SOUTHEASTERN OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
Durant, Oklahoma

Southeastern Oklahoma State University

ANNUAL REPORT OF ACTIVITY ASSESSMENT REPORT
Submitted to the
Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
02 December 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

University Contact: Dr. Teresa Golden
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Southeastern Oklahoma State University
Durant, Oklahoma 74701-0609
580.745.2064
tgolden@se.edu

SOUTHEASTERN OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
Annual Assessment Report (1 July 2021 – 30 June 2022)
Executive Summary

Southeastern's Assessment Plan provides a comprehensive framework of policies and protocols to improve student learning. This plan is compliant with the polices of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (OSRHE) and consistent with the expectations of regional accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission and all specialty accreditations possessed by various programs/disciplines at Southeastern. Individuals at all levels were involved in the collection, analysis, evaluation, and review of data for the five areas required by OSRHE policy: Entry-Level Assessment; Mid-Level Assessment; Program Outcomes Assessment; Student Satisfaction Assessment; and Graduate Student Assessment. Assessment information for these five areas is then forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs. The Vice President of Academic Affairs has primary oversight of the preparation of the annual assessment report for the University. This summative report has been shared with all appropriate entities on campus. Included in individual reports and the summative annual assessment report are program modifications implemented to improve student learning that were made as a direct result of assessment; this process is a good indicator of the culture of assessment that is focused on improvement rather than compliance at Southeastern.

Section I - Executive Summary

During the 2021-2022 academic year, 336 students tested in English, 426 students tested in mathematics, and 291 tested in reading. Southeastern's Blackboard CPT was the testing instrument used for English, mathematics, and reading. Students were placed in a regular college course, a co-requisite college course, or a zero-level math course based on the results of their CPT scores. (See Section I-4 for placement information.)

Section II - Mid-Level Assessment Program

During the Spring semester the ETS Proficiency Profile was administered. The exam was self-scheduled and included proctored, online exam times and a variety of on-campus proctored times. This cycle 176 randomly chosen students (45 freshmen, 48 sophomores, 47 juniors, and 33 seniors) took some portion of the exam. Transfer students that completed most of their general education classes at another university were not included (n=2). Another student did not answer enough questions for ETS to score their exam. Of the remaining 173, 12 took only the essay portion of the exam and 26 took all tests except the essay. Altogether, 161 students took the main portion of the exam and 147 took only the essay portion.

Section III - Program Outcomes Assessment

Program Outcomes Assessment measures the extent to which students are meeting the stated goals and objectives of academic programs. Southeastern faculty were asked to respond to the types of assessment that were used and the number of students that were being assessed. The faculty then provided a summary and explanation of the assessment result. Types of assessments used included comprehensive standardized examinations, locally developed comprehensive examinations, certification tests, surveys, interviews, and senior seminars.

Graduate Student Assessment

The School of Graduate and University Studies continues to grow, and progress has been made in the development and implementation of assessment plans for each graduate program. Southeastern offers the following master's degree programs:

- Master of Arts (M.A.)
    - Clinical Mental Health Counseling
- Master of Business Administration (M.B.A.)
- Master of Music Education (M.M.E)
- Master of Education (M.Ed.)
    - Educational Leadership-Principalship
    - Educational Leadership-Superintendent
    - Curriculum & Instruction
    - School Counseling
    - Special Education
- Master of Science (M.S.)
    - Aerospace Administration and Logistics
    - Occupational Safety and Health
    - Native American Leadership
    - Sports Administration
- Master of Technology (M.T.)
    - Biology
- Master of Early Intervention and Child Development

Section IV - Student Satisfaction Assessment Executive Summary

To monitor student satisfaction, the nationally referenced Ruffalo Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) and the Priorities Survey for Online learners (PSOL) were used in the Spring semester of 2022. A total of 477 randomly selected students provided feedback on their experience with Southeastern, with 197 responding to the SSI and 280 responding to the PSOL. Student satisfaction ratings have consistently demonstrated our students feel very positive about their experiences on this campus and with the services provided by Southeastern offices.

V - Assessment Budgets Executive Summary

Assessment fees and expenditures for 2021-22

	__2021-2022__
Assessment fees	$0; SE does not have an assessment fee
Assessment salaries	$29,556.00

Distributed to other departments	$0; no funds were distributed to other units
Operational costs	$40,623.00
Total Expenditures	$70,119.00

Executive Summary Conclusions

Southeastern continues its effort to improve all aspects of assessment. The Vice President for Academic Affairs, in conjunction with the Institutional Assessment Committee, continues to work to improve the culture of assessment on campus. As most recently stated in the 2018 HLC assurance argument review, "The 24th annual assessment report, prepared by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, captures the culture of assessment across campus by summarizing assessment processed and identifying action steps to address concerns and future actions, thus closing the loop on assessment." The review team also found that Southeastern is continuing to use assessment effectively and has a good assessment system in place, as they noted with "...all degree programs engage students in appropriate levels of mastery modes of inquiry, analyses/communications of information, and development of skills for a changing environment" and "SOSU has demonstrated responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services. These processes individually demonstrate a contribution to learning, and collectively demonstrate an effective system of institutional evaluation of student learning."

SECTION I – ENTRY LEVEL ASSESSMENT AND COURSE PLACEMENT

Administering Assessment

I-1. What information was used to determine college-level course placement?

Students who are admitted to Southeastern Oklahoma State University must meet the admission requirements defined by the university. In addition, students must also meet the following curricular requirements:

> *4 years of English (or an ACT English of 19 or SAT equivalent)
> *3 years of Math (or an ACT Math of 19 or SAT equivalent)
> *3 years of History and Citizenship skills (or an ACT Reading of 19 or SAT equivalent)
> *3 years of Lab Science (or an ACT of 19; SAT does not test in Science)
> *2 additional years or units of foreign language, computer science, or any of the above listed subjects.

If a student is admissible but does not meet curricular requirements, the student must complete a college placement test. Due to COVID-19, students are allowed to be admitted without ACT/SAT scores. These students completed the college placement test in math, English, and reading to determine appropriate placement in courses.

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

Students who met admission requirements but were deficient in one or more areas were assessed using multiple assessment measures, including secondary testing. These measures determined appropriate course placement or eligibility for participation in Southeastern's remediation courses, which include zero level math courses and co-requisite courses in math and English/reading.

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

Students who qualify for remediation courses are eligible for participation in Southeastern's accelerated remediation programs, including summer math workshops (we haven't offered these workshops since Covid began) and co-requisite remediation in English Composition One and College Algebra. Students who score a 70% or above, are cleared of deficiencies. If a student scores lower than a 70% of the placement test, he/she will be placed in the appropriate class based upon the score. Students who wish to retest in English and reading were given the option to complete the Basics of Language Training (BOLT) program. This review course is available to all students via the Blackboard Learning Management System. By completing this review module, students are given the opportunity to have the placement test reset. This allows students a second chance on the placement test. Students are also able to complete the Supplemental Teaching of Remedial Math (STORM) program to have a retest on the math placement test.

I-4. What information was used to determine co-requisite course placement? Please report the specific multiple measures your institution used for FY 2021-2022 (e.g., high school GPA and CPT cut scores).

All entering students were assessed based on their ACT or SAT sub-test scores as a first evaluation of academic readiness; only those students not meeting established cut-scores and/or who had not completed course work in one or more of the deficiency areas were required to undergo secondary testing. Students who have not met the previously mentioned requirements, will be required to take the College Placement Test in math, reading, and/or English.

Southeastern Oklahoma State University (Southeastern) uses an "in-house" college placement test. These tests were developed by our English and math departments. These tests specifically measure a student's ability to pass courses at SOSU. We offer testing for mathematics, reading, and English placement. Our exams are web-based tests with no time limit. Students have the option of taking the exam(s) in our testing center or from an off-campus location using a webcam and the Respondus lock down browser.

If a student scores below a 70% in English or reading, the student will be enrolled in a co-requisite English Comp (ENG 1113Z) class. Placement in math courses is based upon CPT scores, as follows:

      0% - 29%: MATH 0114
      30% - 39%: MATH 0123
      40% - 49%: MATH 0123 or MATH 1303
      50% - 69%: MATH 1303, MATH 1543, MATH 1483Z, or MATH 1513Z
      70% +: MATH 1303, MATH 1483, MATH 1513, MATH 1543, or STAT 2153
      *courses ending with a "Z" are co-requisite courses

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

Adult students who did not complete an ACT will be required to complete course placement tests in English, reading, and math. The requirement of remediation (traditional or embedded) will be based on test outcome.

Adults seeking admission to graduate programs who have scored below the minimum admission standards can request admission based on work experience. These students either have two years of work experience in the field or have GPAs slightly below admission requirements but were approved for admission by both the Program Coordinator and Graduate Dean. The number of students entering this way is typically low but is increasing as our enrollment increases. The information is reported below:

- Undergraduate Admits: 2,136
- Of those, admitted as an adult: 122

- Graduate Admits: 2,597
- Of those, admitted based on work experience: 298 Admitted

Analyses and Findings

I-6. Describe analyses and findings of student success in both developmental and college-level courses, effectiveness of the placement decisions, evaluation of multiple measures, and changes

in the entry-level assessment process or approaches to teaching as a result of findings.
In an effort to collect data on various Complete College America (CCA) initiatives, please complete the additional questions addressing developmental and co-requisite placement.
Complete the Online Reporting Form: https://forms.gle.hUHBrjmoLM8yoaf1A

The success of Southeastern's Entry-Level Assessment and Placement program was measured by several factors, including retention in both remedial and college level courses, course GPA comparisons, and student satisfaction. Several offices were responsible for tracking these factors and ensuring the integrity of the process. One of the offices, the Learning Center, which is responsible for entry-level testing, placement, and remediation, has implemented several measures to validate the success of its program. Table I-1 shows the number of students required to participate in one or more second entry-level assessments.

Please note: We no longer test in science and there is no longer a remedial course in this subject. However, students with a science deficiency are required to clear any math or reading deficiencies before enrolling in a science course. Additionally, students who have a deficiency in reading, after completing the placement test, must enroll in an embedded remediation class of English Comp I to clear the deficiency. In addition to English/Language Arts materials, the embedded course also includes material to enhance reading comprehension in students.

Another measure of program effectiveness was the comparison of course GPAs as developmental students matriculated into regular college courses. Table I-2 suggests a slight shift in how well students in our embedded remediation classes compare with their peers who tested out of the secondary assessment, met other secondary assessment criteria, participated in accelerated remedial programs, or who were not required to test because of their ACT/SAT scores. We plan to monitor this to see if the shift is a significant and ongoing one. These data were based on first-time first-term entering freshmen because we were measuring the effectiveness of Southeastern's remedial courses, and to include transfers would confound the data. At this time, no adjustments to cut scores are recommended. We are, however, frequently reviewing and analyzing the scores and data each semester.

Table I-1   Summary of Secondary Testing and Placement in Remedial Courses
(Data is from Students Required to Test not Total Population)

Placement/ Secondary Assessment	Required to Test		Required but Did not Test		Required to Enroll in Remedial Course or Co-Requisite Course		Passed Test; No Remediation Needed		Total Number of Students Tested
English (Blackboard CPT):									
No. of Students [Percent of Students who Did Not Test] (Percent of Students who Tested)	972		636 **[65.43 %]**		259 **(77.08%)**		77 **(22.92%)**		336 **(34.57%)**

8

Mathematics (Blackboard CPT):									
No. of Students [Percent of Students who Did Not Test] (Percent of Students who Tested)		898		472 **[52.56 %]**		362 **(84.98%)**		64 **(15.02%)**	426 **(47.44%)**
Reading (Blackboard CPT):									
No. of Students [Percent of Students who Did Not Test] (Percent of Students who Tested)		884		593 **[67.08 %]**		211 **(72.51%)**		80 **(27.49%)**	291 **(32.92%)**

Table I-2
Overall GPA Comparisons

Course (Population – First-Time, First-Term Entering Freshmen)	Students Enrolled in Zero-Level Classes	Students Enrolled in Embedded Remediation Classes	Students Testing Out of Zero-Level Classes	Students Exempt from Zero-Level Classes
English				
No. of Students	n/a	127	46	166
GPA (Summer 2021 - Spring 2022)	n/a	1.95	2.40	2.84
Reading				
No. of Students	n/a	78	49	191
GPA (Summer 2021 - Spring 2022)	n/a	1.74	2.59	2.74
Mathematics				
No. of Students	76	185	231	121
GPA (Summer 2021 - Spring 2022)	1.84	2.26	2.14	2.96

*Includes students who participated in summer math and/or English/reading accelerated remediation

workshops and/or enrolled in embedded remediation classes: ENG 1113 or MATH 1513. Embedded remediation is also in with the exempt.

Executive Summary

During the 2021-2022 academic year, 336 students tested in English, 426 students tested in mathematics, and 291 tested in reading. Southeastern's Blackboard CPT was the testing instrument used for English, mathematics, and reading. Students were placed in a regular college course, a co-requisite college course, or a zero-level math course based on the results of their CPT scores. (See Section I-4 for placement information.)

SECTION II – GENERAL EDUCATION ASSESSMENT

Administering Assessment

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

The General Education Council, working with department chairs and faculty, developed the following 6 goals for the general education program; student learning outcomes also were developed for each goal.

Communication Goal: to enhance oral and written communication skills.

Mathematics Goal: to recognize and communicate using mathematical ideas.

Sciences Goal: to observe and evaluate natural processes.

Social and Political Institutions Goal: to investigate the development of social, political, and/or economic institutions.

Wellness Goal: to recognize the importance of physical and emotional health throughout the life cycle.

Fine Arts and Humanities Goal: to explore the cultural heritage of humans and intrinsic value of the fine arts.

Departments developed course-embedded assessments of learning outcomes addressed in each general education course offered; these plans included protocols and benchmarks for each learning outcome. The university also uses the ETS Proficiency Profile to evaluate university-wide general education performance. The ETS measures student performance in the areas of Critical Thinking, Reading, Writing, Mathematics, Humanities, Social Sciences, Natural Sciences, and Essay Writing as well as giving a Total Score for each student.

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

During the Spring semester the ETS Proficiency Profile was administered. The exam was self-scheduled and included proctored, online exam times and a variety of on-campus proctored times. This cycle 176 randomly chosen students (45 freshmen, 48 sophomores, 47 juniors, and 33 seniors) took some portion of the exam. Transfer students that completed most of their general education classes at another university were not included (n=2). Another student did not answer enough questions for ETS to

score their exam. Of the remaining 173, 12 took only the essay portion of the exam and 26 took all tests except the essay. Altogether, 161 students took the main portion of the exam and 147 took only the essay portion.

In the Fall Semester 2005, Southeastern initiated a course-embedded assessment of the general education goals and learning outcomes addressed by each course. Departments were given the latitude to develop assessment protocols, set benchmarks, and determine the numbers and types of students selected to comprise a representative sample. Each department that offers at least one general education course submits an annual report detailing their general education assessment results.

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

Several techniques were used to motivate students during mid-level assessment. First, a letter was sent by the Vice President for Academic Affairs to all students selected to complete the ETS Proficiency Profile based on the times and options available. This letter detailed the importance of students giving their best effort on the exam and the explanation of how assessment results would be used to improve the program. Students also were informed that they could not pre-enroll for the following semester unless they completed the assessment test on the assigned date or completed a make-up test.

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

The role of the General Education Council is to evaluate, review, and develop the philosophy, curriculum, and policies of General Education. Departments review their course-embedded results and submit a general education report to the Director of General Education. The ETS exam results are also complied and reviewed by the Director of General Education. Three years ago, the General Education Council implemented the reduced number of General Education student learning outcomes under each goal (per previous HLC recommendation) and due to the phase-out of the ACT CAAP test, we switched to using the ETS proficiency profile. Based on how new these recent changes are, no instructional changes are currently being planned until sufficient data are collected and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of these programmatic changes.

Analyses and Findings

II-5. What were the analyses and findings from the 2021-22 mid-level/general education assessment?

 Our students scored higher on the 2021-22 exam than previous years. The average score for the five years reported was 430.96 with the lowest being in 2018.

Report

TotalScore

Semester	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Fall2018	428.27	90	15.318
Spring2019	431.11	140	16.494
Spring2020	430.31	154	15.427
Spring2021	431.21	197	19.770
Spring2022	432.66	161	19.525
Total	430.96	742	17.767

In the meantime, the national average on this exam increased by approximately 5 points (442 in 2020-21 and 437.6 in 2019-2020. Our sophomores were ½ standard deviation below the national average. Our freshmen, instead of coming in at 1 standard deviation below the freshman national average, came into the university only ½ standard deviation below the freshman national average (consistent with last year's results). Our juniors scored less than 1/3 standard deviation below the national average and seniors were between ½ and 1/3 standard deviations below the national average, which was the highest our senior class has ever scored.

Students consistently make gains in general education throughout their time at Southeastern. They come in as freshmen at about ½ standard deviation below the national average and leave at about 1/3 standard deviation below the national average. This year, the biggest gain was from sophomores to juniors, but in previous years it was from freshmen to sophomores.

Total Score Results

Class	SE Total Score Average	National Total Score Average
Freshmen	427.2	435.6
Sophomores	430.2	440.2
Juniors	436.6	442.2
Seniors	439.2	447.2

Critical Thinking Results

Class	SE CT Average	National CT Average
Freshmen	107.6	109.2
Sophomores	108.7	110.8
Juniors	110.9	111.3
Seniors	112.3	112.2

Reading Results

Class	SE Reading Average	National Reading Average
Freshmen	111.7	115.3
Sophomores	112.7	117.1
Juniors	114.8	117.6
Seniors	118.1	118.8

Writing Results

Class	SE Writing Average	National Writing Average
Freshmen	110.9	112.5
Sophomores	111.4	113.3
Juniors	112.2	113.8
Seniors	112.4	114.9

Mathematics Results

Class	SE Math Average	National Math Average
Freshmen	108.2	111.6
Sophomores	109.5	112.4
Juniors	110.8	112.8
Seniors	110.5	114.2

Humanities Results

Class	SE Humanities Average	National Humanities Average
Freshmen	110.7	112.4
Sophomores	112.3	113.9
Juniors	113.4	114.4
Seniors	114.9	115.1

Social Sciences Results

Class	SE Total Score Average	National Total Score Average
Freshmen	109.3	111.1
Sophomores	109.6	112.3
Juniors	112.5	112.7
Seniors	113.5	113.7

Natural Sciences Results

Class	SE Total Score Average	National Total Score Average
Freshmen	110.9	113.2
Sophomores	111.7	114.7
Juniors	113.3	115.1
Seniors	116.0	116.1

Essay Results

ETS only reports an overall national average for the essay score and does not parse it into different kinds of universities or into different classifications of students. The overall national average is 3.8 with a standard deviation of 1.1. Possible scores range from 0 to 6. Though all of the national averages reported for the other areas above are from the Spring 2022 semester, ETS has not updated the national average for the essay score since Spring 2019. Over the last 5 years, this has been our best category when compared to national averages. Southeastern consistently ranks right at or, at times, even above the national average in essay scores.

Online vs. Traditional

Because we have recently added online options for many of our general education courses, we were interested in comparing students that take general education courses online to students that take general education courses in a traditional face-to-face class. There is no statistically significant correlation between "the percentage of general education hours taken online" and the Total Score (r=.021, p=.775). This means we cannot predict how well our students will do on the Total Score based on the percentage of online general education hours that they have taken. This is good, as it seems to indicate

no difference between our online general education courses and our traditional general education courses. To confirm or deny this, the dataset was split into two halves, those that had more than half of their general education classes online and those that had more than half of their general education classes face-to-face. Hybrid classes were counted as half online and half face-to-face.

MajorityType

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Majority Face-to-Face	125	72.3	75.8	75.8
	Majority Online	40	23.1	24.2	100.0
	Total	165	95.4	100.0	
Missing	System	8	4.6		
Total		173	100.0		

The data above indicate that the students who complete most of their general education online are not doing quite as well as those who take the majority face-to-face, although there is no statistical difference in most of the areas above. However, students who take most of their classes face-to-face statistically outperform the students who take the majority online in Total Score. The primary reason for this is not in the courses themselves, but a difference in the entering ability of the two groups of students. Students who take most of their general education online have an average ACT of 20, whereas those who take the majority face-to-face have an average ACT of 22.

II-6. How was student progress tracked into future semesters and what were the findings?

Student progress was tracked by sampling cohort groups in a point-in-time sample; cohort groups were defined by the four undergraduate classifications (freshmen, sophomore, junior, and senior). Although we did not track individual students, we completed a longitudinal analysis and examined for differences among the different classifications.

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

Our Total Score is higher than it has ever been at 432.6. However, compared to the national average we did not fare quite as well this year as last year; this is explained by the fact that the national average fell 4 points during the pandemic, whereas our scores stayed flat (actually putting us above the national average in some areas last year). This year the national average is back where it was pre-pandemic so while our score went up 1 point it was not quite as good, comparatively speaking.

Another notable point is that our students are taking more of their general education classes online with 23% of our students taking the majority of their general education classes online this past year vs. 5 to 10% in previous years. While there is still a gap in performance and beginning ability between online and face-to-face students, that gap seems to have at least narrowed a bit this year.

And, lastly, this year we had one student score higher than any other Southeastern student has ever scored on the ETS PP and it is not even close. The student scored 497 out of a possible 500 and the previous high score we had seen in 5 years and almost 800 students that have taken it was 490.

As described above, based on the recent shift to the ETS proficiency profile, and the COVID disruptions going forward, no new changes are currently being planned. We anticipate there will be some challenges in interpreting future data meaningfully as perhaps pre- and post- COVID results may be separately assessed until sufficient data are collected and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of these programmatic changes.

SECTION III – PROGRAM OUTCOMES

III-1. List, in table format, assessment measures and number of individuals assessed for each degree program. Includes graduate programs if applicable to the institutional assessment plan.

TABLE III-1.A
Program outcomes assessment summary for School of Arts and Sciences (Arts and Letters)

Program(s)	Number Assessed	Type of Assessment
Art (3)		ACAT in Art; Pre/Post-tests; Pre/Post Essay; Pre/Post Painting-Drawing-Ceramics-3-D Design; Mid-level Assessment; Senior Capstone; Art Survey; Course Grades; Studio Project; Oral Presentation; Senior Presentation
BSLAS		Exams, projects, course-embedded assessments, ETS scores
Communication (49)		Exams, projects, competition performances
English		Evaluations of student papers based on the following 5 criteria: Writing; Close Reading; Critical Analysis; Research; Cultural Competence
English Education (18)		Evaluation of student papers based on the following 5 criteria: Writing; Close Reading; Critical Analysis; Research; Cultural Sensitivity
History (22)	5-6	ACAT; Entrance & Exit Exams; Content Coverage Surveys; Capstone Research Paper; Coverage Survey

Program(s)	Number Assessed	Type of Assessment
Music (BA-36)	2-7	ETS Examination Scores; Music Theory Proficiency; Ensemble Participation; Exit Assessment; Performance Juries; Recital Class Performance; Sophomore Proficiency; Class Piano Competencies; Conducting Competency
Music (BM-68)	1-7	Applied Lesson Jury; Entrance Audition; Ensemble Performance; Exit Assessment Exam; Junior/Senior Recitals; Performance Ability; Sophomore Proficiency; Conducting Competency; Directed Reading; ETS Major Field Exam; Lyric Diction; Recital Program Notes; Theory/History Competency; Applied Lesson Literature; Exit Exam; Listening Assignments; Literature Bibliography/Websites; Literature Courses; Recital Attendance; Sophomore Proficiency
Music Education (37)	4-12	Student Observation; Teaching Practice; Exams; ETS Exam; OSAT; Current Trends; Professional Readings; Professional Organizations; Professional Events Attended; Teaching Strategies; Conducting; Technology; Performance; Pedagogy; Private Teaching; Theory, History, and Literature; Professional Experience; Professional Organizations; Rules and Regulations; Disposition; Philosophy
Political Science (20)	6	ACAT; Portfolio Analysis
Theatre (60)		Entry Level Audition/Jury; Production Audition; Technical Theatre Student Interviews; Juries; Semester Reviews; Independent Project; Advanced Project; Theatre Auditions; Senior Capstone; Student Placement

Total Number of Assessments = 1- 45

TABLE III-1.A (cont'd)
Program outcomes assessment summary for School of Arts and Sciences (Science & Technology)

Program(s)	Number Assessed	Type of Assessment
Biology (6)	10-29	In-house exit exam; ETS Major Field Test in Biology; Ecology Research Paper and Presentation; Other Writing and Presentations in Biology; Biology Exit Survey; Senior Seminar written proposal and presentation; Laboratory Experience; MCAT Scores

Program(s)	Number Assessed	Type of Assessment
Fisheries & Wildlife (11) (Conservation)	4	ETS MFT in Biology; Fish and Wildlife Assessment Exam (Pre/Post-test); Research Papers in Ornithology; Oral Presentations in Courses; Senior Exit Survey
Chemistry (10)	1-52	American Chemical Society Standardized Exams (1st Semester General Chemistry; 2nd Semester General Chemistry; Analytical Chemistry; Organic Chemistry; Instrumental Analysis; 1st Semester Biochemistry; 2nd Semester Biochemistry; Inorganic Chemistry; Diagnostic of Undergraduate Chemistry Knowledge Exam) Research Paper/Presentation; Presentations at Professional Meetings; Senior Seminar; MCAT; Labs
Computer Science (52)	0-23	Course-embedded Exams; Algorithm Implementation and Analysis
Computer Information Systems (61)	17-20	Exams, projects
Mathematics (28)	2	ETS Calculus Indicator; GRE Practice Exams (Calculus; Algebra); Proof Analyses; ETS Exam Algebra Indicator; ETS Exam Nonroutine Indicator, ETS Exam Applied Indicator; Senior Seminar Presentation; Student Seminar Project; National Competitions; Alumni Data
Math Education (29)	0	ETS MFAT in Mathematics; OSAT; Proof Analyses; ETS Calculus Indicator; ETS Algebra Indicator; ETS Nonroutine Indicator; Summative Evaluations by Mentor Teachers; Lesson Plans; Teacher Work Sample; Alumni Data
Occupational Safety & Health (58)	47-80	Alumni Survey; ASP/CSP Certification Exams; Employer Surveys; Faculty Observations; Course Evaluations; Senior Exit Exam; Senior Exit Interview; Senior Survey; SUMMA Survey; Internship; Placement

Total Number of Assessments = 1-58

TABLE III-1.A (cont'd)
Program outcomes assessment summary for the John Massey School of Business

Program(s)	Number Assessed	Type of Assessment

Program(s)	Number Assessed	Type of Assessment
Accounting (1)	16-22	ETS Major Field Test; CPA Exam; Internships; Senior Exit Survey; Placement
Aviation Management (2)	3-14	Course-embedded exams, projects
Finance (96)	8-94	ETS MFT; Internships
General Business (105)	32	Case Analysis; Internships; Senior Exit Survey; Oral Presentation; CompXM Exam; ETS MFT; Peer Evaluation of Group Projects
Marketing (95)	5-9	Case Analysis; Internships; Senior Exit Survey; Oral Presentation; CompXM Exam; ETS MFT; Peer Evaluation of Group Projects
Management (27)	10-16	Case Analysis; Internships; Senior Exit Survey; CompXM Exam; Peer Evaluation of Group Projects; ETS MFT
Professional Pilot (5)		Written Documents; Oral Presentations; Problem Solving; Math Application; Science Application; Legal/Ethical Standards; Leadership/Teamwork; Practices and Techniques in Aviation; Contemporary Issues; Technology; Aviation Environment; Aviation Knowledge

Total Number of Assessments = 3-94

TABLE III-1.A (cont'd)
Program outcomes assessment summary for School of Education and Behavioral Sciences

Program(s)	Number Assessed	Type of Assessment
Criminal Justice (59)	6-46	ETS MFT; Senior Research; Field Experience

Elementary Education (16)	1-44	Tutoring Case Study; OSAT; Student Teaching Evaluation; Thematic Unit; Science Lesson Plan; Math Lesson Plan; Social Studies Lesson Plan; Fine Arts Lesson Plan; Health Education Teaching Unit; Physical Education Lesson Plan; Concepts about Prints/Reflection; Parent Letter
Health and Physical Education (21)	7	OSAT; Mentor Teacher Survey; Student Teacher Numerical Ratings; Teacher Work Sample; Assessment of Health-Related Fitness Components; Fundamental Skills Analysis (Lifetime Activities; Team Sports and Gymnastics); Secondary Physical Education Unit Plans
Health and Human Performance (114)	38	Internship Evaluations, Course-embedded assessments
Early Childhood	8-14	Course-Embedded Assessments (ELED 4623 and ELED 4723)
Early Intervention and Child Development	19-238	Course-Embedded Assessments (EICD 2213, 3024, 3064, 4084, 4074, 4133, 3044, EDUC 2013, SPED 2123, PSY 3123); Exit Exam
Psychology (42)	27-325	PACAT; Senior Level Exit Exam; Undergraduate Psychology Program Student Survey; Student Field Experience Site Evaluation; Semester Enrollment and Faculty Loads; Grade Distributions
Recreation (41)	6	Exit Exam; Portfolio; Supervisor Evaluation
Sociology (12)	12-21	ETS MFT-Sociology; Mid-Level Assessment
Special Education-Mild/Moderate Disabilities (99)	0	Critical Readings; OSAT; Transition Plan; Lesson Plans; Student Teaching Evaluation; Assessment of P-12 Student

Total Number of Assessments = 1-322

Table III-1.A (Cont'd).
Program outcomes assessment reports for graduate programs (Fall 2021 and Spring 2022)

Degree	Program	Number Assessed	Type of Assessment Used
Master of Arts	Clinical Mental Health Counseling	13	National Counselor Exam for Certification and Licensure; Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Exam
Master of Arts	Early Intervention Child Development	2-34	Course-embedded assessments
Master of Business Administration	M.B.A.	253	Case Analysis; Exit Survey
Master of Education	Curriculum & Instruction	142	Course-embedded assessments
	Superintendent Level	165-208	Major field test, course-embedded assessments
	Principalship	13-97	Major field test, course-embedded assessments
	School Counseling	91-222	Professional Identity Paper; Field Experience Reflection Paper; Developmental Milestone Self-Reflection Paper; OSAT; Career Counseling Portfolio; Counseling Theory Research Paper; Group Counseling Proposal; Assessment Instrument Paper; Research Literature Review Paper
	Special Education	82-114	Major field test, course embedded assessments
Master of Music Education	Music Education	0-7	Course-embedded assessments
Master of Science	Aerospace Admin. and Logistics	No findings provided	Research Paper; Formal In-Class Presentation; Problem Solving Analyses; Legal & Ethical Standards in Business; Computer Skills

	Occupational Safety and Health	8-38	Comprehensive Exam; In-course exams; Prevention Programs; Audits; Homeland Security; Emergency Management; Online Safety Labs; Training and Public Information Presentations; Internships; Employment
	Native American Leadership		Course-embedded writing samples and presentations
	Sports Admin.	184	Course-embedded Exams; Research Proposal; Writing Sample
Master of Technology	Biology	1	Internal exams (written and oral) over core courses; thesis defense; written and presentation portfolios

Total number of students assessed: 0-237

Analyses and Findings

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

During 2021-22, the Institutional Assessment Committee (IAC) reviewed assessment documents for undergraduate programs in preparation for the Higher Learning Commission Assurance Argument. IAC reviewed undergraduate assessment reports from 2012-13 to 2021-22 (**Table III-2.A.1**) to examine for trends in assessment effort among the various programs. Ten (10) years of report reviews are found in Table III-2. These programs are rated by IAC using a rubric constructed from the Assessment Matrix designed by The Higher Learning Commission. In addition we followed the same procedure for the graduate programs (**Table III-2.A.2**).

TABLE III-2.A.1
Summary of scores on a 50-point scale assigned to program outcomes assessment reports by the Institutional Assessment Committee for undergraduate programs.

Undergraduate Programs	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
Maximum Score Possible	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50
Accounting	32	41	49	50	50	47	47	41	39	45
Art	47	45	49	44	44	48	48	45	49	
Aviation - Professional Pilot	47	37		48	38	40	40	46		

Aviation Management	46	40	40	40	31	41	41			43
Biology	50	49	50	50	50	49	49	50	48	38
Chemistry	48	46	49	49	49		50		49	42
Communication	43		45	45	48	48	50	42	50	
Computer Information Systems	45		45	46	48				47	45
Computer Science	48	46	48	50	49		47	38	50	49
Criminal Justice	45	36	48	50	45	39	41	40	43	49
Elem Ed - Early Childhood, Option	48	42	47	50	40	42	39	45	33	46
Early Intervention & Child Develop - BA			38	49	50	50	46	36	47	49
Elementary Education	49	46	45	49	41	50	41	42	35	46
English	35	35	44	44	43	31	41	34	48	
English Education	36	37	46	44	41	31	35	33	48	
Finance	30	45	48	49	50	50	42	37	43	47
Fish and Wildlife Sciences	48	49	49	49	50	46	50	50	50	45
General Business	48	44	48	50	49	44	40	31	34	42
General Studies (BSLAS)									33	
Health and Physical Education	45	48	50	48	42	50	48	49	50	50
Health and Human Performance						47	50	50	49	46

History	41	42	38	38	36	33	40		34	35
Management	48	42	49	43	47	46	43	39	43	47
Marketing	48	42	48	49	31	39	39	38	37	46
Mathematics	49	42	50	46	44		48	44	34	48
Math Education	44	44	50	44	50		49	47	34	40
Music-B.A.	49	48		49	46	47	49	49	43	46
Music-BM	39	45	48	50	48	46	50	49	38	42
Bachelor of Music Education	48	45	48	48	46	41	48	36	43	47
Occupational Safety and Health	48	46	48	48	48		48	49	49	49
Political Science	34	37	35	40	43	33	41		26	38
Psychology	48	40	48	50	47	48		39	38	43
Recreation	44	39	43	47	45	50	50	46	50	49
Sociology	45	41	45	42	34	39	41	38	38	49
Spanish	37	45	45	45	45	38	38			Program is being phased out
Special Education	47	41	47	48	49	41	48	39	46	40
Theatre	50	45	49	43	34	45	43	42	46	

Table III-2.A.2
Summary of scores assigned to program outcomes assessment reports by the Institutional Assessment Committee for graduate programs.

Graduate Programs	Academic Year											
	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
Maximum Score Possible	68	68	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50
MS-Aerospace Admin. & Logistics	46	33.0	49									
Master of Business Administration	45.0	39.0	36	38.5	44.5	47	42.5	48	30	37	30	42
MA-Clin. Ment. Hlth. Counseling	63	64	48	47	50	50	50	45	42	36	38	47
MA- Early Intervention Child Development							New	45	40		41	50
MME-Master of Music Education					New	49	40	41		29		49
MS - Native American Leadership				New			44	45	50	36	50	
MS-Occupational Safety & Health	46	33	48	45	45	48	50		48	39	33	49
MEd-Curriculum & Instruction								New	50	41	35	49
MEd-Educational Leadership-Principalship								29	42	46	46	33

Program												
MEd-Educational Leadership-Superintendent												30
MEd-School Counseling	60	59	48	48	50	50	50	43		38	38	44
MEd-Special Education								New	47	38	32	50
Master of Technology-Biology	54	48	46	46	49	49	50	50	50	37	32	47
MS-Sport Adm.		New	45	37	50	50	36	47	50	44	50	48

The 2018 HLC Assurance Argument team members had a favorable impression about assessment of academic programs at Southeastern and they noted in their final report that, "The 24th annual assessment report, prepared by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, captures the culture of assessment across campus by summarizing assessment processed and identifying action steps to address concerns and future actions, thus closing the loop on assessment." The review team also found that Southeastern is continuing to use assessment effectively and has a good assessment system in place, as they noted with "...all degree programs engage students in appropriate levels of mastery modes of inquiry, analyses/communications of information, and development of skills for a changing environment" and "SOSU has demonstrated responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services. These processes individually demonstrate a contribution to learning, and collectively demonstrate an effective system of institutional evaluation of student learning."

The rubric used by the Institutional Assessment Committee has varied over time and the maximum score possible has ranged from 38-50. To facilitate comparisons among years, overall scores were assigned to one of four categories each year: undeveloped (below 35), developing (35-39), established (40-44), and exemplary (above 44). Of the 29 undergraduate programs that submitted reports before December, nineteen (19) were rated as Exemplary, seven (7) were rated as Established, six (6) were rated at Developing, and none were rated as Underdeveloped (**Table III-2.B.1**). The same system is used for the graduate programs of the thirteen (13) programs that submitted reports before December, nine (9) were rated as Exemplary, two (2) were rated as Established, and two (2) were rated as Undeveloped (**Table III-2.B.2**).

TABLE III-2.B.1

Percentage of undergraduate program outcomes assessment reports identified as exemplary, established, developing, or undeveloped by the Institutional Assessment Committee.

Year	Ranking Categories				Total Number of Reports
	Exemplary 45-50	Established 40-44	Developing 35-39	Undeveloped below 35	
2021-22	19 (66%)	7 (24%)	3 (10%)	0	29
2020-21	17 (49%)	5 (14%)	6 (17%)	7 (20%)	35
2019-20	12 (40%)	6 (20%)	9 (30%)	3 (10%)	30
2018-19	19 (56%)	11 (32%)	4 (12%)	0	34
2017-18	17 (55%)	6 (19%)	4 (13%)	4 (13%)	31
2016-17	21 (60%)	8 (23%)	2 (6%)	4 (11%)	35
2015-16	28 (80%)	5 (14%)	2 (6%)	0 (0%)	35
2014-15	26 (82%)	3 (9%)	3 (9%)	0 (0%)	32
2013-14	17 (53%)	9 (28%)	6 (19%)	0 (0%)	32
2012-13	21 (64%)	6 (18%)	4 (12%)	2 (6%)	33
2011-12	14 (37%)	21 (55%)	3 (8%)	0 (0%)	38
2010-11	15 (41%)	21 (57%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	37

Table III-2.B.2 (Cont'd)

Percentage of graduate program outcomes assessment reports identified as exemplary, established, developing, or undeveloped by the Institutional Assessment Committee.

Year	Ranking Categories				Total Number of Reports
	Exemplary 45-50	Established 40-44	Developing 35-39	Undeveloped BELOW 35	

2021-22	9 (70%)	2 (15%)	0	2 (15%)	13
2020-21	3 (27.5%)	1 (9%)	3 (27.5%)	4 (36%)	11
2019-20	1 (9%)	2 (18%)	7 (64%)	1 (9%)	11
2018-19	7 (64%)	3 (27%)	0	1 (9%)	11
2017-18	7 (64%)	2 (18%)	0	1 (9%)	11
2016-17	5 (50%)	4(40%)	1 10%)	0 (0%)	10
2015-16	8 (89%)	0 (10%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)	9
2014-15	8 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8
2013-14	4 (50%)	2 (25%)	2 (25%)	0 (0%)	8
2012-13	8 (89%)	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)	9
2011-12	3 (33%)	4 (44%)	2 (22%)	0 (0%)	9
2010-11	2 (22%)	7 (78%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9

Table III-2.C
Number of majors and graduates for graduate programs

Graduate Programs	2021-22022		5-year Average	
	Majors	**Grads**	**Majors**	**Grads**
MEd-School Counseling	331	128	210.2	71
MEd-Special Education (was Elem Educ-Reading Specialist)	139	95	86	39.2
MEd-Educational Leadership (school admin-istration)	292	220	182.2	106.6

27

Master of Business Administration	906	370	705.4	228
Master of Technology	5	1	5	2
MA-Clinical Mental Health Counseling	47	12	41.6	11.2
MS-Aerospace Administration and Logistics	82	43	103.4	57.4
MS-Occupational Safety and Health	34	7	51.8	17.2
MS-Sport Administration	277	185	174.6	89.2
MEd-Curriculum and Instruction (MA-Teaching)	238	148	140.4	66.4
Native American Leadership	54	24	57.2	28
Master of Music Education	9	2	6.2	2
Early Intervention & Child Development	35	5	15.6	4.2
Certificate – Educ Leadership – Principal Cert	1	0	0.2	0
Certificate – Educ Leadership – Superintendent Cert	10	0	2	0
Total	**2460**	**1240**	**1781.8**	**722.4**

Another indicator of the quality of graduate programs offered by Southeastern is the numbers of majors and program graduates. **Table III-2.C** provides this information for the 2021-22 academic year and the 5-year average. Many of our programs show numbers of majors and graduates above the five-year average. This is a positive trend that we expect will continue based on our partnership with Academic Partnerships. The Master of Education in School Counseling, Master of Education in Special Education, Master of Education in Educational Leadership, and Master of Education in Curriculum and Instruction programs led with 1000 majors in 2021-2022. The MBA program followed with 906 majors and Master of Sports Administration with 277 majors.

Most notable to the chart listed above is the addition of the Certificates in Education Leadership – Principal and Education Leadership – Superintendent. Students are enrolled in the course offerings and will be awarded certificates of completion in the 2022-2023 academic year.

As mentioned previously in this report, 2018 HLC assurance argument reviewers had a favorable impression about assessment of academic programs at Southeastern and this was noted in their final report. We have gone to an internal assessment management system, and it has proven effective. The reporting template has received favorable comments from faculty and the reviewers (Institutional Assessment Committee members) have found the system easy to navigate.

Even though the culture of assessment of graduate programs appears to be relatively healthy, the Vice President for Academic Affairs plans to meet with department chairs and program coordinators/directors to help ensure the level of commitment remains consistent.

Departments are continually striving to improve student learning and assessment techniques used to evaluate student learning. Such actions may result in temporal variation in rankings/scores of programs. Ongoing discussions will ensure that each program incorporates better ways to assess and use the results to enhance student learning. IAC also continues to modify its rubric and dissemination techniques to better communicate with the schools and departments the results and what needs to be done to improve Program Outcome Assessment Reports.

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

Changes are becoming more institutionalized as culture of assessment continues to evolve at Southeastern. Closing the loop is becoming more institutionalized at the department level. Departments continue using assessment to assist in decision-making regarding planning, budgeting, personnel, and curricular matters. More program modifications are being made to programs to meet the needs of the students and to foster student learning. Existing programs have deleted obsolete courses, added more relevant courses, and modified currently offered courses to improve the student learning. Additions include a Master of Education in Curriculum & Instruction – Reading and Master of Education in Curriculum & Instruction – Music.

The largest graduate program at SE is the M.Ed. With 1,000 students, they make up 40% of all graduate students. Students in the Master of Business Administration Program make up an additional 37% of graduate student enrollment with 906 majors. In 2021-2022, 390 students completed the end-of-instruction Major Field Test. Three hundred and eighty-eighty (388) students were tested with 92.5% meeting or exceeding the benchmark (80% of the national average of 232) in all sub-areas of the MFT.

After discussion with educational leaders and having a market review conducted by our online program manager, the Master of Business Administration – Leadership and Master of Arts in Organizational Management and Leadership were initiated in the 2021-2022 academic year. Future explorations during the 2022-2023 academic year include the launch of the aforementioned programs along with two new concentrations in the Master of Science in Sports Management – Strategic Communication and Leadership. Additionally, the launch of the new Nursing and Allied Health Department will lead us to initiating the Master of Science in Healthcare Administration.

SECTION IV – STUDENT SATISFACTION

Administration of Assessment

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

- Ruffalo Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI)
- Ruffalo Noel Levitz Priorities Survey of Online Learners (PSOL)

To monitor student satisfaction, the nationally referenced Ruffalo Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) and the Priorities Survey of Online learners (PSOL) were used in the Spring semester of 2022. A total of 477 randomly selected students provided feedback on their experience with Southeastern, with 197 responding to the SSI and 280 responding to the PSOL.

We plan to administer these assessments every two years, with the next data collection planned for the Spring semester of 2024.

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

- Ruffalo Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI)

To monitor student satisfaction, the nationally referenced Ruffalo Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory was used, surveying 197 Southeastern students.

This instrument is particularly useful because it not only measures student satisfaction but also the importance students place on individual items. Student satisfaction ratings have consistently demonstrated our students feel very positive about their experiences on this campus and with the services provided by Southeastern offices.

In the SSI, Southeastern students reported, in this order, that academic advising, instructional effectiveness, safety and security, and student centeredness were the four most important aspects of their university experience. The student satisfaction with academic advising, instructional effectiveness, safety and security, and student centeredness each exceeded the national average at four-year public institutions at levels of statistical significance.

No categories for student satisfaction levels were lower than those for the national average. This is a significant change from our 2018 SSI results—especially for safety and security, which has shifted in greater importance for students and in student satisfaction, making it one of our 2022 strengths, whereas it was listed as a challenge for us in the 2018 survey.

Students rated their overall satisfaction with the institution with scores equaling that of the national averages at 59%. And finally, when the students were asked, if they had to do it all over, would they enroll at Southeastern again, 88% said yes, with the percentage exceeding that of the national average by a significant statistical difference.

While we had originally planned to administer this assessment every two years, starting in August 2018, a change in administration in the Fall 2019 and Spring 2020 and subsequent onset of COVID challenges, which have continued for an additional year, precluded this. We resumed administering the assessment in Spring 2022.

In the interim, we did still attempt to survey our students with an in-house survey. In the Fall of 2020, Spring of 2021, and Summer 2021 we had reached out to current students who were graduating with a

related internal survey. In response to when the students were asked if they had to do it all over, would they enroll at Southeastern again, 91% (n=585) said they would enroll again for the same or a different degree program here at Southeastern. Additionally, 86% indicated that they had received a very high-quality education.

- Ruffalo Noel Levitz Priority Survey for Online Learners (PSOL)

To monitor student satisfaction with our significantly increased online enrollment over the past few years, the Ruffalo Noel Levitz Priority Survey of Online Learners (PSOL) was used for the first time in Spring 2022, surveying 280 Southeastern online students.

Like the SSI, the PSOL measures student satisfaction and the importance students place on individual items. Southeastern online students reported, in this order, that enrollment services, academic services, institutional perceptions, and student services were the four most important aspects of their university experience. Student satisfaction with enrollment services, academic services, and institutional perceptions exceeded the national online learners average by a significant statistical difference.

No categories for student satisfaction levels were lower than those for the national average.

75% of students rated their overall satisfaction with their online experience as satisfactory or above (31% satisfied, 44% very satisfied). When asked if they had it to do over, 84% said they would enroll at Southeastern again (27% probably yes, 57% definitely yes).

Student satisfaction ratings demonstrate that our online students feel very positive about their learning experiences and the support services provided by Southeastern.

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

Given limited resources, not all issues identified by students can be immediately addressed; however, these items are not discarded but placed on a master list until such time that resources are available after other items with higher priorities have been addressed. Even given the recent budget constraints, Southeastern has continuously striven to improve the learning environment and educational experience of our students. Overall, students have a favorable impression about Southeastern, including its faculty, staff, and administration, the facilities, and the types and quality of academic and non-academic programming. Southeastern continues to make improvements to the physical appearance of the campus. The north ends of the campus loop have been landscaped to make them more aesthetically pleasing and two empty spaces have been recently renovated. Financial aid processes continue to take advantage of technological advancements to get aid to students quicker. Specifically, a document imaging system has been purchased with the intent of improving transcript transfer processes between financial aid and the Registrar's office. Southeastern is committed to providing a safe learning and working environment; we have invested a significant amount of time in training administrators and staff in the National Incident Management Systems process to respond to crises more effectively. Southeastern is committed to providing an environment of not just excellence, but affordability and availability that enables students to reach their potential. Faculty are now more conscious of class scheduling; students can often arrange a Monday-Wednesday-Friday or Tuesday-Thursday schedule,

especially when supplemented with online courses. Students also have greater access to courses/programs provided by distance education and/or at Southeastern's additional locations (6 in-state and 2 out-of-state locations).

Due to the recent growth of Southeastern, despite the pandemic, President Newsom has many plans to provide a better on campus environment as well as more useful online support for all students. Next year's report will highlight many changes and upgrades related to deferred maintenance and software support.

Section V – **Assessment Budgets**

State Regents policy states that academic service 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*).

Assessment fees and expenditures for 2021-22

	2021-2022
Assessment fees	$0; SE does not have an assessment fee
Assessment salaries	$29,556.00
Distributed to other departments	$0; no funds were distributed to other units
Operational costs	$40,623.00
Total Expenditures	$70,119.00