



Oklahoma State University
America's Brightest **ORANGE**

**Oklahoma State University
The Committee for the Assessment of General Education
and
University Assessment and Testing
Annual Report, 2019**

Committee for the Assessment of General Education (CAGE)

Bridget Miller, Ph.D., (Chair), Interim Associate Provost
Jon Comer, Ph.D., (Vice-Chair) College of Arts and Sciences
Melanie Bayles, Ph.D., Ferguson College of Agriculture
Terry Collins, Ph.D., College of Engineering, Architecture and Technology
Carol Johnson, Ph.D., Spears School of Business
Ginger Welch, Ph.D., College of Education and Human Sciences

University Assessment & Testing (UAT)

Ryan Chung, Ph.D., Director
Kelva Hunger, Ph.D., Assistant Director, Assessment & Analysis
Kaitlynn Holcomb, B.S., Assessment Specialist

Contents

Executive Summary	4
Overview	6
Introduction	6
Artifact Analysis	7
Assessment Administration	7
Analyses and Findings	8
Reliability	8
Difference Tests.....	8
Key Findings	8
Campus Climate Survey for Students	12
Assessment Administration	12
Analyses and Findings	13
Model Fit: Reliability & Validity	13
Key Findings: Demographic Information	13
Key Findings: Highest or Lowest Ranking Items (n=2,109)	15
Discussion	16
Overall Implications and Future Direction.....	17



Tables and Figures

Table 1. Distribution of Diversity Artifacts	9
Table 2. Student Demographics Associated with Diversity Artifacts, 2007-2019	10
Table 3. Diversity Artifact Scores by Class, College, and Gender	11
Table 4. Diversity Artifact Scores by Rubric Category	11



Executive Summary

In the 2018-2019 academic year, OSU evaluated diversity as a general education outcome. In addition to evaluating written student artifacts by means of the AAC&U's Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric, OSU also administered the OSU Campus Climate Survey for Students.

Key Findings:

- In total, 132 student artifacts were assessed using the AAC&U's Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric by two teams of two reviewers per team.
 - 84.8% of student artifacts were rated as Milestones ($n = 112$), and 1.5% of student artifacts were rated as Capstones ($n = 2$). In other words, the majority of students met or exceeded expectations in diversity artifacts.
- The Campus Climate Survey for Students (CCS-S) was conducted during the spring semester of 2019 at Oklahoma State University. The CCS-S was administered to students in the Stillwater and Tulsa campuses. A total of 2,248 students responded to the CCS-S, which was 10.0% of the target population (22,498 students), and 2,109 student responses (9.4%) were analyzed after data cleaning procedures.
 - 89.0% of OSU students indicated they are personally treated with respect by faculty and staff and 28.5% hesitate to talk about issues of diversity at OSU because of fear of offending others. Of the undergraduate respondents, 37.9% believe the OSU 'D' course(s) expanded their knowledge in terms of diversity.
 - When comparing student responses across classification (Undergraduate and Graduate), mean scores of graduate students were generally higher than those of undergraduate students, with small effect sizes. This indicates that generally, graduate students have an overall better experience of the campus climate at OSU than undergraduate students.
 - The vast majority of students feel they were treated with respect by faculty and staff and they were able to work well with their peers/classmates in class. Most students surveyed have a good sense of working with others. Particularly when they graduate from OSU, they are confident in their ability to work with individuals from different backgrounds and cultures than their own. The majority of students believe they have similar opportunities for academic success to those of their classmates at OSU.

Recommendations:

- In an effort to streamline assessment of diversity, the Campus Climate Survey for Students will continue to be administered to OSU students for each diversity assessment cycle year in order to establish a baseline and track progress at OSU across years. By collecting responses from all students, we will be able to improve upon the existing CCS-S which will provide OSU with the ability to measure progress and effectiveness of diversity initiatives. With this information, OSU will be able to effectively address any issues or concerns.
- Discussions were initiated by the diversity artifact review subcommittee. One initiative is to create our own customized OSU rubric for assessing diversity artifacts. Another topic of discussion, in order to promote solid, meaningful diversity assignments, is to competitively offer a stipend to approved instructors of qualifying courses.



Assessment of general education is a critical aspect of our work to continuously improve our institution. We are fortunate that Oklahoma State University provides substantial resources to assess students' learning and to consider ways in which learning might be improved. Our challenge moving forward is clear: to make the most of this investment by using these results to make meaningful changes to our programs.

Thank you for your time and support of general education assessment. Please let us know if you have any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

Ryan Chung, Ph.D.
Director
University Assessment and Testing
Oklahoma State University



Overview

Introduction

General Education at Oklahoma State University (OSU) 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.

Full details of the General Education program can be found at:

<http://academicaffairs.okstate.edu/content/general-education>

Oklahoma State University has assessed general education for more than 10 years. Three approaches have typically been used to evaluate the general education program: institutional portfolios, review of the general education course database, and college-, department-, and program-level approaches (i.e. exams, surveys, capstone projects, artifact analysis, etc.). This report focuses on OSU's use of institutional portfolios to assess the general education program. Institutional portfolios provide direct evidence of student achievement of the overall goals of general education. Institutional portfolios are currently in use in four areas that represent the overall goals of the general education program. For the 2018-19 academic year, Diversity was assessed, which was the last year of the previous three-year cycle. A new four-year cycle was approved for the upcoming years to evaluate general education at OSU. Here are the previous and current cycles:

Previous Cycle:

1. **2016-17 | Written Communication and Critical Thinking** (student artifacts)
2. **2017-18 | Student Engagement** (BCSSE and NSSE)
3. **2018-19 | Diversity** (student artifacts/survey)

Current/Upcoming Cycle

1. **2019-20 | Information Literacy** (student artifacts)
2. **2020-21 | Diversity** (student artifacts/survey)
3. **2021-22 | Professionalism and Ethics** (student artifacts)
4. **2022-23 | Written Communication and Critical Thinking** (student artifacts)

Recognizing that these goals cannot be achieved only through the completion of courses with general education designations, student artifacts are collected from courses across campus that reveal students' achievement in each institutional portfolio area. These student artifacts are then assessed by a panel of OSU faculty members using rubrics, each of which has a different number of categories used in the scoring process.



In 2019, for the review of Diversity artifacts, OSU continued its use of the AAC&U's Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric. Artifacts rated with the VALUE rubrics can receive ratings of: Benchmark (1), Milestone (2 or 3), or Capstone (4). Oklahoma State University also expanded the institutional portfolio for Diversity beyond the assessment of student artifacts to include administration of the OSU Campus Climate Survey for Students (CCS-S).

Artifact Analysis

Assessment Administration

A call for student artifacts was sent out to all instructors of courses designated with a 'D' (Diversity), 'H' (Humanities), 'I' (International), or 'S' (Social and Behavioral Sciences). Instructors were given information on what type of assignment we would be able to use, the rubric used to review, instructions on how to collect the artifacts, and insurance that the artifacts would be anonymized and in no way identifiable back to the student. Student artifacts were collected by UAT and compiled for review by the facilitator. UAT and the facilitator examined the assignments of these artifacts to determine if they aligned with AAC&U's Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric. 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.

The instructors of 481 courses with the designation of 'D,' 'H,' 'I,' or 'S' were solicited for participation in submitting student artifacts. The number of artifacts used for analysis has been tracked in Table 2 from 2007 to 2013, 2016, and 2019. Student performance cannot currently be tracked based on student artifact ratings because different rubrics have been used, making comparison inadvisable. However, a diversity assessment subcommittee is currently undergoing meetings to collaborate and develop an OSU diversity rubric which will then be used every time we are assessing diversity, making student performance tracking across years possible.

In the assessment of diversity artifacts, six categories of the Intercultural Knowledge and Competence Value rubric and the overall student ratings were assessed. The six categories were:

- A. Knowledge - Cultural self-awareness,
- B. Knowledge - Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks,
- C. Skills – Empathy,
- D. Skills - Verbal and nonverbal communication,
- E. Attitudes – Curiosity, and
- F. Attitudes – Openness.

For more information about the above six categories or to view the Intercultural Knowledge and Competence Value rubric, please refer to:

<https://uat.okstate.edu/sites/default/files/assessPDFs/GenEdRubrics/Diversity%20VALUE%20Rubric.pdf>.



Analyses and Findings

Reliability

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 = .933; $n = 132$).

Difference Tests

The Mann-Whitney U and Kruskal Wallis tests were performed to test differences among diversity artifacts scores among gender, class, and college. In the 'Knowledge - Cultural self-awareness' and 'Skills – Empathy' category, artifact scores were different between male and female. In the 'Knowledge - Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks' category, artifact scores were significantly different between the College of Arts and Sciences and College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources.

Key Findings

Overall, 84.8% of the student artifacts were rated as Milestones ($n = 112$; rating of "2" or "3"), and 1.5% of student artifacts were rated as Capstone ($n = 2$; rating of "4"). If the threshold for "meets expectation" is to achieve a rating of "Milestone" and "exceeds expectation" is to achieve a rating of "Capstone," then the majority of students **met or exceeded expectations** in diversity artifacts.

Below are the results for each rubric category:

- A. Knowledge - Cultural self-awareness:
79.5% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones ($n = 105$), and 3.0% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone ($n = 4$).
- B. Knowledge - Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks:
81.8% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones ($n = 108$), and 0.8% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone ($n = 1$).
- C. Skills - Empathy:
90.2% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones ($n = 119$), and 1.5% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone ($n = 2$).
- D. Skills - Verbal and nonverbal communication:
85.7% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones ($n = 60$).
- E. Attitudes - Curiosity:
90.2% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones ($n = 119$), and 0.8% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone ($n = 1$).
- F. Attitudes - Openness:
87.1% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones ($n = 115$), and 3.0% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone ($n = 4$).

Analysis tables follow.



Table 1. Distribution of Diversity Artifacts

College ¹	Course Prefix and Number	Course Name	General Education Designation (if any) ²	Number of Artifacts Submitted	Number of Artifacts Rated	Number of Artifacts Included in Analysis
CAS	AFAM 3950	Special Topics in Africana Studies	D, H	20	20	10
	AMST 2103 ³	Introduction to American Studies	D, H	85	N/A	N/A
	ENGL 2243	Language, Text and Culture	H, I	19	N/A	N/A
	ENGL 2413 ³	Conversations in Literature	D, H	67	N/A	N/A
	HIST 4523	American Environmental History	H	20	N/A	N/A
	MC 1143	Media in a Diverse Society	D, S	81	10	10
	PHIL 4733	Philosophy of Biology	H	15	N/A	N/A
	SOC 4213	Sociology of Sexualities	S	18	18	17
	SOC 4643	Sociology of Gender	S	21	N/A	N/A
	SOC 4103	The Death Penalty in America	S	12	N/A	N/A
CASNR	AGEC 2303	Food Marketing to a Diverse Population	D	27	N/A	N/A
	AGEC 4343	International Agricultural Markets and Trade	I	36	N/A	N/A
	AGLE 2403	Agricultural Leadership in a Multicultural Society	D, S	102	30	29
CoHS	HDFS 2123	Developmental Disabilities: Issues Across the Lifespan	D	50	30	28
	HDFS 3123	Parenting	S	942 ⁴	N/A	N/A
EHA	HLTH 4233	Health and Sexuality	D, S	22	22	22
	SCFD 3223	Role of Teacher in American Schools	D	12	12	11
	SPED 3202	Educating Exceptional Learners	D	198 ⁴	N/A	N/A
HC	HONR 1000	Story of Lizzie Borden	D, H	22	10	0
	HONR 1000	Introductory Honors Topics		21	N/A	N/A
	HONR 2423 ³	The Middle Ages and Renaissance	H	18	N/A	N/A
	HONR 3053	Biology, Race, and Gender: Honors	D, H	11	10	5
SSB	ECON 1113	The Economics of Social Issues	S	45	N/A	N/A
	LSB 4633	Legal Aspects of International Business Transactions	I	26 ⁴	N/A	N/A
Total Number of Diversity Artifacts:				1,890⁵	162⁶	132

Note: ¹Colleges: CAS = College of Arts and Sciences; CASNR = College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources; CEAT = College of Engineering, Architecture and Technology; CoHS = College of Human Sciences; EHA = Education, Health and Aviation; SSB = Spears School of Business; UC = University College

²Designations: D= Diversity, H = Humanities, I = International Dimension, S = Social and Behavioral Sciences

³Course name and prefix includes multiple sections.

⁴Value contains artifacts from multiple assignments.

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

⁶Although 162 artifacts were rated, 30 artifacts could not be used in analysis due to their lack of applicability to the rubric.



Table 2. Student Demographics Associated with Diversity Artifacts, 2007-2019

		2007-2013	2016	2019	Combined
		# of artifacts (% of total)	# of artifacts (% of total)	# of artifacts (% of total)	# of artifacts (% of total)
Class	Freshman	45 (9.6%)	24 (32.8%)	7 (5.3%)	76 (11.2%)
	Sophomore	118 (25.1%)	8 (10.9%)	38 (28.8%)	164 (24.3%)
	Junior	162 (34.4%)	24 (32.8%)	42 (31.8%)	228 (33.7%)
	Senior	146 (31.0%)	17 (23.2%)	45 (34.1%)	208 (30.8%)
	Total	<i>n</i> =471	<i>n</i> =73	<i>n</i>=132	<i>N</i> = 676
College ¹	CAS	181 (38.4%)	27 (36.9%)	41 (31.1%)	249 (36.7%)
	CASNR	28 (5.9%)	22 (30.1%)	21 (15.9%)	71 (10.5%)
	CEAT	50 (10.6%)	3 (4.10%)	6 (4.5%)	59 (8.7%)
	CoHS	51 (10.8%)	5 (6.8%)	24 (18.2%)	80 (11.8%)
	EHA	100 (20.7%)	4 (5.4%)	31 (23.5%)	135 (19.9%)
	SSB	28 (5.9%)	9 (12.3%)	6 (4.5%)	43 (6.3%)
	UC	35 (7.4%)	3 (4.1%)	3 (2.3%)	41 (6.0%)
	Total	<i>n</i> =473	<i>n</i> =73	<i>n</i>=132	<i>N</i> =678
Gender	Female	255 (54.1%)	25 (34.2%)	101 (76.5%)	385 (57.1%)
	Male	216 (45.9%)	48 (65.7%)	31 (23.5%)	295 (43.6%)
	Total	<i>n</i> =471	<i>n</i> =73	<i>n</i>=132	<i>N</i> =676
OSU GPA	<2.0	28 (5.9%)	2 (2.7%)	3 (2.3%)	33 (4.8%)
	2.0 to 2.49	70 (14.9%)	3 (4.1%)	11 (8.3%)	84 (12.2%)
	2.50 to 2.99	118 (25.1%)	15 (20.5%)	35 (26.5%)	168 (24.5%)
	3.00 to 3.49	126 (26.6%)	19 (26.0%)	33 (25.0%)	178 (25.9%)
	3.50 to 4.00	130 (27.6%)	34 (46.5%)	50 (37.9%)	214 (31.1%)
	Missing	10 (2.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10 (1.5%)
	Total	<i>n</i> =482	<i>n</i> =73	<i>n</i>=132	<i>N</i> =687

Note: ¹Colleges: CAS = College of Arts and Sciences; CASNR = College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources; CEAT = College of Engineering, Architecture and Technology; CoHS = College of Human Sciences; EHA = Education, Health and Aviation; SSB = Spears School of Business; UC = University College



Table 3. Diversity Artifact Scores by Class, College, and Gender

	SCORE: <i>n</i> (%)				<i>N</i>
	Benchmark	Milestones		Capstone	
	1	2	3	4	
Class					
Freshman	0(0.0)	5(71.4)	2(28.6)	0(0.0)	7
Sophomore	4(10.5)	22(57.9)	11(28.9)	1(2.6)	38
Junior	9(21.4)	24(57.1)	9(21.4)	0(0.0)	42
Senior	5(11.1)	24(53.3)	15(33.3)	1(2.2)	45
College¹					
CAS	3(7.3)	23(56.1)	13(31.7)	2(4.9)	41
CASNR	4(19.0)	14(66.7)	3(14.3)	0(0.0)	21
CEAT	1(16.7)	4(66.7)	1(16.7)	0(0.0)	6
CoHS	2(8.3)	13(54.2)	9(37.5)	0(0.0)	24
EHA	7(22.6)	16(51.6)	8(25.8)	0(0.0)	31
SSB	1(16.7)	2(33.3)	3(50.0)	0(0.0)	6
UC	0(0.0)	3(100.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	3
Gender					
Male	5(16.1)	21(67.7)	4(12.9)	1(3.2)	31
Female	13(12.9)	54(53.5)	33(32.7)	1(1.0)	101
Overall	18(13.6)	75(56.8)	37(28.0)	2(1.5)	132

Note: ¹Colleges: CAS = College of Arts and Sciences; CASNR = College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources; CEAT = College of Engineering, Architecture and Technology; CoHS = College of Human Sciences; EHA = Education, Health and Aviation; SSB = Spears School of Business; UC = University College

Table 4. Diversity Artifact Scores by Rubric Category

	SCORE: <i>n</i> (%)				<i>N</i>
	Benchmark	Milestones		Capstone	
	1	2	3	4	
A ¹	23(17.4)	68(51.5)	37(28.0)	4(3.0)	132
B	23(17.4)	80(60.6)	28(21.2)	1(0.8)	132
C	11(8.3)	62(47.0)	57(43.2)	2(1.5)	132
D	10(14.3)	42(60.0)	18(25.7)	0(0.0)	132
E	12(9.1)	91(68.9)	28(21.2)	1(0.8)	132
F	13(9.8)	67(50.8)	48(36.4)	4(3.0)	132
Overall	18(13.6)	75(56.8)	37(28.0)	2(1.5)	132

Note: ¹A = Knowledge (Cultural Self-Awareness); B = Knowledge (Knowledge of Cultural Worldview Frameworks); C = Skills (Empathy); D = Skills (Verbal and Nonverbal Communication); E = Attitudes (Curiosity); F = Attitudes (Openness)



Campus Climate Survey for Students

Assessment Administration

The OSU Campus Climate Survey for Students (CCS-S) was developed by University Assessment and Testing (UAT) in fulfillment of the General Education Assessment for Diversity, set by the Committee for the Assessment of General Education (CAGE). During this process, UAT collaborated with CAGE, the Assessment and Academic Improvement Council (AAIC), the division of Institutional Diversity, and the Office of Multicultural Affairs. This internal campus climate survey could be beneficial in providing not only valuable results for general education assessment of diversity, but also meaningful information about the current climate of the institution as a whole.

The CCS-S was conducted during the spring semester of 2019 at Oklahoma State University. This survey was administered online to students in the Stillwater and Tulsa campuses. 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 your experience with diversity and inclusion at Oklahoma State University, Assessment and Testing in collaboration with the Division of Institutional Diversity are conducting a short climate survey to learn about your experience at OSU. Your responses will contribute to the advancement of a welcoming and inclusive environment that appreciates and values all members of the University community. The survey will take 5-10 minutes to complete and will provide meaningful and useful feedback to us.

By completing this survey, the students were entered for a chance to win a \$10 gift card to the University Store. They were informed that the survey is completely voluntary and their responses were to remain confidential.

A total of 2,248 students responded to the CCS-S, which was 10.0% of the target population (22,498 students), and 2,109 student responses (9.4%) were analyzed after data cleaning procedures. The CCS-S contained 39 items asked on a five-point agreement Likert scale. Item topics consisted of inclusion, support, experience at OSU, belonging, 'D' course issues, working with others, improvement, concern, discussion with others, and equity. There were also seven demographic items and one open-ended item which asked, "Do you have any other comments you would like to make about diversity at OSU?" For this open-ended question, 450 participants responded (21.3%); after deleting cases such as "no", "n/a", or "nope", 363 responses remained (17.2%).



Analyses and Findings

Model Fit: Reliability & Validity

Overall Model Fit ($n=1,899$)

Reliability:

- The overall, updated model of OSU CCS-S was found to be highly reliable (39 items; Cronbach's Alpha = 0.899).

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 0.92 and is *good*.
 - Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) ranges from 0 to 1 and a value of 0.06 or less is indicative of an *acceptable* model fit. RMSEA for this model is 0.06 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 could be considered reliable and valid.

Key Findings: Demographic Information

Classification: ($n=2,050$ ¹)

- 23.6% of participants were Senior students ($n=498$),
- 18.4% of participants were Junior students ($n=388$),
- 16.9% of participants were Sophomore students ($n=356$),
- 14.8% of participants were Freshman students ($n=313$),
- 12.1% of participants were Doctoral students ($n=255$), and
- 11.4% of participants were Master's students ($n=240$).

Campus: ($n=2,109$)

- 90.8% of participants were Stillwater based students ($n=1,914$),
- 5.6% of participants were Stillwater and Tulsa based ($n=118$), and
- 3.7% of participants were Tulsa based students ($n=77$).

Gender: ($n=2,109$)

- 55.8% of participants responded Female ($n=1,177$)
- 31.2% responded Male ($n=659$),
- 0.8% of participants responded Transgender ($n=16$),
- 0.8% of participants responded Other ($n=16$), and
- 0.9% of participants responded 'Prefer not to answer' ($n=19$).

¹ 59 students could not be grouped into these classifications.



Sexual Orientation: (n=2,109)

- 73.8% of participants responded Heterosexual/Straight ($n=1,557$),
- 6.1% responded Bisexual ($n=129$),
- 2.8% responded Prefer not to answer ($n=59$),
- 2.0% responded Gay ($n=42$),
- 1.9% responded Other ($n=40$),
- 1.7% responded Lesbian ($n=36$), and
- 1.1% responded Questioning ($n=23$).

Religion: (n=2,109)

- 43.4% of participants responded Christian - Protestant ($n=915$),
- 21.8% responded No religious affiliation ($n=459$),
- 11.6% responded Christian - Catholic ($n=244$),
- 3.4% responded Prefer not to answer ($n=72$),
- 3.3% responded Other ($n=70$),
- 2.7% responded Hindu ($n=57$),
- 1.8% responded Muslim ($n=39$),
- 0.9% responded Buddhist ($n=19$),
- 0.6% responded Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints ($n=12$), and
- 0.3% responded Jewish ($n=6$).

Marital Status: (n=2,109)

- 65.9% of participants responded Single ($n=1,390$),
- 13.6% of participants responded Married ($n=286$),
- 6.4% of participants responded Not married but living with a partner ($n=134$),
- 1.5% of participants responded Other ($n=31$),
- 1.1% of participants responded Prefer not to answer ($n=24$),
- 1.1% of participants responded Divorced ($n=23$),
- 0.1% of participants responded Widowed ($n=2$), and
- 0.1% of participants responded Separated ($n=1$).

Ethnicity: (n=2,109)

- The majority of participants were not Hispanic or Latino (80.2%; $n=1,691$), and
- 184 participants were Hispanic or Latino (8.7%; $n=184$).

Reported Race: Multiple Response Item

- 54.5% of participants responded European American, White ($n=1,270$),
- 10.6% responded American Indian, Native American, or Alaska Native ($n=246$),
- 9.3% responded Asian ($n=217$),
- 6.2% responded Hispanic ($n=145$),
- 5.4% responded Two or more races ($n=126$),
- 5.3% responded African American or Black ($n=123$),
- 3.0% responded Prefer not to answer ($n=70$),
- 2.9% responded I self-identify as [...] ($n=68$),
- 1.7% responded Nonresident alien ($n=39$),
- 0.6% responded Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander ($n=13$), and
- 0.5% responded Race unknown ($n=12$).



Reported Disability: Multiple response item

- No: 84.8%; $n=1,789$
- Yes: 4.8%; $n=101$
 - Of those who responded "Yes,"*
 - 25.6% of participants responded Psychological and Mental Health ($n=41$),
 - 15.6% responded Chronic Illness ($n=25$),
 - 13.8% responded Other ($n=22$),
 - 11.3% responded Learning Disability ($n=18$),
 - 11.3% responded Physical Disability ($n=18$),
 - 6.9% responded Hearing Loss and Deafness ($n=11$),
 - 4.4% responded Autism ($n=7$),
 - 3.8% responded Vision Loss and Blindness ($n=6$),
 - 3.1% responded Memory Loss ($n=5$),
 - 2.5% responded Prefer not to answer ($n=4$),
 - 1.3% responded Speech and Language Disorder ($n=2$), and
 - 0.6% responded Intellectual Disability ($n=1$).

Key Findings: Highest or Lowest Ranking Items ($n=2,109$)

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

- At OSU, I am personally treated with respect by faculty and staff – *Inclusion/Support* (89.0%)
- At OSU, I am able to work well with my peers/classmates in class – *Belonging* (85.3%)
- At OSU, I am personally treated with respect by peers – *Inclusion/Support* (84.4%)
- There is a fellow student at OSU that I feel comfortable turning to if I need support – *Inclusion/Support* (83.0%)
- When I graduate from OSU, I will be confident in my ability to work with individuals from different backgrounds and cultures than my own – *Working with Others* (80.7%)
- In class at OSU, I am able to work with classmates from different backgrounds and cultures than my own – *Working with Others* (80.2%)
- I believe that meaningful interactions with individuals different from me is an essential part of my college education at OSU – *Working with Others* (79.4%)
- At OSU, I have opportunities for academic success that are similar to those of my classmates – *Equity* (77.6%)
- I am satisfied with the sense of community I have at OSU – *Inclusion/Support* (73.5%)
- It is important for OSU's leaders to talk about racial and ethnic issues to help work through and solve the problems. – *Working with Others* (72.2%)

Bottom 5 "Strongly Agree" and "Agree" Items:

- I believe the OSU's 'D' course(s) I have taken expand my knowledge in terms of diversity – *D-Course Issues* (37.9%)
- I feel the quality of the 'D' course(s) I took at OSU is/are solid and that the course(s) include adequate information and knowledge for students – *D-Course Issues* (38.4%)
- At OSU, the 'D' course(s) I have taken serve as tools for students to discuss and learn about diversity issues – *D-Course Issues* (39.0%)
- I participate in OSU campus events often – *Belonging* (45.7%)
- I hesitate to talk about issues of diversity at OSU because of the fear of offending others – *Concern* (45.9%)



Top 5 “Strongly Disagree” and “Disagree” Items:

- I hesitate to talk about issues of diversity at OSU because of the fear of offending others – *Concern* (28.5%)
- At OSU, in the past year, I have witnessed insulting or disparaging remarks about someone’s ethnic background - *Concern* (24.8%)
- At OSU, I feel that I personally have experienced being ignored – *Experience at OSU* (23.4%)
- I participate in OSU campus events often – *Belonging* (22.9%)
- At OSU, I feel that I personally have experienced exclusion/isolation – *Belonging* (21.0%)

Discussion

The vast majority of students feel they were treated with respect by faculty and staff and they are able to work well with their peers/classmates in class. Most students surveyed have a good sense of working with others; particularly when they graduate from OSU, they are confident in their ability to work with individuals from different backgrounds and cultures than their own. The majority of students believe they have similar opportunities for academic success to those of their classmates at OSU.

Somewhat concerning is the result of the items rated lowest “Strongly Agree” or “Agree.” The majority of these items were from the topic of D-Course Issues. Most students seem to be less satisfied with their ‘D’ course(s) they have taken. There could be improvement of ‘D’ courses in terms of expanding student knowledge, providing adequate information, and facilitating discussion in terms of diversity. These results suggest that improvement of the ‘D’ course may be necessary.

The highest rated “Strongly Disagree” or “Disagree” items lead to the conclusion that students feel most hesitant to talk about issues of diversity at OSU because of the fear of offending others. Other dissatisfied items have to do with student concerns such as witnessing insulting or disparaging remarks about someone’s ethnic background. Some students feel that they have personally experienced being ignored at OSU.

When comparing student responses across classification (Undergraduate and Graduate), mean scores of graduate students were generally higher than those of undergraduate students, with small effect sizes. This indicates that graduate students have an overall better experience of the campus climate at OSU than undergraduate students. When comparing student responses across undergraduate classification (freshman, sophomore, junior and senior), one noticeable difference was found under the topic of D-course related issues: *“I feel the quality of the ‘D’ course(s) I took at OSU is/are solid and that the course(s) include adequate information and knowledge for students.”* Significant differences were found between upper classmen and lower classmen: Junior and Senior students have a higher mean score than Freshman and Sophomore students. This suggests that through OSU’s effort and commitment to excellence in diversity and inclusion, ‘D’ designated courses have aided in impacting students on this issue during their time at OSU, yet there is still room for improvement.

When comparing student responses based on gender, mean scores of female students were overall higher than those of male students, and white students had overall higher mean scores than non-white students. These significant differences generally yielded a small effect size. When comparing student responses based on race, non-white students experienced more discrimination and feelings of being ignored, excluded, or isolated than white students did.



Overall Implications and Future Direction

- Assessment data collected from the general education assessment process has been and will continue to be shared broadly (both internally and publicly) to encourage discussion and consideration of additional curricular, programmatic, and/or assessment changes that may result in improvement to the general education assessment program and/or to student achievement of the general education goals.
- Specifically, the General Education Advisory Council (GEAC), the Committee for the Assessment of General Education (CAGE), and the Assessment and Academic Improvement Council (AAIC) meet together once per year to discuss general education assessment results, consider needed changes, and provide recommendations for improvement.
- Assessment data from the general education assessment process are used in three main ways:
 1. to implement improvement initiatives (e.g., faculty, staff, and instructor professional development; modification of assessment processes),
 2. to monitor recent curricular changes, and
 3. to consider and discuss additional modifications to the general education program (e.g., modifying general education curriculum, syllabi, instructional methodologies, general education course designations, or designation goals/criteria).
- In an effort to streamline assessment of diversity, the Campus Climate Survey for Students will continue to be administered to OSU students for each diversity assessment cycle year in order to establish a baseline and track progress at OSU across years. The next year for assessment of diversity will be during the 2020-2021 academic year so the next survey administration will be in spring of 2021. By collecting responses from all students across multiple years, we will be able to improve upon the existing CCS-S which will provide OSU with the ability to measure progress and effectiveness of diversity initiatives. With this information, OSU will be able to address any issues or concerns effectively.
- This survey is cost effective and could yield a potentially higher response rate once it has been further established among students and once funds could be acquired in order to offer an attractive incentive for students.
- Currently, student performance on the CCS-S cannot be tracked since spring 2019 was the first time this survey was conducted; however, this survey will again be distributed in spring of 2021, which will allow us to establish a baseline and track student self-reported climate at OSU.
- In the current monthly meeting discussion, CAGE agreed that the planned process for collecting diversity student artifacts could be more efficient in terms of time consumption and quality of usable artifacts. UAT is in the process of working with a subcommittee that includes the 2018-19 faculty raters, some members from CAGE, and a representative from Institutional Diversity on developing our own institutional diversity rubric that could yield better, more robust results.



- The subcommittee is also talking about a putting together an initiative that will engage diversity instructors to produce student artifacts that better align with OSU general education assessment and the corresponding OSU diversity rubric. An initiation of the promotion of solid diversity assignments will be competitively offered with a stipend to approved instructors of qualifying courses.

