	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	No Data Submitted		
Microbiology/ Cell & Molecular Biology	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Course Project	Course Embedded Assignments	60	10	18
Microbiology/ Cell & Molecular Biology	MS	No Report Submitted					
Microbiology/ Cell & Molecular Biology	PhD	No Report Submitted					
Multidisciplinary Studies	BA	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Capstone Assignment	6	6	6
Multidisciplinary Studies	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	1	1	1

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Multimedia Journalism	BA	Supervisor Evaluation	Portfolio Review	Survey	No Data Submitted		
Multimedia Journalism	BS	Supervisor Evaluation	Portfolio Review	Survey	No Data Submitted		
Music	BA	Course Exam(s)	Performance or Jury	Performance or Jury	4	4	4
Music	BM	Course Exam(s)	Performance or Jury	Performance or Jury	11	11	11
Music	MM	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Oral Presentation	-	2	10	-
Music Education	BM	Portfolio Review	Internship	Certification Exam(s)	16	16	16
Music Industry	BS	Course Exam(s)	Course Exam(s)	Internship	7	7	7
Philosophy	BA	Analysis of Written Artifacts	-	-	44	-	-
Philosophy	MA	Analysis of Written Artifacts	-	-	2	-	-
Photonics	PhD	Course Exam(s)	Rating of Skills	Rating of Skills	2	3	3
Physics	BS	Other	Course Exam(s)	Other	40	68	19
Physics	MS	Rating of Skills	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Student Research	6	14	4
Physics	PhD	Rating of Skills	Rating of Skills	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	6	7	9
Physiology	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Other	Other	No Data Submitted		
Plant Biology	BS	Course Exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	17	9	3

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Plant Biology	MS	Rating of Skills	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Oral Presentation	5	3	5
Plant Biology	PhD	Rating of Skills	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Rating of Skills	2	2	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	10	10
Psychology	BA	Course Exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	850	49	49
Psychology	BS	Course Exam(s)	Course Exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	850	188	49
Psychology	MS	Portfolio Review	Portfolio Review	-	23	23	-
Psychology	PhD	Portfolio Review	Portfolio Review	-	56	56	-
Sociology	BA	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	2	2	1
Sociology	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	20	20	6
Sociology	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	8	8	8
Sociology	PhD	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	4	4	4
Spanish	BA	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Other	Other	371	371	371

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Sports Media	BA	Supervisor Evaluation	Portfolio Review	Survey	No Data Submitted		
Sports Media	BS	Supervisor Evaluation	Portfolio Review	Survey	No Data Submitted		
Statistics	BS	Course Exam(s)	Course Exam(s)	Capstone Assignment	8	10	6
Statistics	MS	Course Exam(s)	Course Exam(s)	Oral Presentation	2	9	0
Statistics	PhD	Course Exam(s)	Course Exam(s)	Oral Presentation	2	9	0
Strategic Communication	BA	Supervisor Evaluation	Portfolio Review	Survey	No Data Submitted		
Strategic Communication	BS	Supervisor Evaluation	Portfolio Review	Survey	No Data Submitted		
Theatre	BA	Other	Project & Assignments	Portfolio Review	54	4	7
Zoology	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Other	Other	No Data Submitted		

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	Course Exam(s)	Course Project	Project & Assignments	49	45	44
Applied Educational Studies: Aviation and Space	EDD	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	Analysis of Written Artifacts	15	6	13
Applied Exercise Sciences	BS	Internship	Course Exam(s)	Internship	No Data Submitted		
Aviation and Space	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	18	18	17
Counseling	MS	Rating of Skills	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Survey	138	27	132
Design, Housing and Merchandising	BSHS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Performance or Jury	Analysis of Written Artifacts	43	56	65
Design, Housing and Merchandising	MS	No Report Submitted – Alternative Assessment Schedule Congruent with Great Plains IDEA					
Early Child Care and Development	BSHS	No Report Submitted – Alternative Assessment Schedule Congruent with Great Plains IDEA					
Education: School Psychology	EDS	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Portfolio Review	-	3	3	-
Educational Leadership & Policy Studies: Educational Administration	PhD	No Report Submitted – Alternative Assessment Plan Congruent with External Accreditation					

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Educational Leadership & Policy Studies: Higher Education	PhD	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Rating of Skills	Analysis of Written Artifacts	4	4	4
Educational Leadership Studies: College Student Development	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Rating of Skills	Course Project	7	7	7
Educational Leadership Studies: Higher Education	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Rating of Skills	Course Project	2	2	2
Educational Leadership Studies: School Administration	MS	No Report Submitted – Alternative Assessment Plan Congruent with External Accreditation					
Educational Psychology: Educational Psychology	MS	Other	Other	Survey	8	8	8
Educational Psychology: Educational Psychology	PhD	Survey	Other	Other	19	19	19
Educational Psychology: Research and Evaluation	MS	Course Project	Course Project	Course Exam(s)	175	69	157
Educational Psychology: Research and Evaluation	PhD	Course Project	Course Project	Course Exam(s)	18	67	38

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	Other	8	8	8
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	No Report Submitted					
Health, Leisure & Human Performance: Health & Human Performance	PhD	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Other	Other	No Data Submitted		
Health, Leisure & Human Performance: Leisure Studies	PhD	Performance or Jury	Capstone Assignment	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	6	6	6
Human Development and Family Science	BSHS	Survey	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Survey	82	65	82
Human Development and Family Science	MS	Other	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	19	19	19
Human Sciences: Design, Housing and Merchandising	PhD	No Report Submitted					
Human Sciences: Human Development and Family Science	PhD	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	0	7	0

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Leisure Studies	MS	Other	Performance or Jury	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	5	13	15
Nursing	BSN	Project & Assignments	Presentation/ Performance	Course Embedded Assignments	26	20	20
Nutritional Sciences	BSHS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Project & Assignments	Group Project	55	86	43
Nutritional Sciences	MS	Oral Presentation	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Nationally Benchmarked Exam	17	17	12
Nutritional Sciences	PhD	Oral Presentation	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Other	6	6	2
Recreational Therapy	BS	Rating of Skills	Rating of Skills	Survey	36	37	25
Recreation and Athletics Management	BS	No Report Submitted – New Program					
School Administration	EDD	No Report Submitted – Alternative Assessment Plan Congruent with External Accreditation					
Social Foundations of Education	MA	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Other	Analysis of Written Artifacts	3	3	3
Counseling Psychology	PhD	Course Exam(s)	Other	Survey	7	16	38
Curriculum Studies	PhD	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Other	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	7	4	3
Education	PhD	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Review of Student Research	-	9	9	-
Education: Educational Administration	EDS	No Report Submitted – Alternative Assessment Plan Congruent with External Accreditation					

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Elementary Education	BS	No Report Submitted – Alternative Assessment Plan Congruent with External Accreditation					
Public Health	BS	Course Embedded Assignments	Oral Presentation	Project & Assignments	76	13	38
School Psychology	PhD	No Report Submitted – Alternative Assessment Plan Congruent with External Accreditation					
Secondary Education	BS	No Report Submitted – Alternative Assessment Plan Congruent with External Accreditation					
Teaching, Learning and Leadership	MS	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	15	15	15

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	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	73	73	73
Architectural Engineering	BEN	Capstone Assignment	Course Project	Course Project	29	29	29
Architecture	BAR	Performance or Jury	Performance or Jury	Performance or Jury	41	41	41
Chemical Engineering	BSCH	Survey	Course Project	Course Embedded Assignments	43	46	43
Chemical Engineering	MS			No Report Submitted			
Chemical Engineering	PhD	Performance or Jury	Interviews	Oral Presentation	11	2	7
Civil Engineering	BSCV			No Report Submitted			
Civil Engineering	MS	Review of Student Research	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Presentation/ Performance	14	14	14
Civil Engineering	PhD	Rating of Skills	Review of Student Research	Presentation/ Performance	5	5	5
Computer Engineering	BSCP	Course Exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	14	12	14
Construction Engineering Technology	BSET	Internship	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Internship	31	47	31
Electrical Engineering	BSEE	Course Exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	19	22	21
Electrical Engineering	ME	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Survey	1	1	124
Electrical Engineering	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Survey	2	2	124

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Electrical Engineering	PhD	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Survey	10	10	124
Electrical Engineering Technology	BSET	Course Embedded Assignments	Capstone Assignment	Course Embedded Assignments	61	11	9
Engineering and Technology Management	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Course Embedded Assignments	Review of Student Research	9	9	9
Fire & Emergency Management	PhD	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Course Exam(s)	6	6	6
Fire & Emergency Management Administration	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	7	7	7
Fire Protection & Safety Engineering Technology	BSET	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	65	65	57
Fire Safety & Explosion Protection	MSET	Course Exam(s)	Course Exam(s)	Capstone Assignment	9	7	2
Industrial Engineering & Management	BSIE	Survey	Course Embedded Assignments	Survey	14	14	14
Industrial Engineering & Management	MS	Survey	Survey	Survey	8	8	8
Industrial Engineering & Management	PhD	Survey	Survey	Survey	2	2	2
Materials Science and Engineering	MS	Oral Presentation	Oral Presentation	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	6	6	6

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	Oral Presentation	1	1	1
Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering	MS	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	23	23	23
Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering	PhD	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	6	6	6
Mechanical Engineering	BSME	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	135	135	135
Mechanical Engineering Technology	BSET	Course Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Capstone Assignment	11	24	29
Mechatronics and Robotics	BSET	No Report Submitted – New Program					
Mechatronics and Robotics	MSET	No Report Submitted – New Program					
Petroleum Engineering	MS	Rating of Skills	Course Project	Presentation/ Performance	5	5	5
Petroleum Engineering	PhD	Rating of Skills	Oral Presentation	Oral Presentation	5	2	5

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)	Survey	330	154	112
Accounting	MS	Course Exam(s)	Course Embedded Assignments	Survey	46	45	34
Business Administration	MBA	Presentation/ Performance	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Exam(s)	56	54	54
Business Administration	PhD	Performance or Jury	Presentation/ Performance	Survey	7	11	6
Business Administration: Accounting	PhD	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Review of Student Research	Oral Presentation	3	2	2
Business Administration: Entrepreneurship	PhD	Performance or Jury	Performance or Jury	Survey	7	11	6
Business Administration: Executive Research	PhD	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Student Research	Survey	14	19	6
Business Administration: Finance	PhD	Performance or Jury	Presentation/ Performance	Survey	7	11	6
Business Administration: Hospitality and Tourism Management	PhD	Performance or Jury	Presentation/ Performance	Survey	7	11	6
Business Administration: Management	PhD	Performance or Jury	Presentation/ Performance	Survey	7	11	6

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Business Administration: Management Information Systems	PhD	Performance or Jury	Presentation/ Performance	Survey	7	11	6
Business Administration: Marketing	PhD	Performance or Jury	Presentation/ Performance	Survey	7	11	6
Business Analytics and Data Science	MS	Course Exam(s)	Survey	Project & Assignments	60	21	49
Economics	BSBA	Survey	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	799	199	324
Economics	PhD	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	Survey	6	6	4
Entrepreneurship	BSBA	Survey	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	799	199	324
Finance	BSBA	Survey	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	799	199	324
General Business	BSBA	Survey	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	799	199	324
Hospitality and Tourism Management	BSBA	Survey	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	799	199	324
Hospitality and Tourism Management	MS	Oral Presentation	Survey	Analysis of Written Artifacts	29	4	34
International Business	BSBA	Survey	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	799	199	324
Management	BSBA	Survey	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	799	199	324

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Management Information Systems	BSBA	Survey	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	799	199	324
Management Information Systems	MS	No Report Submitted – Restructuring Assessment Plan					
Marketing	BSBA	Survey	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	799	199	324
Quantitative Financial Economics	MS	Oral Presentation	Survey	-	4	3	-

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			No Report Submitted			
Environmental Science	PhD			No Report Submitted			
Interdisciplinary Studies	MS	Group Project	Portfolio Review	Capstone Assignment	4	4	4
Public Health	MPH	Project & Assignments	Group Project	Internship	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	Internship	Internship	6	6	6

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	Survey	94	94	94

Table III.9. Program Outcomes Assessment: College of Veterinary Medicine

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Comparative Biomedical Sciences	MS	Course Exam(s)	Project & Assignments	Oral Presentation	6	2	6
Comparative Biomedical Sciences	PhD	Course Exam(s)	Project & Assignments	Oral Presentation	9	10	16

Analyses and Findings

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

University Assessment and Testing has received 217 (87.9%) 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 a five-point annual review rubric. The 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: 1.7% of programs received purple; 8.3% of programs received blue; 37.7% of programs received green; 27.9% received yellow; 5.7% received orange; 7.8% of programs received red; and 10.9% of programs received gray.

The following table provides a longitudinal comparison of Program Outcomes Assessment scores over the last three years.

Table III.9. Institutional POA Summary – Three Year Comparison

		2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023
	Total programs[16]	247	247	247
	Completed reports	217 (87.9%)	222 (89.9%)	217 (87.9%)
Overall				
	GEE	3.0%	4.0%	1.7%
	EE	13.4%	12.1%	8.3%
	ME	40.6%	33.9%	37.7%
	SME	24.8%	31.3%	27.9%
	MME	5.9%	5.3%	5.7%
	MI	9.6%	6.2%	7.8%
	NA	2.8%	7.2%	10.9%
SLOs				
	GEE	2.8%	1.2%	0.4%
	EE	18.6%	19.4%	13.0%
	ME	39.7%	44.1%	57.5%
	SME	28.3%	22.7%	12.6%
	MME	2.8%	1.2%	2.0%
	MI	6.5%	5.7%	4.0%
	NA	1.2%	5.7%	10.5%
Methods				
	GEE	1.2%	1.2%	0.0%
	EE	17.8%	11.3%	8.5%
	ME	43.3%	42.1%	48.2%
	SME	22.7%	29.1%	24.3%
	MME	7.3%	4.9%	3.6%
	MI	6.5%	5.7%	4.9%
	NA	1.2%	5.7%	10.5%
Findings				
	GEE	6.9%	6.1%	0.0%
	EE	11.3%	12.1%	11.3%
	ME	37.3%	27.1%	21.1%
	SME	21.1%	36.0%	36.4%
	MME	8.5%	3.6%	8.5%
	MI	10.9%	6.5%	11.3%
	NA	4.1%	8.5%	11.3%
Use of Findings				
	GEE	2.4%	6.1%	4.0%
	EE	7.3%	7.7%	4.5%
	ME	30.4%	22.7%	26.7%
	SME	33.6%	37.2%	31.6%
	MME	8.1%	10.5%	10.5%
	MI	13.4%	6.9%	11.3%
	NA	4.9%	8.9%	11.3%

[16] Certificates were excluded from the counts due to the ongoing work on building a certificate-based assessment process.

III-3. What instructional changes occurred or are planned in the programs in response to program outcomes assessment?

- Findings of the program outcomes assessment report review will be presented to AAIC during the December meeting. UAT and AAIC will discuss the best approach to disseminate the outcomes of the review information.
- All relevant stakeholders of the program outcomes assessment (such as college deans, associate and assistant deans, chairs, directors, program assessment coordinators, etc.) will be informed of the results.
- In Spring 2023, UAT began working with programs that needed 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 has begun collaborating 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 2024, 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.
- Beginning in Fall of 2022, UAT began meeting with each of the 300 academic programs in one-on-one meetings to discuss their individual challenges with assessment and provide any support needed. After the conclusion of the 2022-2023 review process, UAT will continue to meet with these program coordinators. All programs will have been contacted by the end of Summer 2024.

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 Satisfaction and Engagement Survey (OSU-SSES) was developed in Fall 2022 in order to measure concepts regarding satisfaction with OSU academics and services and overall engagement in various activities. The survey instrument was created through a combination of the previously established OSU Student Engagement Survey and OSU Student Satisfaction Survey. Each of these surveys were validated over three-year administration periods prior to their condensing into the new OSU-SSES.

In the following sections, we will present information and results for the most recent Spring 2023 administration of the SSES.

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 2023 administration of the Student Satisfaction and Engagement Survey (SSES) was the pilot administration of the newly developed survey.
- The survey was administered online using Qualtrics online survey software. The SSES consisted of 30 five-point Likert scale items, four three-point Likert scale items, and one open-ended item designed to measure concepts regarding overall OSU student satisfaction and engagement through five themes: Academic Satisfaction, Connection to OSU, Academic Effort, Interaction, Higher Order Learning, and Involvement.
-

Analyses and Findings

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

Data collection yielded 5,740 (25.8%) total responses; after data collection procedures, there were 5,566 (25.0%) valid responses in the final data set.

- Response Rates
    - College
        - College of Arts and Sciences: 24.0% (*n* = 1,357/5,664)
        - College of Education and Human Sciences: 27.1% (*n* = 1,025/3,785)
        - College of Engineering, Architecture and Technology: 25.1% (*n* = 832/3,316)
        - College of Professional Studies: 23.1% (*n* = 3/13)
        - Ferguson College of Agriculture: 30.9% (*n* = 872/2,826)
        - Global Studies: 51.9% (*n* = 14/27)
        - Spears School of Business: 23.3% (*n* = 1,246/5,359)
        - University College: 12.8% (*n* = 120/940)

  - Classification
    - Undergraduate: 23.0% (*n* = 4,251/18,509)
    - Graduate: 35.2% (*n* = 1,314/3,731)

- Demographic Variables
  - Campus[17]
    - Stillwater: 89.6% (*n* = 4,968)
    - Stillwater/Tulsa: 8.3% (*n* = 461)
    - Tulsa: 2.1% (*n* = 114)
  - Gender
    - Female: 62.5% (*n* = 3,481)
    - Male: 37.5% (*n* = 2,085)
  - Race, Nationality, and Ethnicity
    - White or European American: 61.9% (*n* = 3,446)
    - International: 10.0% (*n* = 559)
    - Multiracial: 9.5% (*n* = 529)
    - Hispanic, Latin(a/o), or Latinx: 8.6% (*n* = 476)
    - Native American or Alaska Native: 3.7% (*n* = 205)
    - Black or African American: 3.4% (*n* = 189)
    - Asian or Asian American: 2.7% (*n* = 150)
    - Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander: 0.1% (*n* = 7)
    - Unknown: 0.1% (*n* = 5)
  - Class Level[18]
    - FR: 13.0% (*n* = 709)
    - SO: 17.6% (*n* = 961)
    - JR: 19.9% (*n* = 1,087)
    - SR: 26.6% (*n* = 1,456)
    - Masters: 13.2% (*n* = 719)
    - Doctoral: 9.8% (*n* = 534)
  - Classification[19]
    - Undergraduate: 76.4% (*n* = 4,251)
    - Graduate: 23.6% (*n* = 1,314)
  - Full-Time/Part-Time Status
    - FT: 76.1% (*n* = 4,233)
    - PT: 23.9% (*n* = 1,333)

[17] 23 students' campus location was outside the campus parameters associated with the OSU-Main campus.
[18] 100 students were not included due to being enrolled in either a "Specialist" or "Certificate" degree program.
[19] 1 student could not be classified as undergraduate or graduate (no classification).

  - Home State
    - OK: 64.6% (*n* = 3,594)
    - TX: 13.1% (*n* = 731)
    - KS: 1.6% (*n* = 89)
    - CA: 1.2% (*n* = 67)
    - Other[20]: 19.5% (*n* = 1,085)
- A total of 2,274 open-ended comments were recorded.

Reliability and Validity

- Overall reliability for OSU Student Satisfaction and Engagement Survey (SSES) (Cronbach's alpha) is 0.925 for the four-factor model, indicating excellent internal consistency. Overall validity CFI is 0.907 for the four-factor model, both indicating a good fit.

Item Analysis

Top 4 "Satisfied" items *(Very Satisfied and Satisfied)*

- Your intellectual growth at OSU. **(87.3%)**
- The quality of teaching at OSU. **(86.6%)**
- Availability of OSU faculty. **(85.9%)**
- Being a student at OSU. **(85.3%)**

Top 4 "Dissatisfied" items *(Very Dissatisfied and Dissatisfied)*

- Availability of courses needed for your degree program at OSU. **(11.8%)**
- Your sense of belonging at OSU. **(7.2%)**
- Concern for me as a person by OSU staff. **(5.9%)**
- Feedback about your academic progress at OSU. **(5.8%)**

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

- I do my best regarding my responsibilities in group work at OSU. **(97.1%)**
- I spend enough time and make enough effort to learn at OSU. **(95.0%)**
- I attend my classes at OSU. **(94.4%)**
- I feel safe on the OSU campus. **(91.8%)**
- I motivate myself to learn at OSU **(91.1%)**
- I try to be open to learning things that could potentially change the way I am understand an issue or concept at OSU. **(89.5%)**
- Overall, I feel good about being at OSU. **(87.6%)**
- I come to class having completed readings/assignments at OSU. **(86.0%)**
- I am comfortable being myself at OSU. **(85.6%)**
- I combine ideas from different courses when completing assignments at OSU. **(84.0%)**

[20] 633 students did not provide a permanent home state and were therefore included in the "Other" count.

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

- I discuss course topics, ideas, or concepts with an OSU professor outside of class. **(33.4%)**
- I talk about my career plans with career services, faculty, or advisors at OSU. **(24.4%)**
- I ask other students to help me understand course material at OSU. **(20.4%)**
- I feel I am an important part of the OSU community. **(13.6%)**
- I have quality interactions with my academic advisor at OSU. **(10.4%)**

Top 3 "Involved" items *(Yes)*

- I have been actively involved in an OSU student group or group in the community. **(64.4%)**
- I have participated in field experience (e.g., internship, part-time job, student teaching, clinical placement, or other field experience) while at OSU. **(57.2%)**
- I have participated in a community-based project (e.g., volunteering) during my studies at OSU. **(56.4%)**

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

- I have worked with a faculty member on a research project at OSU. **(36.4%)**
- I have been actively involved in an OSU student group or group in the community. **(15.5%)**

Note: Frequency percentages were calculated without including Missing responses.

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

After this initial pilot administration of the OSU-SSES, the survey will be administered going forward every other year. As more data is gathered, comparisons will be made across the years.

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 2022-23:

Assessment Fees	**$828,538.90**
Assessment Salaries	**$486,828.65**
Distributed to Other Departments	**$140,641.08**
Operational Costs	**$186,094.14**
Total Expenditures[21]	**$813,563.87**

[21] Total Expenditures were slightly lower than collected fees due to turnover in assessment staffing, which allowed for some savings.