Oklahoma State University
America's Brightest ORANGE

Student Assessment Report
2023-2025

Prepared for
The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
December 22, 2025

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

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

James Knecht, MBA
Associate Director

Kaitlynn Holcomb, M.S.
Assistant Director, Assessment and Analysis

Cat Bertucci, B.S.
Assessment Specialist

Salome Charron, B.S.
Assessment Specialist

Paola Sainz Sujet, M.S.
Statistical Analyst Graduate Research Associate

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

Contents

Executive Summary

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

Key findings:

- A total of 4,487 admitted and enrolled new freshmen and transfer students with fewer than 24 earned credit hours were assessed using the entry-level placement assessment process. In addition, 10 (0.22%) were required to enroll in developmental English courses, 26 (0.58%) in developmental reading courses, 195 (4.35%) in developmental mathematics courses, and 26 (0.58%) in developmental science courses.
- During the 2023-2024 academic year as part of OSU's General Education assessment, Diversity was measured using student artifact review and an institutional campus climate survey.
    - Overall, 40.0% (n = 108) of the student artifacts were rated as met expectations (score of '3'), and 50.0% (n = 135) of student artifacts were rated as exceeded expectations (score of '4' or '5'). In other words, the majority of students **met or exceeded expectations** in diversity artifacts.
    - The top three items with the highest agreement from the institution-wide campus climate survey were:
        - When I graduate from OSU, I will be confident in my ability to work with individuals from different backgrounds and cultures than my own (92.2%)
        - In class at OSU, I am able to work with classmates with backgrounds and cultures different from my own (91.8%)
        - At OSU, I am personally treated with respect by faculty and staff (88.5%)
- This was the pilot year for the new General Education cycle, Civic Learning. Civic Learning was measured with a student artifact review.
    - There were 75 artifacts used for review and analysis.
    - Because this was a pilot year for assessing Civic Learning, the number of artifacts achieved was not yet enough to use as evidence for decision-making.
- In program outcomes assessment, five components of the annual reports were reviewed: (1) Program Student Learning Outcomes, (2) Assessment Methods, (3) Findings, (4) Use of Findings, and (5) Annual Executive Summary. The review process involved assignment of a rubric level (a.k.a. color code) to each category. The overall program average percentages for each color category are as follows:
    - 7.9% of programs received purple, which indicates the item Greatly Exceeded Expectations,
    - 12.5% of programs received blue, which suggests the item Exceeded Expectations,
    - 28.3% of programs received green, which denotes the item Met Expectations,
    - 15.5% received yellow, which suggests the item Somewhat Met Expectations,
    - 7.3% received orange, which denotes the item Minimally Met Expectations,
    - 11.6% of programs received red, which indicates there was Missing Information, and

    - 16.9% 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 engagement and satisfaction, a total of 5,768 OSU students responded to the 2025 Student Satisfaction and Engagement Survey (OSU-SSES) survey with a 27.1% response rate.
    - The top three "Engaged" responses were:
        - I do my best regarding my responsibilities in group work at OSU. (96.7%)
        - I attend my OSU classes. (96.6%)
        - I spend enough time and make enough effort to learn at OSU. (95.6%)
    - The top 3 "Involved" items were:
        - I have been actively involved in an OSU student group or group in the community. (63.0%)
        - I have participated in field experience (e.g., internship, part-time job, student teaching, clinical placement, or other field experience) while at OSU. (55.7%)
        - I have participated in a community-based project (e.g., volunteering) during my studies at OSU. (55.5%)

Next steps:

- In the future, in terms of the assessment of Diversity and intercultural knowledge among undergraduate students at Oklahoma State University, these endeavors will become the responsibility of the Access and Community Impact office. The CAGE will be adding a new learning outcome to the General Education Assessment rotation, Civic Engagement, so efforts will be placed in developing the assessment plan and logistics. If diversity is adopted back into the cycle rotation for the Assessment of General Education, the new method for artifact collection will continue, as well as administration of the Campus Climate Survey for Students.
- UAT and the CAGE will continue to make recommendations for upper-level leadership on ever-changing best practices and processes for closing the loop. We will also continue to streamline the General Education assessment for each cycle and eventually integrate the information into 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. This process is ongoing and will span over a number of years.
- 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.
- UAT will continue to meet with and support academic programs as they adjust to the new every-other-year reporting cycle for program outcomes assessment. While the next reporting date will be Fall 2027, all programs will continue to gather annual assessment data to promote continuous assessment and improvement within their programs yearly.

- As this was the second administration of the OSU-SSES, OSU will administer the survey to all students again in Spring of 2027 to round out a three-year baseline before making any necessary modifications to the survey instrument. Results from this survey continues to be shared with faculty, staff, and administrators through the online IRA dashboard: https://ira.okstate.edu/cdr/uatsurveys.html

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 FYs 2023-2025 (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 0163 or equivalent to satisfy remediation in science.

I-2. How were students determined to need remediation (e.g., CPT cut scores or advising process)?

All new OSU students (new freshmen and transfer students with fewer than 24 credit hours) are assessed using a combination of the measures described above. Each student receives an ELPA Report that includes the following information:

- The student's academic summary (best recorded ACT scores, high school GPAs [cumulative, core, and subject], high school class rank and size, and high school units),
- The student's PGI coefficients,
- Secondary testing (OSU placement exam) scores (if available);
- The curricular and performance deficiencies that require remediation based on the academic summary (i.e. enrollment restrictions), if any, and
- The recommendations and requirements for course placement based on OSU's guidelines as approved by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (OSRHE).

ELPA Reports are produced by the Office of Institutional Research and Analytics (IRA) and are distributed to students by the Office of Student 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). Since 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 OSU math courses and the OSU Math Placement Exam.

The OSU English Placement Exam and the OSU Reading Placement Exam 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 FY2024 and FY2025 (e.g., high school GPA, and CPT cut scores).

In FY2024 and FY2025, OSU offered co-requisite sections of five courses, MATH 1483 (Mathematical Functions and Their Uses), MATH 1493 (Applications of Modern Mathematics), MATH 1513 (College Algebra), MATH 1813 (Preparation for Calculus), and MATH 2144 (Calculus I). MATH 1493 was first offered in corequisite format in Fall 2024, so we do not have the full two years of data for this course. Initial placement into co-requisite sections of MATH 1483, MATH 1493, 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, MATH 1493, 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 typically 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. Permission for entry into a corequisite section by someone qualified for a non-corequisite section requires the permission of the Department of Mathematics. Sometimes enrollment in corequisite courses can be a bit tight (especially in the Fall semester), so the department is not always able to grant students' requests to join a corequisite section if they're eligible for a non-corequisite one. 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, and are encouraged to discuss with their advisor and the Department of Mathematics, although the final decision is theirs.

OSU allows students who score at least 15 on the placement test to take a non-remedial math class. Students who score in the range 15-24 are eligible for co-requisite MATH 1493 and those who score in the range 25-34 are eligible for co-requisite MATH 1483. 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 or science course) before they can enroll in those 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 the academic years 2023-2024 and 2024-2025 (Fall 2023, Spring 2024, Summer 2024, Fall 2024, Spring 2025, and Summer 2025), a total of 10,181 newly admitted and enrolled students (including all new freshmen regardless of earned credit hour totals, new transfers with less than 24 earned credit hours, and students whose first term was Summer 2023 who continued into Fall 2023) were assessed using the entry-level placement assessment process. As described above, during the summer/fall 2021 enrollment cycle, OSU made changes to the ELPA process to allow for new, alternate, non-ACT/SAT PGI calculations and for a new, non-stem PGI science calculation. These changes appear to have had significant effects on the number of students needing remediation in English, reading, and, especially, science. Table I-6a shows the number of enrolled students who had performance deficiencies in each subject area based on ACT scores (or converted SAT scores) and the number of students who were cleared for college-level coursework using ELPA.

Table I-6a. Number of enrolled new students with ACT subscores below 19 in each subject area and the number of students who were cleared for college-level coursework by ELPA in academic years 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.

Subject Area	# of Students with ACT sub-scores <19[1]	# of Students cleared for college-level coursework by ELPA
English	1,608	1,589
Mathematics	2,568	2,222
Reading	1,157	1,130
Science	1,039	1,021

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: 2,075, Mathematics: 2,075, Reading: 2,075, Science: 3,461.

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 academic years 2023-2024 and 2024-2025 placement along with pass numbers.

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

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. 616 new students with ACT Math scores below 19 cleared remediation requirements using the OSU Math Placement Exam (ALEKS) in academic years 2023-2024 and 2024-2025.

After all entry-level assessment was completed, 709 students in academic years 2023-2024 and 2024-2025 (6.96 % of the total number of new students enrolled in each of those years) were required to take at least one developmental (remedial) course. Of the 10,181 new students that enrolled those two years, 34 (0.33%) were required to enroll in developmental English courses, 95 (0.93%) in developmental reading courses, 670 (6.58%) in developmental mathematics courses, and 60 (0.59%) 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 academic years 2023-2024 and 2024-2025 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 academic years 2023-

2024 and 2024-2025 (Fall 2023, Spring 2024, Summer 2024, Fall 2024, Spring 2025, and Summer 2025 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)	Replaced by UNIV0163	
UNIV 0153 (reading and science)	Replaced by UNIV0163	
UNIV 0163 (English, reading, and science)	150	89 (59.33 %)
UNIV 0123 (mathematics)	124	59 (47.58 %)
1. Figures are totals for the two Fall, two Spring, and two Summer semesters (6 total 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 the Office of Student Success 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-6mm 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) over the last two academic (equivalently, fiscal) years. In Fall 2024 co-requisite MATH 1493 (Applications of Modern Mathematics) was introduced, so we have data for this course for only FY 2025. 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 2023 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
Section Type		Enrollment		Success Rate (C or better)	
Standard		183		90%	
Co-requisite		126		75%	
Fall 2023 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
A	B	C	D	F	W
25%	32%	18%	8%	7%	10%

Table I-6e. MATH 1483 (Math Functions) Fall 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%	72%
Co-requisite	17%	78%

Table I-6f. MATH 1483 (Math Functions) Spring 2024 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
Section Type		Enrollment		Success Rate (C or better)	
Standard		101		76%	
Co-requisite		60		77%	
Spring 2024 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
A	B	C	D	F	W
13%	35%	28%	10%	8%	5%

Table I-6g. MATH 1483 (Math Functions) Spring 2024 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates		
Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better)
Standard	16%	81%
Co-requisite	18%	64%

Table I-6h. MATH 1483 (Math Functions) Fall 2024 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
Section Type		Enrollment		Success Rate (C or better)	
Standard		202		90%	
Co-requisite		208		88%	
Fall 2024 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
A	B	C	D	F	W
42%	28%	18%	4%	2%	5%

Table I-6i. MATH 1483 (Math Functions) Fall 2024 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates		
Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better)
Standard	13%	88%
Co-requisite	14%	83%

Table I-6j. MATH 1483 (Math Functions) Spring 2025 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
Section Type		Enrollment		Success Rate (C or better)	
Standard		118		77%	
Co-requisite		95		77%	
Spring 2025 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
A	B	C	D	F	W
32%	25%	20%	4%	5%	14%

Table I-6k. MATH 1483 (Math Functions) Spring 2025 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates		
Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better)
Standard	13%	47%
Co-requisite	20%	74%

MATH 1493 Applications of Modern Mathematics

Table I-6l. MATH 1493 (Applications of Modern Mathematics) Fall 2024 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
Section Type		Enrollment		Success Rate (C or better)	
Standard		46		76%	
Co-requisite		19		74%	
Fall 2024 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
A	B	C	D	F	W
21%	32%	21%	21%	0%	5%

Table I-6m. MATH 1493 (Applications of Modern Mathematics) Fall 2024 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates		
Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better)
Standard	24%	100%
Co-requisite	21%	75%

Table I-6n. MATH 1493 (Applications of Modern Mathematics) Spring 2025 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
Section Type		Enrollment		Success Rate (C or better)	
Standard		46		80%	
Co-requisite		43		47%	
Spring 2025 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
A	B	C	D	F	W
9%	16%	23%	21%	14%	19%

Table I-6o. MATH 1493 (Applications of Modern Mathematics) Spring 2025 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates		
Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better)
Standard	13%	100%
Co-requisite	5%	50%

<u>MATH 1513 College Algebra</u>

Table I-6p. MATH 1513 (College Algebra) Fall 2023 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
Section Type		Enrollment		Success Rate (C or better)	
Standard		466		77%	
Co-requisite		281		63%	
Fall 2023 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
A	B	C	D	F	W
25%	20%	19%	7%	11%	19%

Table I-6q. MATH 1513 (College Algebra) Fall 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%	68%
Co-requisite	26%	56%

Table I-6r. MATH 1513 (College Algebra) Spring 2024 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
Section Type		Enrollment		Success Rate (C or better)	
Standard		206		54%	
Co-requisite		93		60%	
Spring 2024 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
A	B	C	D	F	W
19%	26%	15%	3%	18%	18%

Table I-6s. MATH 1513 (College Algebra) Spring 2024 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates		
Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better)
Standard	16%	30%
Co-requisite	22%	60%

Table I-6t. MATH 1513 (College Algebra) Fall 2024 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
Section Type		Enrollment		Success Rate (C or better)	
Standard		509		71%	
Co-requisite		325		67%	
Fall 2024 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
A	B	C	D	F	W
30%	23%	14%	5%	12%	15%

Table I-6u. MATH 1513 (College Algebra) Fall 2024 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates		
Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better)
Standard	13%	55%
Co-requisite	18%	53%

Table I-6v. MATH 1513 (College Algebra) Spring 2025 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
Section Type		Enrollment		Success Rate (C or better)	
Standard		234		53%	
Co-requisite		114		42%	
Spring 2025 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
A	B	C	D	F	W
10%	14%	18%	11%	16%	32%

Table I-6w. MATH 1513 (College Algebra) Spring 2025 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates		
Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better)
Standard	21%	41%
Co-requisite	27%	39%

MATH 1813 Preparation for Calculus

Table I-6x. MATH 1813 (Preparation for Calculus) Fall 2023 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
Section Type		Enrollment		Success Rate (C or better)	
Standard		515		66%	
Co-requisite		37		73%	
Fall 2023 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
A	B	C	D	F	W
24%	27%	22%	8%	8%	11%

Table I-6y. MATH 1813 (Preparation for Calculus) Fall 2023 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates		
Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better)
Standard	22%	49%
Co-requisite	24%	67%

Table I-6z. MATH 1813 (Preparation for Calculus) Spring 2024 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
Section Type		Enrollment		Success Rate (C or better)	
Standard		393		69%	
Co-requisite		12		58%	
Spring 2024 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
A	B	C	D	F	W
%	%	%	%	%	%

Table I-6aa. MATH 1813 (Preparation for Calculus) Spring 2024 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates		
Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better)
Standard	23%	60%
Co-requisite	17%	100%

Table I-6bb. MATH 1813 (Preparation for Calculus) Fall 2024 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
Section Type		Enrollment		Success Rate (C or better)	
Standard		520		66%	
Co-requisite		31		71%	
Fall 2024 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
A	B	C	D	F	W
23%	32%	16%	6%	16%	6%

Table I-6cc. MATH 1813 (Preparation for Calculus) Fall 2024 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates		
Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better)
Standard	18%	60%
Co-requisite	13%	75%

Table I-6dd. MATH 1813 (Preparation for Calculus) Spring 2025 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
Section Type		Enrollment		Success Rate (C or better)	
Standard		394		67%	
Co-requisite		8		38%	
Spring 2025 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
A	B	C	D	F (and F!)	W
13%	0%	25%	25%	38%	0%

Table I-6ee. MATH 1813 (Preparation for Calculus) Spring 2025 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates		
Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better)
Standard	18%	54%
Co-requisite	0%	N/A

MATH 2144 Calculus I

Table I-6ff. MATH 2144 (Calculus I) Fall 2023 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
Section Type		Enrollment		Success Rate (C or better)	
Standard		401		69%	
Co-requisite		35		89%	
Fall 2023 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
A	B	C	D	F	W
34%	20%	34%	6%	6%	0%

Table I-6gg. MATH 2144 (Calculus I) Fall 2023 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates		
Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better)
Standard	17%	55%
Co-requisite	14%	80%

Table I-6hh. MATH 2144 (Calculus I) Spring 2024 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
Section Type		Enrollment		Success Rate (C or better)	
Standard		305		64%	
Co-requisite		13		46%	
Spring 2024 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution (one I excluded)					
A	B	C	D	F	W
0%	8%	38%	8%	15%	31%

Table I-6ii. MATH 2144 (Calculus I) Spring 2024 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates		
Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better)
Standard	18%	56%
Co-requisite	31%	25%

Table I-6jj. MATH 2144 (Calculus I) Fall 2024 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
Section Type		Enrollment		Success Rate (C or better)	
Standard		387		67%	
Co-requisite		33		85%	
Fall 2024 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
A	B	C	D	F	W
36%	21%	27%	3%	9%	3%

Table I-6kk. MATH 2144 (Calculus I) Fall 2024 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates		
Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better)
Standard	16%	55%
Co-requisite	3%	100%

Table I-6ll. MATH 2144 (Calculus I) Spring 2025 Overall Enrollment, Success Rates, and Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution					
Section Type		Enrollment		Success Rate (C or better)	
Standard		300		66%	
Co-requisite		15		80%	
Spring 2025 Co-requisite Sections Grade Distribution (one I excluded)					
A	B	C	D	F	W
33%	13%	33%	0%	7%	13%

Table I-6mm. MATH 2144 (Calculus I) Spring 2025 First-Generation Student Proportions and Success Rates		
Section Type	Proportion of First-Generation Students	First-Generation Student Success Rate (C or better)
Standard	17%	50%
Co-requisite	27%	75%

As the data show, in most semesters and courses the success rate in the co-requisite sections approaches or exceeds that in the standard sections. A few outliers, such as the gap between co-requisite and standard success rates in Spring 2025 MATH 1813, are likely due to the fact that the unique co-requisite section had a low enrollment. Additionally, in MATH 1483, 1493, and 1513, the success rates often suffer in the Spring are often lower than those in the Fall, albeit often slightly. This is likely due to the fact that these courses have no practical prerequisites, so students taking these courses in the Spring usually have taken no MATH courses in the previous Fall semester, and research has shown that students who skip a semester or more of math face more difficulties when returning to the subject than students who have had no interruption. Thus, in the absence of any long-term trends, we believe that keeping the cut scores where they are is the best course of action. If we do notice long-term decreases in success rates, then we may consider adjusting the co-requisite cutoffs implemented in the ALEKS test.

Section II – General Education Assessment

The following General Education Assessment section will cover two annual cycles of General Education assessment: Diversity (2023-2024) and Civic Learning (2024-2025).

Diversity (2023-2024 cycle)
Administering Assessment

II- 1. Describe the institutional general education competencies/outcomes and how they are assessed.

General education at Oklahoma State University is intended to:

A. Construct a broad foundation for the student's specialized course of study,
B. Develop the student's ability to read, observe, and listen with comprehension,
C. Enhance the student's skills in communicating effectively,
D. Expand the student's capacity for critical analysis and problem solving,
E. Assist the student in understanding and respecting diversity in people, beliefs, and societies, and
F. Develop the student's ability to appreciate and function in the human and natural environment.

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

For the 2023-24 academic year, Diversity was assessed. Here is the current/upcoming cycle:

Current/Upcoming Cycle

1. **2023-24 | Diversity** (student artifacts/survey)
2. **2024-25 | Civic Engagement – PILOT** (student artifacts)
3. **2025-26 | Professionalism and Ethics** (behavioral ratings/student artifacts)
4. **2026-27 | Information Literacy** (student artifacts)
5. **2027-28 | Written Communication and Critical Thinking** (student artifacts)

The assessment of OSU's General Education 2023-24 cycle of Diversity was accomplished by evaluating written student artifacts by means of a customized rubric developed by OSU faculty raters and the Committee for Assessment of General Education, called the OSU Diversity Rubric and the Campus Climate Survey for Students.

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

Campus Climate Survey for Students

The OSU Campus Climate Survey for Students (CCS-S) was conducted during the spring semester of 2024 at Oklahoma State University. The CCS-S was administered to students at both Stillwater and Tulsa campuses. A total of 738 students responded to the CCS-S, which was 3.1% of the target population (24,105 students), and 596 student responses (2.5%) were analyzed after data cleaning procedures. The CCS-S contained 31 items asked on a 5-point agreement Likert scale. Topics of these items included support, experience at OSU, belonging, 'D' course issues, working with others, improvement, concern, and discussion with others, and one open-ended item which asked, "Do you have any other comments you would like to make about diversity, equity and inclusion at OSU?" For this open-ended question, there were 160 participants who responded (26.8%); after deleting cases such as "no", "n/a", or "nope", 128 responses remained (21.5%).

Student Artifact Review

A call for student artifacts was sent out to all instructors of courses designated with a 'D' (Diversity), I' (International), 'S' (Social and Behavioral Sciences), or 'H' (Humanities) during the Fall of 2023. For the artifacts collected during the Spring of 2024, a new method was implemented. A random sample of all courses designated with a "D" (Diversity) was determined and instructors were asked to submit artifacts.

Student artifacts were collected by UAT and compiled for review by the facilitator. University Assessment and Testing and the facilitator examined the assignment prompts of these artifacts to determine if they aligned with the OSU Diversity Rubric used to rate the artifacts. Once the qualifying student artifacts were identified, the artifacts were split between two teams of two faculty raters (four in total). The distribution of artifacts submitted, rated, and used for analysis can be found in Table 1.

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

OSU Campus Climate Survey for Students (CCS-S)

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

> In order to gain a better understanding of the campus climate and your experience at Oklahoma State University, the OSU Office of the Provost in collaboration with the Committee for the Assessment of General Education and University Assessment and Testing are conducting a short climate survey to learn about your

experience at OSU. The survey will take **5-10 minutes** to complete and will provide meaningful and useful feedback to us**.**

Your response will contribute to the advancement of a welcoming and inclusive environment that appreciates and values all members of the University community. The survey is completely voluntary and your responses will remain confidential.

Student Artifact Review

The instructors of courses with the designation of 'D,' 'I,' 'S,' or 'H' were solicited for participation in submitting student artifacts to be used in the diversity artifact review during the Fall of 2023 and the instructors of the randomly selected courses with the D designation for the Spring 2024. Instructors were contacted by their respective college CAGE representative and given information on what type of assignment we would be able to use, the rubric used to review, instructions on how to collect the artifacts, and assurance that the artifacts would be anonymized and in no way identifiable to any student.

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

- In the future, in terms of the assessment of Diversity and intercultural knowledge among undergraduate students at Oklahoma State University, these endeavors will become the responsibility of the Access and Community Impact office. The CAGE will be adding a new learning outcome to the General Education Assessment rotation, Civic Engagement, so efforts will be placed in developing the assessment plan and logistics.
- If diversity is adopted back into the cycle rotation for the Assessment of General Education, the new method for artifact collection will continue, as well as administration of the Campus Climate Survey for Students.
- We will continue to streamline the General Education assessment for each cycle and eventually integrate the information into 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. This process is ongoing and will span over a number of years.

Analyses and Findings

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

OSU Campus Climate Survey for Students (CCS-S)

Important demographic information is below:

Classification: (*n*=596[1])

- 40.8% of participants were Senior students (*n*=243),
- 24.7% of participants were Junior students (*n*=147),
- 18.8% of participants were Sophomore students (*n*=112), and
- 14.1% of participants were Freshman students (*n*=84).

Campus: (*n*=596)

- 88.3% of participants were Stillwater based students (*n*=526),
- 10.1% of participants were Stillwater and Tulsa based (*n*=60), and
- 1.6% of participants were Tulsa based students (*n*=10).

Gender: (*n*=596)

- 66.1% of participants responded Female (*n*=394), and
- 33.9% responded Male (*n*=202).

Race: (*n*=596)

- 72.3% of participants were White (*n*=431),
- 12.1% were Multiracial (*n*=72),
- 7.2% were Hispanic (*n*=43),
- 3.2% were American Indian or Alaska Native (*n*=19),
- 2.3% were Black or African American (*n*=14),
- 1.5% were Nonresident Alien (*n*=9),
- 1.2% were Asian (*n*=7), and
- 0.2% were Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (*n*=1).

The CCS-S was developed in 2017 by University Assessment and Testing (UAT) in fulfillment of the General Education Assessment for Diversity, set by the Committee for the Assessment of General Education (CAGE). During this process, UAT collaborated with CAGE, the Assessment and Academic Improvement Council (AAIC), the division of Institutional Diversity, and the Office of Multicultural Affairs. The survey was reviewed and revised prior to the spring 2024 administration.

[1] 10 students could not be grouped into these classifications.

Model Fit: Reliability & Validity

Overall Model Fit (n=596)

Reliability:

- The overall, updated model of OSU CCS-S was found to be reliable (31 items; Cronbach's Alpha = 0.859).

Validity:

- Validity of the overall, updated model indicates that the model is a good fit to the data. Model fit indices support this:
    - The Comparative Fit Index (CFI) is a value between 0 and 1 and is considered *good* if it is greater than 0.90. CFI for this model is 0.903 which is *good*.
    - Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) ranges from 0 to 1 and a value of 0.07 or less is indicative of an *acceptable* model fit. RMSEA for this model is 0.07 and *acceptable*.
    - The Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) ranges from 0 to 1 and a value of 0.08 or less indicates an *acceptable* model. The SRMR for this model is 0.08 and therefore indicates an *acceptable* fit.

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

Highest or Lowest Ranking Items (*n*=596)

Top 10 "Strongly Agree" and "Agree" Items:

- When I graduate from OSU, I will be confident in my ability to work with individuals from different backgrounds and cultures than my own (92.2%)
- In class at OSU, I am able to work with classmates with backgrounds and cultures different from my own (91.8%)
- At OSU I am personally treated with respect by faculty and staff (88.5%)
- At OSU, I am able to work well with my peers/classmates in class (86.4%)
- I believe that meaningful interactions with individuals different from me is an essential part of my college education at OSU (84.9%)
- At OSU, I am personally treated with respect by peers (80.6%)
- There is a fellow student at OSU that I feel comfortable turning to if I need support (80.2%)
- I am satisfied with the sense of community I have at OSU (71.3%)
- I feel a sense of belonging to my own student organization/club at OSU (70.8%)
- I feel a sense of belonging to OSU (69.2%)

Top 5 "Strongly Disagree" and "Disagree" Items:

- I participate in OSU campus events often – *Belonging* (25.1%)
- OSU can improve diversity by focusing its efforts on recruiting/retention of faculty/staff from diverse backgrounds - *Improvement* (21.5%)

- At OSU, I feel comfortable expressing my views regarding race/ethnicity – *Discussion with Others* (20.8)
- At OSU, I feel free and comfortable discussing diversity issues in school with others - *Discussion with Others* (20.6%)
- OSU can improve diversity by focusing its efforts on events related to diversity - *Improvement* (19.2%)

Student Artifact Review

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

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

In the assessment, which included all students, reliability was tested by calculating Cronbach's Alpha. The resulting statistic suggested that the scale's reliability is "Excellent" (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.928; $n = 270$).

- Overall, 40.0% ($n = 108$) of the student artifacts were rated as met expectations (score of '3'), and 50.0% ($n = 135$) of student artifacts were rated as exceeded expectations (score of '4' or '5'). In other words, the majority of students **met or exceeded expectations** in diversity artifacts.
- Below are the results for each rubric category. Although approximately 90% of students either **met or exceeded expectations** within each rubric category, as you can see below, the *Values and Diversity* component of the rubric is not as consistent in the rating distribution as in the *Knowledge of Cultural Context* and the *Conceptual Understanding* categories. This finding was reported to the CAGE in order to determine the underlying cause and exploration. It was determined that the nature of the artifact prompts and the artifacts themselves made it difficult to assign a rating beyond 'met expectations.'
    A. <u>Knowledge of Cultural Context:</u>
    35.2% of the students' artifacts were rated as met expectations ($n = 95$), and 56.3% of the artifacts were rated as exceeded expectations ($n = 152$).
    B. <u>Conceptual Understanding:</u>
    37.4% of the students' artifacts were rated as met expectations ($n = 101$), and 51.5% of the artifacts were rated as exceeded expectations ($n = 139$).
    C. <u>Values & Attitudes:</u>
    53.0% of the students' artifacts were rated as met expectations ($n = 143$), and 36.7% of the artifacts were rated as exceeded expectations ($n = 99$).

Analysis tables follow.

Table 1. *Collection of Diversity Artifacts*

College [2]	Course Prefix and Number	Course Name	General Education Designation (if any)[3]	Number of Artifacts Submitted[4]	Number of Artifacts Rated	Number of Artifacts Included in Analysis[5]
CAS	ENGL 2883	Survey of American Literature II	(D, H)	76	47	42
	TH 3633	Diverse American Drama	(D, H)	20	8	8
	SPCH 2713	Introduction to Speech Communication	(S)	162	24	24
	GWST 2123	Introduction to Gender Studies	(D, H)	13	13	13
	HIST 3303	Nations on the Move: Latin American Migration and Latinx Communities in the U.S.	(D, H)	8	8	8
	AMST 3303	Nations on the Move: Latin American Migration and Latinx Communities in the U.S.	(D, H)	7	7	7
	HIST 3683	United States History Since 1945	(D, H)	51	51	42
	HIST 3703	Oklahoma History	(D, H)	27	27	27
CEHS	HLTH 3113	Health Issues in Diverse Populations	(D)	21	21	21
	LLCE 2003	American Stories: Diverse Peoples in YA Literature	(D, H)	23	7	7
	RT 2443	Contemporary Issues in Diversity	(D, S)	12	12	12
	SPED 3202	Educating Exceptional Leaders	(D)	62	62	32
SSB	MGMT 4650	Legal and Ethical Issues in a Diverse Workplace	(D)	27	27	27
Total Number of Diversity Artifacts:				**509**	**314**	**270**

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

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

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

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

Table 2. *Student Demographics Associated with Diversity Artifacts, 2007-2024*

		2007-2013 # of artifacts (% of total)	2016 # of artifacts (% of total)	2019 # of artifacts (% of total)	2021 # of artifacts (% of total)	**2024 # of artifacts (% of total)**	Total # of artifacts (% of total)
Class	Freshman	45 (9.6)	24 (32.8)	7 (5.3)	49 (21.2)	**25 (9.3)**	150 (12.7)
	Sophomore	118 (25.1)	8 (10.9)	38 (28.8)	69 (29.9)	**58 (21.5)**	291(24.7)
	Junior	162 (34.4)	24 (32.8)	42 (31.8)	66 (28.6)	**68 (25.2)**	362 (30.8)
	Senior	146 (31.0)	17 (23.2)	45 (34.1)	47 (20.3)	**94 (34.8)**	349 (29.7)
	Special Undergraduate	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	**25 (9.3)**	25(2.1)
	Total	*n* = 471	*n* = 73	*n* = 132	*n* = 231	***n = 270***	*n = 1177*
College[6]	CAS	181 (38.4)	27 (36.9)	41 (31.1)	107 (46.1)	**74 (27.4)**	430 (36.4)
	AGRI	28 (5.9)	22 (30.1)	21 (15.9)	13 (5.6)	**17 (6.3)**	101 (8.6)
	CEAT	50 (10.6)	3 (4.1)	6 (4.5)	20 (8.6)	**20 (7.4)**	99 (8.4)
	CEHS	151 (31.8)	9 (12.3)	55 (41.7)	53 (22.8)	**86 (31.9)**	354 (0.3)
	SSB	28 (5.9)	9 (12.3)	6 (4.5)	27 (11.6)	**45 (16.7)**	115 (9.7)
	UC	35 (7.4)	3 (4.1)	3 (2.3)	12 (5.2)	**28 (10.4)**	81 (6.9)
	Total	*n* = 473	*n* = 73	*n* = 132	*n = 232*	***n = 270***	*n = 1180*
Gender	Female	255 (54.1)	25 (34.2)	101 (76.5)	161 (69.4)	**172 (63.7)**	714 (60.6)
	Male	216 (45.9)	48 (65.7)	31 (23.5)	71 (30.6)	**98 (36.3)**	464 (39.4)
	Total	*n* = 471	*n* = 73	*n* = 132	*n = 232*	***n = 270***	*n = 1178*
OSU GPA	< 2.0	28 (5.9)	2 (2.7)	3 (2.3)	4 (1.7)	**5 (1.9)**	42 (3.5)
	2.0 to 2.49	70 (14.9)	3 (4.1)	11 (8.3)	15 (6.5)	**20 (7.4)**	119(10.0)
	2.50 to 2.99	118 (25.1)	15 (20.5)	35 (26.5)	34 (14.7)	**43 (15.9)**	245(20.6)
	3.00 to 3.49	126 (26.6)	19 (26.0)	33 (25.0)	55 (23.7)	**62 (23.0)**	295(24.8)
	3.50 to 4.00	130 (27.6)	34 (46.5)	50 (37.9)	124 (53.4)	**136 (50.4)**	474(39.9)
	Missing	10 (2.1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	**4 (1.5)**	14(1.2)
	Total	*n* = 482	*n* = 73	*n* = 132	*n* = 232	***n = 270***	*n = 1189*

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

Table 3. *Diversity Artifact Scores, 2024*

	SCORE: *n* (%)					
	1	2	3	4	5	*n*
Class						
Freshman	0 (0.0)	8 (3.0)	9 (3.3)	8 (3.0)	0 (0.0)	25 (9.3)
Sophomore	1 (0.4)	2 (0.7)	28 (10.4)	26 (9.6)	1 (0.4)	58 (21.5)
Junior	0 (0.0)	3 (1.1)	24 (8.9)	37 (13.7)	4 (1.5)	68 (25.2)
Senior	1 (0.4)	5 (1.9)	32 (11.9)	53 (19.6)	3 (1.1)	94 (34.8)
Special Undergraduate	4 (1.5)	3 (1.1)	15 (5.6)	3 (1.1)	0 (0.0)	25 (9.3)
College[7]						
CAS	1 (0.4)	2 (0.7)	25 (9.3)	43 (15.9)	3 (1.1)	74 (27.4)
CEAT	1 (0.4)	2 (0.7)	6 (2.2)	11(4.1)	0 (0.0)	20 (7.4)
CEHS	0 (0.0)	7 (2.6)	37 (13.7)	38 (14.1)	4 (1.5)	86 (31.9)
AGRI	0 (0.0)	2 (0.7)	8 (3.0)	7 (2.6)	0 (0.0)	17 (6.3)
SSB	0 (0.0)	4 (1.5)	16 (5.9)	24 (8.9)	1 (0.4)	45 (16.7)
UC	4 (1.5)	4 (1.5)	16 (5.9)	4 (1.5)	0 (0.0)	28 (10.4)
Gender						
Male	5 (1.9)	16 (5.9)	69 (25.6)	78 (28.9)	4 (1.5)	172 (63.7)
Female	1 (0.4)	5 (1.9)	39 (14.4)	49 (18.1)	4 (1.5)	98 (36.3)
Overall	6 (2.3)	21 (7.8)	108 (40.0)	127 (47.0)	8 (3.0)	270 (100.0)

Table 4. *Diversity Artifact Scores for each rubric category, 2024*

	SCORE: *n* (%)					
	1	2	3	4	5	*n*
A[8]	5 (1.9)	18 (6.7)	95 (35.2)	137 (50.7)	15 (5.6)	270 (100)
B	5 (1.9)	25 (9.3)	101 (37.4)	132 (48.9)	7 (2.6)	270 (100)
C	4 (1.5)	24 (8.9)	143 (53.0)	94 (34.8)	5 (1.9)	270 (100)
Overall	6 (2.2)	21 (7.8)	108 (40.0)	127 (47.0)	8 (3.0)	270 (100)

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

[8] A = Knowledge of Cultural Context; B = Conceptual Understanding; C = Values & Attitudes

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

OSU Campus Climate Survey for Students (CCS-S)

The CCS-S was administered in spring 2019, spring 2021, and again in spring 2024. By administering the survey for a third time, we are continuing to establish a baseline and track student self-reported climate at OSU. In general and consistent with previous years' results, most of the students believe they will be able to work well with individuals from different cultures and backgrounds when they graduate from OSU, and they also feel they have a strong ability to work together with their peers/classmates from different cultures and backgrounds in the classroom. Most surveyed students feel that they are treated with respect by faculty and staff and consider that meaningful interactions with individuals different from themselves are an essential part of their experience at OSU. These results suggest successful efforts to promote diversity and inclusion initiatives.

Student Artifact Review

The instructors of courses with the designation of 'D,' 'H,' 'I,' or 'S' in the Fall of 2023 were solicited for participation in submitting student artifacts, and, according to the new collection method for Spring 2024, courses with the designation of 'D' were randomly selected and requested to submit student artifacts. The number of artifacts used for analysis have been tracked in Table 2 from 2007 to 2013, 2016, 2019, 2021, and 2024. Student performance cannot currently be tracked based on student artifact ratings because different rubrics have been used, making comparison inadvisable.

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

- Assessment data collected from the general education assessment process has been and will continue to be shared broadly (both internally and publicly) to encourage discussion and consideration of additional curricular, programmatic, and/or assessment changes that may result in improvement to the general education assessment program and/or to student achievement of the general education goals.
- Specifically, the General Education Advisory Council (GEAC), the Committee for the Assessment of General Education (CAGE), and the Assessment and Academic Improvement Council (AAIC) meet together once per year to discuss general education assessment results, consider needed changes, and provide recommendations for improvement.
- Assessment data from the general education assessment process are used in three main ways:
    1. to implement improvement initiatives (e.g., faculty, staff, and instructor professional development; modification of assessment processes),
    2. to monitor recent curricular changes, and
    3. to consider and discuss additional modifications to the general education program (e.g., modifying general education curriculum, syllabi, instructional methodologies,

general education course designations, or designation goals/criteria).

Assessment of Diversity in the General Education cycle is currently suspended in order to introduce the assessment of a new component, Civic Engagement. In order to stay relevant with current trends in education and assessment, Civic Engagement will be added as a key topic for assessment. If diversity is adopted back into the cycle rotation for the Assessment of General Education, the new method for artifact collection will continue, as well as administration of the Campus Climate Survey for Students.

Civic Learning (2024-2025 cycle)

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 a student's specialized course of study,
B. Develop a student's ability to read, observe, and listen with comprehension,
C. Enhance a student's skills in communicating effectively,
D. Expand a student's capacity for critical analysis and problem solving,
E. Assist students in understanding and respecting diversity in people, beliefs, and societies, and
F. Develop a 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 General Education assessments based on the following cycle.

Current Cycle

- 2025 - Civic Learning – PILOT

Upcoming Cycle

- 2026 - Professionalism & Ethics
- 2027 - Information Literacy
- 2028 - Written Communication & Critical Thinking

In 2025, for the review of civic learning artifacts, OSU used the newly developed OSU Civic Learning Rubric. Artifacts rated with this rubric can receive ratings of '1' through '5' with '1' being beginner level and '5' being advanced.

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

Since this was a pilot year, UAT and CAGE first developed and administered a survey in order to find appropriate courses to include in the new assessment cycle. This survey was sent to all

Department Heads, Associate Deans, Faculty Fellows, Hargis Institute, and Unit Head Directors. Limited feedback was received from the survey. Therefore, a review of the Spring 2025 course catalog was also conducted.

Instructors of courses that were identified as potentially having a written assignment in civic learning were asked to submit student artifacts that could be used for the assessment. Instructors were contacted by their respective college CAGE representative, and given information on what type of civic learning assignment we would be able to use, the respective rubric, instructions on how to collect the artifacts, and assurance that the artifacts would be anonymized and in no way identifiable back to the student.

Student artifacts were collected by UAT and compiled for review by a CAGE facilitator. UAT and the facilitator examined the assignment prompts of these artifacts to determine if they aligned with the OSU Civic Learning Rubric used to rate the artifacts. It was determined that one assignment prompt in the Experiential Learning & Civic Engagement course was usable. Student artifacts were collected, anonymized, and provided to the team of faculty raters (two raters in total). The distribution of artifacts submitted, rated, and used for analysis can be found in Table II.1.

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

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

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

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

Analyses and Findings

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

Four categories of the OSU Civic Learning Rubric and the overall student ratings were assessed for each student artifact. The four categories were:

E. Civic Knowledge
F. Civic Skills
G. Civic Values
H. Civic Communication

- Overall, 48.0% (36/75) of the student artifacts met or exceeded expectations by receiving a rating of '3,' '4,' or '5.' Of those, 29.3% were rated as '3' (*n* = 22), and 18.7% of student artifacts were rated as '4' or '5' (*n* = 14). In other words, the majority of students **met or exceeded expectations** in civic learning artifacts.

- Below are the results for each rubric category:
  D. Civic Knowledge:
  21.3% of the students' artifacts were rated as '3' (*n* = 16), and 16.0% of the artifacts were rated as '4' or '5' (*n* =12).
  E. Civic Skills:
  30.7% of the students' artifacts were rated as '3' (*n* = 23), and 9.3% of the artifacts were rated as '4' or '5' (*n* = 7).
  F. Civic Values:
  28.0% of the students' artifacts were rated as '3' (*n* = 21), and 24.0% of the artifacts were rated as '4' or '5' (*n* =18).
  G. Civic Communication:
  36.0% of the students' artifacts were rated as '3' (*n* = 27), and 24.0% of the artifacts were rated as '4' or '5' (*n* = 18).

Analysis tables follow.

Table II.1. Collection of Ethics Artifacts

College	Course Prefix and Number	Course Name	Number of Artifacts Submitted	Number of Artifacts Rated[9]	Number of Artifacts Included in Analysis
CPS[10]	CPS 3513	Experiential Learning & Civic Engagement	76	75	75

Table II.2. Student Demographics Associated with Civic Learning Artifacts

Demographic Variable	Category	# of artifacts (% of total)
Class	Freshman	1 (1.3)
	Sophomore	5 (6.7)
	Junior	38 (50.7)
	Senior	31 (41.3)
	Total	*n* = 75
College	CAS	3 (4.0)
	CEHS	2 (2.7)
	CPS	69 (92.0)
	SSB	1 (1.3)
	Total	*n* = 75
Gender	Female	54 (72.0)
	Male	21 (28.0)
	Total	*n* = 75

[9] Although many artifacts were submitted, not all could be used for rating because they did not align with the rubric
[10] College of Professional Studies

OSU GPA	< 2.0	3 (4.0)
	2.0 to 2.49	6 (8.0)
	2.50 to 2.99	9 (12.0)
	3.00 to 3.49	7 (9.3)
	3.50 to 4.00	50 (66.7)
	Total	*n* = 75

Table II.3. Civic Learning Artifact Scores for Each Rubric Category

	Rubric Component	SCORE: *n* (%)					
		1	2	3	4	5	*n*
A.	Civic Knowledge	14 (18.7)	33 (44.0)	16 (21.3)	12 (16.0)	0 (0.0)	75
B.	Civic Skills	10 (13.3)	35 (46.7)	23 (30.7)	7 (9.3)	0 (0.0)	75
C.	Civic Values	10 (13.3)	26 (34.7)	21 (28.0)	15 (20.0)	3 (4.0)	75
D.	Civic Communication	6 (8.0)	24 (32.0)	27 (36.0)	17 (22.7)	1 (1.3)	75
E.	Overall	10 (13.3)	29 (38.7)	22 (29.3)	13 (17.3)	1 (1.3)	75

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

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

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

- Because this was a pilot year for assessing Civic Learning, the number of artifacts acquired was not enough to use as evidence for decision-making. The materials used to recruit participation had to be created, developed, reviewed, and approved before use and therefore the recruitment process did not begin until the end of the Spring semester.. Future years of assessment of Civic Learning will likely lead to larger points of data because recruitment will begin during the Fall semester.
- Assessment results from the General Education assessment process have 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, GEAC, CAGE, and 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:

4. to implement improvement initiatives (e.g., faculty, staff, and instructor professional development; modification of assessment processes),
5. to monitor recent curricular changes, and
6. 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).

- CAGE will continue to discuss the newly created and implemented OSU Civic Learning Rubric. Also, discussion will take place about the promotion of solid civic learning assignments.
- We will continue to streamline the General Education assessment for each cycle and eventually integrate the 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[11]:
    - Analysis of Written Artifacts (17.9%),
    - Surveys (11.9%),
    - Oral Presentation (9.6%),
    - Capstone Assignment (7.3%)
    - Course Exam(s) (6.9%),
    - Course Embedded Assignments (6.5%),
    - Review of Thesis/Dissertation/Creative Component (6.4%),
    - Rating of Skills (5.3%),
    - Other (4.8%),
    - Course Project (3.5%),
    - Project & Assignments (3.0%),
    - Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s) (2.3%),
    - Interviews (2.1%),
    - Review of Student Research (2.1%),
    - Portfolio Review (2.0%),
    - Supervisor Evaluation (2.0%),
    - Presentation/Performance (1.8%),
    - Performance or Jury (1.7%),
    - Internship (1.6%),
    - Group Project (0.9%), and
    - Nationally Benchmarked Exam (0.5%).

- Assessment plans must be updated every five years and reviewed at least once every five years within the department.
- Assessment reports are due to University Assessment and Testing biannually in the month of September. This was adjusted from an annual reporting schedule due to new language presented by the OSRHE that indicated outcomes assessment should occur on a "periodic"

[11] The list of methods presented in this report are associated with the 2024-2025 Academic Year. As programs were asked to submit information for both the 2023-2024 and 2024-2025 academic years, only slight differences in the methods utilized were found between years. As such, the 2024-2025 methods presented are representative of the assessment methods currently being used across programs.

basis. Individual program assessment plans and reports will be available through 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[12]

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	Survey	125	35	25
Agricultural Communications	BSAG	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Presentation/ Performance	Analysis of Written Artifacts	31	33	37
Agricultural Communications	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Review of Student Research	Oral Presentation	3	1	2
Agricultural Economics	BSAG	Course Embedded Assignments	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Survey	2	4	0
Agricultural Economics	MS	Course Embedded Assignments	Rating of Skills	Presentation/ Performance	10	6	6
Agricultural Economics	PhD	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Oral Presentation	5	6	3
Agricultural Education	BSAG	Nationally Benchmarked Exam	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exams	Other	42	42	42
Agricultural Education	MS	Review of Student Research	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	3	3	3
Agricultural Education	PhD	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	Analysis of Written Artifacts	2	2	2
Agricultural Leadership	BSAG	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Other	Analysis of Written Artifacts	23	21	21
Animal Science	BSAG	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	213	186	186

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

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Animal Science	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Survey	6	6	6
Animal Science	PhD	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Survey	Analysis of Written Artifacts	10	10	10
Biochemistry & MolecularBiology	BSAG	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Project	Interviews	181	0	4
Biochemistry & MolecularBiology	MS	Presentation/ Performance	Review of Student Research	-	4	3	-
Biochemistry & Molecular Biology	PhD	Presentation/ Performance	Review of Student Research	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	15	15	2
Biosystems Engineering	BSBE	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Interviews	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	10	20	1
Biosystems Engineering	MS	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Supervisor Evaluation	3	4	4
Biosystems Engineering	PhD	Supervisor Evaluation	-	-	No Data Submitted		
Crop Science	PhD	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Rating of Skills	Oral Presentation	5	5	5
Entomology	BSAG	Oral Presentation	Rating of Skills	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	2	3	2
Entomology & Plant Pathology	MS	Oral Presentation	Oral Presentation	Analysis of Written Artifacts	20	11	7
Environmental Science	BSAG	Capstone Assignment	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Capstone Assignment	14	53	37

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 – Context Provided					
Environmental Science	PhD	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
Food Science	BSAG	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	9	9	9
Food Science	MS	Survey	Survey	Survey	3	3	3
Food Science	PhD	Review of Student Research	Survey	Survey	2	2	2
General Agriculture: Agricultural Leadership	MAG	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Project & Assignments	Course Embedded Assignments	No Data Submitted		
Horticulture	BSAG	Internship	Internship	Internship	11	11	11
Horticulture	MS	Rating of Skills	Rating of Skills	Rating of Skills	15	15	15
International Agriculture	MAG	Oral Presentation	Project & Assignments	Other	9	9	12
International Agriculture	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	Other	9	9	16
Landscape Architecture	BLA	Rating of Skills	Rating of Skills	Rating of Skills	36	36	26

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	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Project & Assignments	30	42	69
Natural Resource Ecology & Management	MS	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Analysis of Written Artifacts	10	10	10
Natural Resource Ecology & Management	PhD	No Report Submitted					
Plant & Soil Sciences	BSAG	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Rating of Skills	20	19	11
Plant & Soil Sciences	MS	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Rating of Skills	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	14	9	14
Plant Pathology	PhD	Oral Presentation	-	-	1	-	-
Soil Sciences	PhD	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Rating of Skills	Oral Presentation	4	4	4

Table III.2. Program Outcomes Assessment: College of Arts and Sciences

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
American Studies	BA	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
American Studies	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	-	12	12	-
Applied Computer Programming	BS	No Report Submitted					
Applied Statistics	MS	Course Exam(s)	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Course Embedded Assignments	6	5	4
Art History	MA	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	2	2	2
Art: Art History	BA	Oral Presentation	Oral Presentation	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	6	6	6
Art: Graphic Design	BFA	No Report Submitted					
Art: Studio Art	BFA	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	15	15	15
Arts Administration	BA	No Report Submitted					
Biochemistry	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	23	1	3
Biological Science	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Other	Other	60	147	147
Chemistry	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Supervisor Evaluation	Supervisor Evaluation	No Data Reported		

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Chemistry	PhD	Supervisor Evaluation	Supervisor Evaluation	Oral Presentation	23	39	6
Chemistry: ACS Approved	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Rating of Skills	26	2	8
Chemistry: Departmental Degree	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	39	3	7
Communication Science & Disorders	BS	Course Exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	297	55	55
Communication Science & Disorders	MS	Nationally Benchmarked Exam	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	28	68	60
Computer Science	BS	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Exams	Presentation/ Performance	60	60	60
Computer Science	MS	No Report Submitted					
Computer Science	PhD	No Report Submitted					
Creative Writing	MFA	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
English	BA	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
English	MA	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
English	PhD	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
French	BA	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Embedded Assignments	107	107	107
Geography	BA	Other	Other	Other	1	1	2

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Geography	BS	Rating of Skills	Other	Other	5	9	11
Geography	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Course Embedded Assignments	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	38	20	6
Geography	PhD	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Course Embedded Assignments	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	14	14	1
Geology	BS	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
Geology	MS	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
Geology	PhD	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
Geospatial Information Sciences	BS	Other	Other	Other	8	7	3
German	BA	No Report Submitted					
Global Studies	BA	Rating of Skills	Rating of Skills	Rating of Skills	8	8	11
History	BA	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	15	15	15
History	PhD	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	3	3	3
History: Public History	MA	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	11	11	11
Integrative Biology	MS	Other	Other	Other	4	3	7
Integrative Biology	PhD	Other	Oral Presentation	Other	8	2	7
Mass Communication	MS	No Report Submitted					
Mathematics	BA	No Report Submitted					
Mathematics	BS	No Reports Submitted					

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Mathematics	MS	Course Exam(s)	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Oral Presentation	15	5	4
Mathematics	PhD	Course Exam(s)	Project & Assignments	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	16	4	4
Medicinal Chemistry	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	5	1	0
Microbiology/ Cell & Molecular Biology	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Rating of Skills	Course Embedded Assignments	60	10	18
Microbiology/ Cell & Molecular Biology	MS	Oral Presentation	Oral Presentation	Analysis of Written Artifacts	11	6	11
Microbiology/ Cell & Molecular Biology	PhD	Other	Other	Other	30	30	30
Multidisciplinary Studies	BA	No Report Submitted					
Multidisciplinary Studies	BS	No Report Submitted					
Multimedia Journalism	BA	Survey	Pre-Post Core Course	Portfolio Review	15	267	15
Multimedia Journalism	BS	Survey	Other	Survey	15	267	15
Music	BA	Course Exam(s)	Rating of Skills	Performance or Jury	3	1	28
Music	BM	Course Exam(s)	Course Exam(s)	Performance or Jury	21	8	16
Music	MM	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Oral Presentation	Supervisor Evaluation	21	17	14

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Music Education	BM	Course Exam(s)	Performance or Jury	-	42	17	-
Music Industry	BS	Course Exam(s)	Course Exam(s)	Internship	71	55	28
Peace Conflict Security Studies	MA	Course Exam(s)	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	7	2	2
Philosophy	BA	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
Philosophy	MA	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
Photonics	PhD	Course Exam(s)	Rating of Skills	Rating of Skills	3	3	2
Physics	BS	No Report Submitted					
Physics	MS	No Report Submitted					
Physics	PhD	No Report Submitted					
Physiology	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Other	Other	22	22	22
Plant Biology	BS	Course Exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	49	28	9
Plant Biology	MS	Rating of Skills	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Oral Presentation	3	16	2
Plant Biology	PhD	Rating of Skills	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Rating of Skills	17	17	14
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
Politics and Policy Studies	MA	Course Exam(s)	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	30	3	3

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Psychology	BA	Course Exam(s)	Course Exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	621	188	110
Psychology	BS	Course Exam(s)	Course Exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	1137	188	110
Psychology	MS	No Report Submitted					
Psychology	PhD	No Report Submitted					
Sociology	BA	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	40	40	20
Sociology	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	40	40	20
Sociology	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	7	7	7
Sociology	PhD	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	3	3	3
Spanish	BA	Oral Presentation	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Project & Assignments	618	618	618
Sports Media	BA	No Report Submitted					
Sports Media	BS	Course Exam(s)	Course Project	Portfolio Review	267	76	15
Statistics	BS	Course Exam(s)	Capstone Assignment	Course Exam(s)	10	9	12
Statistics	MS	Course Exam(s)	Course Exam(s)	Course Exam(s)	5	2	2
Statistics	PhD	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Rating of Skills	Course Embedded Assignments	2	3	2
Strategic Communication	BA	Course Exam(s)	Portfolio Review	Project & Assignments	267	15	87
Strategic Communication	BS	Course Exam(s)	Course Project	Portfolio Review	267	87	87
Theatre	BA	No Report Submitted					

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Zoology	BS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Other	Other	71	81	81

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	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
Applied Educational Studies: Aviation and Space	EDD	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Course Project	22	18	17
Applied Exercise Sciences	BS	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
Aviation and Space	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	Project & Assignments	18	20	48
Counseling	MS	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
Counseling Psychology	PhD	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
Curriculum Studies	PhD	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Other	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	8	10	8
Design, Housing and Merchandising	BSHS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Oral Presentation	28	88	55
Design, Housing and Merchandising	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	14	18	18
Early Child Care and Development	BSHS	No Report Submitted					
Education	PhD	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Research Proposal	10	9	9
Education: Educational Administration	EDS	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Capstone Assignment	-	16	6	-
Educational Leadership & Policy	PhD	Qualifying Exam	Capstone Assignment	-	6	6	-

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Studies: Educational Administration							
Educational Leadership & Policy Studies: Higher Education	PhD			No Report Submitted			
Educational Leadership Studies: College Student Development	MS	Course Embedded Assignments	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Internship	18	6	6
Educational Leadership Studies: Higher Education	MS	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	-		No Data Submitted	
Educational Leadership Studies: School Administration	MS			No Report Submitted			
Educational Psychology: Educational Psychology	MS	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Survey	Survey	11	11	11
Educational Psychology: Educational Psychology	PhD	Survey	Other	Other	13	13	13
Educational Psychology: Research and Evaluation	MS	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	-	1	1	-

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Educational Psychology: Research and Evaluation	PhD	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	2	2	2
Educational Technology	MS	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Other	24	24	24
Elementary Education	BS	Portfolio Review	Capstone Assignment	Other	No Data Submitted		
Family and Consumer Sciences Education	MS	No Report Submitted					
Family Financial Planning	MS	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	No Data Submitted		
Health and Human Performance	MS	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Other	Survey	12	12	12
Health, Leisure & Human Performance: Health & Human Performance	PhD	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Other	Survey	12	5	5
Health, Leisure & Human Performance: Leisure Studies	PhD	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
Human Development and Family Science	BSHS	Survey	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Survey	47	59	47

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Human Development and Family Science	MS	Rubric	Rubric	-	23	3	-
Human Sciences: Design, Housing and Merchandising	PhD	No Report Submitted					
Human Sciences: Human Development and Family Science	PhD	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
Leisure Studies	MS	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
Nursing	BSN	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
Nutritional Sciences	BSHS	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
Nutritional Sciences	MS	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
Nutritional Sciences	PhD	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
Public Health	BS	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
Recreation and Athletic Management	BS	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
Recreational Therapy	BS	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
School Administration	EDD	No Report Submitted					
School Psychology	PhD	Other	Rating of Skills	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	7	19	7
Secondary Education	BS	Portfolio Review	Capstone Assignment	Portfolio Review	No Data Reported		
Social Foundations of Education	MA	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Other	Analysis of Written Artifacts	4	4	4

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
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	No Data Submitted		
Architectural Engineering	BEN	Performance or Jury	Performance or Jury	Performance or jury	19	19	19
Architecture	BAR	Performance or Jury	Survey	Performance or jury	38	23	38
Chemical Engineering	BSCH	Course Embedded Assignments	Survey	Course Embedded Assignments	35	35	35
Chemical Engineering	MS	Performance or Jury	Performance or Jury	Survey	2	2	2
Chemical Engineering	PhD	Performance or Jury	Student Survey of Instruction	Interviews	9	9	2
Civil Engineering	BSCV	Nationally Benchmarked Exam	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	32	45	45
Civil Engineering	MS	Review of Student Research	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	Presentation/ Performance	13	13	11
Civil Engineering	PhD	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
Computer Engineering	BSCP	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
Construction Engineering Technology	BSET	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
Electrical Engineering	ME	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
Electrical Engineering	BSEE	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
Electrical Engineering	MS	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Electrical Engineering	PhD	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
Electrical Engineering Technology	BSET	Course Project	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Embedded Assignments	7	43	8
Engineering and Technology Management	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	44	27	27
Fire & Emergency Management	PhD	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
Fire & Emergency Management Administration	MS	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
Fire Protection & Safety Engineering Technology	BSET	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
Fire Protection & Safety Engineering Technology	MSET	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
Industrial Engineering & Management	BSIE	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
Industrial Engineering & Management	MS	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
Industrial Engineering & Management	PhD	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					
Materials Science and Engineering	MS	No Report Submitted					
Materials Science and Engineering	PhD	No Report Submitted					

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Number Assessed #3
Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering	MS	Rating of Skills	Other	Other	26	18	26
Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering	PhD	Capstone Assignment	Other	Other	14	14	14
Mechanical Engineering	BSME	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	162	119	119
Mechanical Engineering Technology	BSET	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Oral Presentation	Group Project	No Data Submitted		
Mechatronics and Robotics	BSET	Course Exam(s)	Course Exam(s)	Course Embedded Assignments	9	1	18
Mechatronics and Robotics	MSET	Rating of Skills	Oral Presentation	Course Project	6	2	9
Petroleum Engineering	MS	Course Exam(s)	Oral Presentation	Oral Presentation	7	2	9
Petroleum Engineering	PhD	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Oral Presentation	Group Project	No Data Submitted		

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

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Accounting	BSBA	Course Exam(s)	Course Exam(s)	Course Exam(s)	381	201	123
Accounting	MS	Course Exam(s)	Course Embedded Assignments	Course Exam(s)	33	54	33
Business Administration	MBA	Presentation/ Performance	Survey	-	72	161	-
Business Administration	PhD	Performance or Jury	Presentation/ Performance	Oral Presentation	42	6	33
Business Administration: Accounting	PhD	Other	Oral Presentation	Analysis of Written Artifacts	2	2	2
Business Administration: Entrepreneurship	PhD	Performance or Jury	Presentation/ Performance	Oral Presentation	42	6	33
Business Administration: Executive Research	PhD	Performance or Jury	Presentation/ Performance	Oral Presentation	42	6	33
Business Administration: Finance	PhD	Performance or Jury	Presentation/ Performance	Oral Presentation	42	6	33
Business Administration: Hospitality and Tourism Management	PhD	Performance or Jury	Presentation/ Performance	Oral Presentation	42	6	33
Business Administration: Management	PhD	Performance or Jury	Presentation/ Performance	Oral Presentation	42	6	33
Business Administration:	PhD	Performance or Jury	Presentation/ Performance	Oral Presentation	42	6	33

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Management Information Systems							
Business Administration: Marketing	PhD	Performance or Jury	Presentation/ Performance	Oral Presentation	42	6	33
Business Analytics and Data Science	MS	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Comprehensive, Certification, or Professional Exam(s)	Project & Assignments	49	70	43
Economics	BSBA	Course Exam(s)	Oral Presentation	Survey	660	293	965
Economics	PhD	Exam(s)	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Analysis of Written Artifacts	7	4	4
Entrepreneurship	BSBA	Course Exam(s)	Oral Presentation	Survey	660	293	965
Finance	BSBA	Course Exam(s)	Oral Presentation	Survey	660	293	965
General Business	BSBA	Course Exam(s)	Course Exam(s)	Survey	660	660	965
Hospitality and Tourism Management	BSBA	Course Exam(s)	Oral Presentation	Survey	660	293	965
Hospitality and Tourism Management	MS	Oral Presentation	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Review of Thesis/Dissertation/ Creative Component	18	97	1
International Business	BSBA	Course Exam(s)	Oral Presentation	Survey	660	293	965
Management	BSBA	Course Exam(s)	Oral Presentation	Survey	660	293	965

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed # 2	Number Assessed # 3
Management Information Systems	BSBA	Course Exam(s)	Oral Presentation	Survey	660	293	965
Management Information Systems	MS	Survey	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Course Embedded Assignments	34	57	21
Marketing	BSBA	Course Exam(s)	Oral Presentation	Survey	660	293	965
Quantitative Financial Economics	MS	Analysis of Written Artifacts	Course Project	Course Exam	6	9	10

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
Interdisciplinary Studies	MS	Capstone Assignment	Capstone Assignment	-	5	5	-
Public Health	MPH	Course Embedded Assignments	Internship	Course Project	25	25	25

Table III.7. 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)	Course Exam(s)	Project & Assignments	6	5	4
Comparative Biomedical Sciences	PhD	Course Exam(s)	Course Exam(s)	Oral Presentation	12	13	38

Table III.8. 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	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					

Table III.9. Program Outcomes Assessment: University Studies

Program	Degree	Assessment Method #1	Assessment Method #2	Assessment Method #3	Number Assessed #1	Number Assessed #2	Num-ber Assessed #3
University Studies	BUS	No Report Submitted – Context Provided					

Analyses and Findings

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

University Assessment and Testing has received 210 (86.8%) program outcomes assessment reports (covering the AY 2023-2024 and 2024-2025) out of 242 programs from eight colleges. This number excludes certificate programs due to the ongoing process of establishing institution wide assessment procedures to address certificates. Five components were used in the reviewing process of the reports: (1) Program Student Learning Outcomes, (2) Assessment Methods, (3) Findings, (4) Use of Findings, and (5) Annual Executive Summary. Each review component was reviewed using the established 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: 7.9% of programs received purple; 12.5% of programs received blue; 28.3% of programs received green; 15.5% received yellow; 7.3% received orange; 11.6% of programs received red; and 16.9% of programs received gray.

The following table, Table III.10, provides a longitudinal comparison of Program Outcomes Assessment scores over the last five years.

Table III.10. Institutional POA Summary – Five Year Comparison

		2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2023-2024 2024-2025
	Total programs[13]	296	247	247	242
	Completed reports	244 (82.4%)	217 (87.9%)	222 (89.9%)	210 (86.8%)
Overall					
	GEE	-	3.0%	4.0%	7.9%
	EE	15.8%	13.4%	12.1%	12.5%
	ME	49.1%	40.6%	33.9%	28.3%
	SME	11.9%	24.8%	31.3%	15.5%
	MME	-	5.9%	5.3%	7.3%
	MI	7.8%	9.6%	6.2%	11.6%
	NA	15.3%	2.8%	7.2%	16.9%
SLOs					
	GEE	-	2.8%	1.2%	6.2%
	EE	20.0%	18.6%	19.4%	14.0%
	ME	49.0%	39.7%	44.1%	49.6%
	SME	15.5%	28.3%	22.7%	5.4%
	MME	-	2.8%	1.2%	1.7%
	MI	9.8%	6.5%	5.7%	6.6%
	NA	11.7%	1.2%	5.7%	16.5%
Methods					
	GEE	-	1.2%	1.2%	11.6%
	EE	19.0%	17.8%	11.3%	18.2%
	ME	51.0%	43.3%	42.1%	26.0%
	SME	12.8%	22.7%	29.1%	9.1%
	MME	-	7.3%	4.9%	10.7%
	MI	4.5%	6.5%	5.7%	7.9%
	NA	12.8%	1.2%	5.7%	16.5%
Findings					
	GEE	-	6.9%	6.1%	7.9%
	EE	15.9%	11.3%	12.1%	11.2%
	ME	52.8%	37.3%	27.1%	20.7%
	SME	5.9%	21.1%	36.0%	22.7%
	MME	-	8.5%	3.6%	6.2%
	MI	9.0%	10.9%	6.5%	14.0%
	NA	16.6%	4.1%	8.5%	17.4%
Use of Findings					
	GEE	-	2.4%	6.1%	5.0%
	EE	9.8%	7.3%	7.7%	8.7%
	ME	56.4%	30.4%	22.7%	22.7%
	SME	14.5%	33.6%	37.2%	22.3%
	MME	-	8.1%	10.5%	9.1%
	MI	8.8%	13.4%	6.9%	14.9%
	NA	10.5%	4.9%	8.9%	17.4%

[13] During the 2023-2024 and 2024-2025 years, a total of 55 certificate programs were excluded from the counts.

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

- Findings of the program outcomes assessment report review will be presented to AAIC during the February 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 2026, UAT will be working with programs that need assistance in modifying program student learning outcomes, creating more robust assessment methods, analyzing findings, and identifying the best strategies for use of findings of their program assessment for continuous improvement.
- UAT will collaborate with each of the associate deans, department chairs, program directors, and program assessment coordinators on how to use program assessment findings to strengthen the quality of student learning outcomes assessment.
- In the Spring of 2026, 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.

Additionally, guidelines created in 2023 on how to follow-up with missing program outcomes assessment reports were followed again this year. 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.
- 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 was created through the intentional and statistically sound combination of the prior instruments, the OSU Student Engagement Survey (SES) and the OSU Student Satisfaction Survey (SSS). A baseline of each survey was established by surveying for three consecutive years as well as the survey structure was validated.

In the following section, we will present information and results for the most recent Spring 2025 administration, which marked the second administration of the OSU-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 2025 administration of the OSU Student Satisfaction and Engagement Survey (OSU-SSES) was the second bi-annual administration of the survey.
- The survey is administered online using Qualtrics online survey software. The OSU-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 satisfaction with OSU academics and services and overall engagement in various activities. The survey scale included the themes: Academic Satisfaction, Connection to OSU, Academic Effort, Interaction, Higher Order Learning, and Involvement.

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

Data collection yielded 5,768 (27.1%) responses, with 5,571 (26.2%) in the final data set.

- Response Rates
  - College
    - College of Arts and Sciences: 22.9% (*n* = 1,371/5996)
    - College of Education and Human Sciences: 22.6% (*n* = 1,030/4,560)
    - College of Engineering, Architecture and Technology: 23.1% (*n* = 895/3,878)
    - College of Professional Studies: 21.4% (*n* = 30/140)
    - Ferguson College of Agriculture: 27.8% (*n* = 849 /3,051)
    - Global Studies: 52.0% (*n* = 13 /25)
    - Spears School of Business: 17.9% (*n* = 1,154/6,449)
  - Classification
    - Undergraduate: 19.9 % (n = 4,123/20,762)

        - Graduate: 32.8% (n = 1,446 /4,410)

Demographic Variables

- Campus
    - Stillwater: 87.5% (*n* = 4,876)
    - Stillwater/Tulsa: 9.7% (*n* = 540)
    - Tulsa: 2.8% (*n* = 155)
- Gender
    - Female: 62.1% (*n* = 3,460)
    - Male: 37.9% (*n* = 2,110)
- Race, Nationality, and Ethnicity
    - White or European American: 58.1% (n = 3,235)
    - International: 11.7% (n = 653)
    - Multiracial: 10.6% (n = 589)
    - Hispanic, Latin(a/o), or Latinx: 9.1% (n = 507)
    - Native American or Alaska Native: 4.0% (n = 222)
    - Black or African American: 3.9% (n = 218)
    - Asian or Asian American: 2.4% (n = 133)
    - Unknown: 0.2% (*n* = 9)
    - Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander: 0.1% (*n* = 5)
- Class Level
  (Note: 174 students' classifications did not fit into one of the below six categories)
    - Freshman: 11.7% (*n* = 654)
    - Sophomore: 15.5% (*n* = 862)
    - Junior: 19.6% (*n* = 1,094)
    - Senior: 25.3% (*n* = 1,412)
    - Masters: 13.9% (*n* = 776)
    - Doctoral: 10.8% (*n* = 599)
- Classification
    - Undergraduate: 74.0% (*n* = 4,123)
    - Graduate: 26.0% (*n* = 1,446)
- Full-Time/Part-Time Status
    - Full-time: 72.6% (*n* = 4,047)
    - Part-time: 27.4% (*n* = 1,524)
- Home State
    - Oklahoma: 63.2% (*n* = 3,521)
    - Texas: 12.5% (*n* = 697)
    - Kansas: 1.5% (*n* = 84)
    - California: 1.4% (*n* = 76)
    - Other: 21.4% (*n* = 1,193)

- A total of 2,017 open-ended comments were recorded.

Reliability and Validity

- Overall reliability for OSU Student Satisfaction and Engagement Survey (OSU-SSES) (Cronbach's alpha) is 0.929 for the four-factor model, indicating excellent internal consistency. Overall validity CFI is 0.90 for the four-factor model, both indicating a good fit.

Item Analysis

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

- I do my best regarding my responsibilities in group work at OSU. **(96.7%)**
- I attend my OSU classes. **(96.6%)**
- I spend enough time and make enough effort to learn at OSU. **(95.6%)**
- I motivate myself to learn at OSU. **(92.2%)**
- I feel safe on the OSU campus. **(90.6%)**
- I attend my OSU classes having completed readings/assignments. **(88.7%)**
- I try to be open to learning things that could potentially change the way I understand an issue or concept at OSU. **(87.8%)**
- Overall, I feel good about being at OSU. **(87.0%)**
- I am comfortable being myself at OSU. **(85.5%)**
- I combine ideas from different courses when completing assignments at OSU. **(83.6%)**

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

- I discuss course topics, ideas, or concepts with an OSU professor outside of class. **(33.1%)**
- I talk about my career plans with career services, faculty, or advisors at OSU. **(24.7%)**
- I ask other students to help me understand course material at OSU. **(22.6%)**
- I feel I am an important part of the OSU community. **(14.8%)**
- I have quality interactions with my OSU academic advisor. **(10.4%)**

Top 3 "Involved" items *(Yes)*

- I have been actively involved in an OSU student group or group in the community. **(63.0%)**
- I have participated in field experience (e.g., internship, part-time job, student teaching, clinical placement, or other field experience) while at OSU. **(55.7%)**
- I have participated in a community-based project (e.g., volunteering) during my studies at OSU. **(55.5%)**

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

- I have worked with a faculty member on a research project at OSU. **(35.4%)**
- I have been actively involved in an OSU student group or group in the community. **(15.8%)**

Note: Frequency percentages were calculated without including missing responses.

OSU Student Satisfaction and Engagement Survey – Multi-Year Comparison

Table IV.1. Item Analysis

	Top Items with the HIGHEST Levels of Engagement						
Survey Item	**2025**		**2025**		***Associated Theme***	***P-value***	***Effect Size (Cohen's d)***
	"Always" & "Often"	***"Rarely" & "Never"***	***"Always" & "Often"***	***"Rarely" & "Never"***			
I do my best regarding my responsibilities in group work at OSU.	96.7%	0.5%	97.0%	0.4%	Academic Effort	0.477	
I attend my OSU classes. **	96.6%	0.5%	94.6%	1.3%	Academic Effort	0.002	0.095
I spend enough time and make enough effort to learn at OSU.	95.6%	0.4%	95.0%	0.6%	Academic Effort	0.948	
I motivate myself to learn at OSU.	92.2%	1.2%	90.9%	1.2%	Academic Effort	0.612	
I feel safe on the OSU campus. *	90.6%	1.4%	91.9%	0.9%	Connection to OSU	0.043	0.066
I attend my OSU classes having* completed readings/assignments.	88.7%	2.0%	86.0%	2.4%	Academic Effort	0.025	0.067
I try to be open to learning things that could potentially change the way I understand an issue or concept at OSU.	87.8%	1.1%	89.4%	1.0%	Higher Order Learning	0.156	
Overall, I feel good about being at OSU. **	87.0%	2.7%	87.4%	2.9%	Connection to OSU	0.003	0.092
I am comfortable being myself at OSU. *	85.5%	2.7%	85.2%	2.9%	Connection to OSU	0.016	0.062
I combine ideas from different courses when completing assignments at OSU. *	83.6%	2.3%	83.6%	2.1%	Higher Order Learning	0.029	0.068

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

Table IV.2. Item Analysis

	Top Items with the HIGHEST Levels of Disengagement						
Survey Item	**2025**		**2025**		***Associated Theme***	***P-value***	***Effect Size (Cohen's d)***
	"Always" & "Often"	***"Rarely" & "Never"***	***"Always" & "Often"***	***"Rarely" & "Never"***			
I discuss course topics, ideas, or concepts with an OSU professor outside of class.	33.8%	33.1%	34.5%	33.0%	Interaction	0.069	
I talk about my career plans with career services, faculty, or advisors at OSU.	44.7%	24.7%	46.2%	23.7%	Interaction	0.315	
I ask other students to help me understand course material at OSU.	46.9%	22.6%	51.0%	19.7%	Interaction	0.335	
I feel I am an important part of the OSU community.*	58.0%	14.8%	61.1%	13.6%	Connection to OSU	0.002	0.088
I have quality interactions with my OSU academic advisor.	71.6%	10.4%	71.9%	10.2%	Interaction	0.688	

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

Table IV.3. Item Analysis

	Top Items with the HIGHEST Levels of Involvement						
Survey Item	**2025**		**2025**		***Associated Theme***	***P-value***	***Effect Size (Cohen's d)***
	"Always" & "Often"	***"Rarely" & "Never"***	***"Always" & "Often"***	***"Rarely" & "Never"***			
I have been actively involved in an OSU student group or group in the community.	63.0%	15.8%	65.8%	14.3%	Involvement	0.108	
I have participated in field experience (e.g., internship, part-time job, student teaching, clinical placement, or other field experience) while at OSU. ***	55.7%	10.1%	57.7%	8.9%	Involvement	<0.001	0.404
I have participated in a community-based project (e.g., volunteering) during my studies at OSU.***	55.5%	14.4%	57.5%	12.6%	Involvement	<0.001	0.140

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

Interpreting Significant Differences
Cohen's d was used to provide the "degree of the differences" between student responses in 2023 and 2025. Cohen's d is considered "small" if the value is less than or equal to .20. All significant differences among the highest and lowest engagement items but one are considered to have small differences. This means that essentially, students responded to the survey similarly in 2023 as they did in 2025, and that the difference does not have practical significance despite its statistical significance.

Concluding Inferences
In conclusion, student responses across the two years, 2023 and 2025, did not drastically differ. There were some significant differences among items between years; however, effect sizes were generally very small.

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

- As this was only the second administration of the OSU-SSES, we will continue to administer the survey every other year until a proper baseline is set and further changes to the instrument will be made according to the developing needs of the university.

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 202-25:

2023-24:

Assessment Fees	**$843,766.46**
Assessment Salaries	**$421,043.86**
Distributed to Other Departments	**$121,669.41**
Operational Costs	**$267,372.05**
Total Expenditures	**$810,085.32**

2024-25:

Assessment Fees	**$877,017.63**
Assessment Salaries	**$484,190.80**
Distributed to Other Departments	**$99,137.24**
Operational Costs	**$213,475.12**
Total Expenditures	**$796,803.16**