

**Oklahoma State University
Committee for the Assessment of General Education
and
University Assessment and Testing
Annual Report, 2021**

Committee for the Assessment of General Education (CAGE)

Melanie Bayles, Ph.D., Ferguson College of Agriculture (Chair)
Jon Comer, Ph.D., College of Arts and Sciences
Terry Collins, Ph.D., College of Engineering, Architecture and Technology
Teresa Lightner, Ph.D., Spears School of Business
Whitney Bailey, 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
Robin Fitzgerald, B.A., Assessment Specialist



Contents

Executive Summary	4
Overview	6
Introduction.....	6
Artifact Analysis	7
Assessment Administration	7
Analyses and Findings	8
Reliability	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=4,857).....	16
Discussion	17
Overall Implications and Future Direction	17



Tables and Figures

Table 1. Distribution of Diversity Artifacts	9
Table 2. Student Demographics Associated with Diversity Artifacts, 2007-2021	10
Table 3. Diversity Artifact Scores	11
Table 4. Diversity Artifact Scores for each rubric category, 2021	11



Executive Summary

In the 2020-2021 academic year, OSU evaluated diversity as a general education outcome. In addition to evaluating written student artifacts by means of the OSU Diversity Rubric, OSU also administered the OSU Campus Climate Survey for Students.

Key Findings:

- In total, 233 student artifacts were assessed using the OSU Diversity Rubric by two teams of two reviewers per team.
 - 47.3% of student artifacts were rated as Milestones ($n = 123$), and 41.5% of student artifacts were rated as Capstones ($n = 48$). 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 2021 at Oklahoma State University. The CCS-S was administered to students in the Stillwater and Tulsa campuses. A total of 5,436 students initially responded to the CCS-S, which was 24.0% of the target population ($N = 22,628$ students), and 4,857 responses (21.5%) were analyzed after data cleaning procedures.
 - 91.1% of OSU students indicated they are personally treated with respect by faculty and staff and 31.4% hesitate to talk about issues of diversity at OSU because of fear of offending others.
 - 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.
- This was the first year OSU used our own customized OSU rubric for assessing diversity artifacts and the faculty raters enjoyed using it. It was more straight-forward, usable, and robust when rating diversity artifacts. Another topic of discussion among the faculty raters was how to continue to promote solid, meaningful diversity assignments. One idea was to competitively offer a stipend to approved instructors of qualifying courses. This conversation will continue.



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 portfolio and survey 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 2020-21 academic year, Diversity was assessed; here is the current 4-year cycle:

Current Cycle

1. **2019-20 | Information Literacy** (student artifacts)
2. **2020-21 | Diversity** (student artifacts/survey) **REPORTING YEAR**
3. **2021-22 | Professionalism and Ethics** (student artifacts and behavioral ratings)
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 2021, for the review of Diversity artifacts, OSU used the newly developed OSU Diversity Rubric. Artifacts rated with this rubric can receive ratings of: Benchmark (1), Milestone (2 or 3), or Capstone (4 or 5). 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

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

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 has worked with a subcommittee that included the 2018-19 faculty raters for diversity artifacts, some members from CAGE, and a representative from ID to develop an institutional diversity rubric, fitting for OSU, and that could yield better, more robust results. This subcommittee, along with CAGE developed and implemented the OSU Diversity Rubric. Additionally, CAGE put together an initiative that engaged diversity instructors to produce student artifacts that better aligned with OSU general education assessment and the corresponding OSU Diversity Rubric.

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

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

For more information about the above four categories or to view the OSU Diversity Rubric, refer to: <https://uat.okstate.edu/assessment/assessgenedrubrics.html>.



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 = .927; $n = 224$).

Key Findings

Overall, 47.3% of the student artifacts were rated as Milestones ($n = 123$), and 41.5% of student artifacts were rated as Capstone ($n = 108$). In other words, the majority of students met or exceeded expectations in diversity artifacts.

Below are the results for each rubric category:

- A. Knowledge of Cultural Context
55% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones ($n = 143$), and 32.7% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone ($n = 85$).
- B. Conceptual Understanding:
56.2% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones ($n = 146$), and 31.9% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone ($n = 83$).
- C. Values Diversity:
43.9% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones ($n = 114$), and 40.3% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone ($n = 105$).
- D. Attitudes:
37.7% of the students' artifacts were rated as Milestones ($n = 98$), and 48.8% of the artifacts were rated as Capstone ($n = 127$).

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 ³	Number of Artifacts Rated ⁴	Number of Artifacts Included in Analysis
CAS	AMST 3503	Television and American Society	D, H	21	18	18
	ANTH 3353	Cultural Anthropology	I, S	18	17	17
	SOC 1113	Introductory Sociology	S	82	9	9
	SOC 3133	Racial and Ethnic Relations	D, S	41	30	30
	SOC 4213	Sociology of Sexualities	S	30	10	10
	SOC 4653	Gender and the Middle East	I, S	37	30	15
CEHS	FFP 2613	Financial Perspectives throughout the United States	D, S	27	19	19
	HDFS 2123	Developmental Disabilities: Issues Across the Lifespan	D	78	18	9
	HLTH 3113	Health Issues in Diverse Populations	D	21	20	20
	HLTH 3201	Health in Special Populations	D	82	47	45
	RMRT 2443	Contemporary Issues in Diversity	D, S	115	39	38
SSB	MSIS 3931	Diversity Impacts in Information Systems	D	76	3	3
Total Number of Diversity Artifacts:				628	260	233

¹ Colleges: CAS = College of Arts and Sciences; CEHS = College of Education and Human Sciences; SSB = Spears School of Business

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

³ Although many artifacts were submitted, not all could be used for rating because they did not align with the rubric

⁴ Although many artifacts were rated, not all could be used in analysis due to their lack of applicability to the rubric



Table 2. Student Demographics Associated with Diversity Artifacts, 2007-2021

		2007-2013	2016	2019	2021	Combined
		# of	# of	# of	# of	# of
		artifacts	artifacts	artifacts	artifacts	artifacts
		(% of total)	(% of total)	(% of total)	(% of total)	(% of total)
Class ⁵	Freshman	45 (9.6)	24 (32.8)	7 (5.3)	49 (21.2)	125 (13.8)
	Sophomore	118 (25.1)	8 (10.9)	38 (28.8)	69 (29.9)	233 (25.7)
	Junior	162 (34.4)	24 (32.8)	42 (31.8)	66 (28.6)	294 (32.4)
	Senior	146 (31.0)	17 (23.2)	45 (34.1)	47 (20.3)	255 (28.1)
	Total	<i>n</i> = 471	<i>n</i> = 73	<i>n</i> = 132	<i>n</i> = 231	<i>N</i> = 907
College ⁶	CAS	181 (38.4)	27 (36.9)	41 (31.1)	107 (46.1)	356 (39.1)
	AGRI	28 (5.9)	22 (30.1)	21 (15.9)	13 (5.6)	84 (9.2)
	CEAT	50 (10.6)	3 (4.1)	6 (4.5)	20 (8.6)	79 (8.7)
	CEHS	151 (31.8)	9 (12.3)	55 (41.7)	53 (22.8)	268 (29.4)
	SSB	28 (5.9)	9 (12.3)	6 (4.5)	27 (11.6)	70 (7.7)
	UC	35 (7.4)	3 (4.1)	3 (2.3)	12 (5.2)	53 (5.8)
	Total	<i>n</i> = 473	<i>n</i> = 73	<i>n</i> = 132	<i>n</i> = 232	<i>N</i> = 910
Gender	Female	255 (54.1)	25 (34.2)	101 (76.5)	161 (69.4)	542 (59.7)
	Male	216 (45.9)	48 (65.7)	31 (23.5)	71 (30.6)	366 (40.3)
	Total	<i>n</i> = 471	<i>n</i> = 73	<i>n</i> = 132	<i>n</i> = 232	<i>N</i> = 908
OSU GPA	< 2.0	28 (5.9)	2 (2.7)	3 (2.3)	4 (1.7)	37 (4.0)
	2.0 to 2.49	70 (14.9)	3 (4.1)	11 (8.3)	15 (6.5)	99 (10.8)
	2.50 to 2.99	118 (25.1)	15 (20.5)	35 (26.5)	34 (14.7)	202 (22.0)
	3.00 to 3.49	126 (26.6)	19 (26.0)	33 (25.0)	55 (23.7)	233 (25.4)
	3.50 to 4.00	130 (27.6)	34 (46.5)	50 (37.9)	124 (53.4)	338 (36.8)
	Missing	10 (2.1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0(0)	10 (1.1)
	Total	<i>n</i> = 482	<i>n</i> = 73	<i>n</i> = 132	<i>n</i> = 232	<i>N</i> = 919

⁵ One artifact could not be assigned to any class because of missing information

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



Table 3. Diversity Artifact Scores

Class	SCORE: <i>n</i> (%)					<i>n</i>
	Benchmark	Milestones		Capstones		
	1	2	3	4	5	
Freshman	0 (0.0)	1 (2.0)	26 (53.1)	18 (36.7)	4 (8.2)	49
Sophomore	2 (3.0)	6 (9.0)	29 (43.3)	25 (37.3)	5 (7.5)	67
Junior	1 (1.4)	10 (14.5)	24 (34.8)	29 (42.0)	5 (7.2)	69
Senior	0 (0.0)	5 (10.6)	20 (42.6)	17 (36.2)	5 (10.6)	47
College ⁷						
CAS	0 (0.0)	7 (6.5)	39 (36.4)	47 (43.9)	14 (13.1)	107
CEAT	0 (0.0)	4 (20.0)	7 (35.0)	6 (30.0)	3 (15.0)	20
CEHS	1 (1.9)	7 (13.2)	31 (58.5)	13 (24.5)	1 (1.9)	53
AGRI	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (15.4)	11 (84.6)	0 (0.0)	13
SSB	2 (7.4)	4 (14.8)	15 (55.6)	5 (18.5)	1 (3.7)	27
UC	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	5 (41.7)	7 (58.3)	0 (0.0)	12
Gender						
Male	1 (1.4)	9 (12.7)	27 (38.0)	28 (39.4)	6 (8.5)	71
Female	2 (1.2)	13 (8.1)	72 (44.7)	61 (37.9)	13 (8.1)	161
Overall	3 (1.3)	22 (9.5)	99 (42.7)	89 (38.4)	19 (8.2)	232

Table 4. Diversity Artifact Scores for each rubric category, 2021

	SCORE: <i>n</i> (%)					<i>n</i>
	Benchmark	Milestones		Capstones		
	1	2	3	4	5	
A ⁸	5 (2.1)	25 (10.7)	118 (50.6)	60 (25.8)	25 (10.7)	233
B	4 (1.7)	40 (17.2)	106 (45.5)	70 (30.0)	13 (5.6)	233
C ⁹	5 (2.2)	16 (7.1)	98 (43.8)	82 (36.6)	23 (10.3)	224
D ¹⁰	0 (0)	8 (3.6)	90 (40.0)	89 (39.6)	38 (16.9)	225
Overall	3 (1.3)	22 (9.4)	101 (43.2)	89 (38.0)	19 (8.1)	234

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

⁸ A = Knowledge of Cultural Context; B = Conceptual Understanding; C = Values Diversity D = Attitudes

⁹ Nine artifacts could not be used in analysis due to their lack of applicability to category C of the rubric

¹⁰ Eight artifacts could not be used in analysis due to their lack of applicability to category D of the rubric



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. The CCS-S 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. This survey is cost effective and has yielded a higher response rate as it has been further established among students and since we have been able to offer an attractive incentive for students.

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

In order to gain a better understanding of the campus climate and your experience at Oklahoma State University, the OSU Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Task Force in collaboration with the Committee for the Assessment of General Education and University Assessment and Testing are conducting a short climate survey to learn about your experience at OSU. The survey will take **5-10 minutes** to complete and will provide meaningful and useful feedback to us.

Your responses will contribute to the advancement of a welcoming and inclusive environment that appreciates and values all members of the University community.

By completing this survey, the students were entered for a chance to win one of ten \$100 Bursar reimbursements. They were informed that the survey is completely voluntary and their responses were to remain confidential.

The 2021 CCS-S was conducted during the spring semester at Oklahoma State University. The CCS-S was administered to all students in the Stillwater and Tulsa campuses. A total of 5,436 students initially responded to the CCS-S, which was 24.0% of the target population ($N = 22,628$ students), and 4,857 responses (21.5%) were analyzed after data cleaning procedures. The CCS-S contained 40 items asked on a 5-point agreement Likert scale. Topics of these items included inclusion, support, experience at OSU, belonging, 'D' course issues, working with and discussion with others, improvement, concern, and equity. There were also eight demographic items and one open-ended item which asked, "Do you have any other comments you would like to make about diversity, equity or inclusion at OSU?" For this open-ended question there were 1,204 responses.



Analyses and Findings

Model Fit: Reliability & Validity

Overall Model Fit

($n = 4,857 \rightarrow n = 4,078$ after cases with missing values were excluded)

Reliability: The model was found to be reliable (40 items; Cronbach's Alpha = 0.732).

- The overall model of OSU CCS-E included nine factors: 1) Inclusion/Support, 2) Experience at OSU, 3) Belonging, 4) D-Course Issues, 5) Working with Others, 6) Improvement, 7) Concern, 8) Discussion with Others, and 9) Equity.

Validity: Validity of the overall 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 *acceptable* if it is greater than 0.90. CFI for this model is 0.92 and considered *good*.
- Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) ranges from 0 to 1 and a value of 0.08 or less is indicative of an *acceptable* model fit. RMSEA for this model is 0.055 and is *good*.
- 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 0.080 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

Classification¹¹ ($n = 4,857$)

- 12.1% of participants were Freshmen ($n = 565$),
- 18.0% of participants were Sophomores ($n = 842$),
- 20.2% of participants were Juniors ($n = 944$),
- 27.1% of participants were Seniors ($n = 1,266$),
- 11.2% of participants were Masters students ($n = 521$), and
- 11.3% of participants were Doctoral students ($n = 528$).

Campus: ($n = 4,857$)

- 90.3% of participants were affiliated with the Stillwater campus ($n = 4,385$),
- 7.0% of participants were affiliated with the Stillwater and Tulsa campuses ($n = 342$), and
- 2.7% of participants were affiliated with the Tulsa campus ($n = 130$).

¹¹ 191 students could not be classified into one of the prescribed categories. The extraneous categories included Professional students, Graduate Certificate, Special Graduate, and Special Undergraduate



Reported Gender¹²: (n = 4,367)

- 61.2% of participants responded Female (*n* = 2,674)
- 35.4% responded Male (*n* = 1,545),
- 1.5% responded Other (*n* = 65),
- 0.8% responded 'Prefer not to answer' (*n* = 37),
- 0.4% responded Transgender woman (*n* = 19),
- 0.3% responded Non-binary (*n* = 15),
- 0.2% responded Gender non-conforming (*n* = 8), and
- 0.1% responded Transgender man (*n* = 4).

Reported Sexual Orientation²: (n = 4,352)

- 82.2% of participants responded Heterosexual/Straight (*n* = 3,577),
- 8.0% responded Bisexual (*n* = 347),
- 2.7% responded Other (*n* = 116),
- 1.9% responded Prefer not to answer (*n* = 82),
- 1.7% responded Gay (*n* = 75),
- 1.7% responded Questioning (*n* = 74),
- 1.3% responded Lesbian (*n* = 56), and
- 0.6% responded Queer (*n* = 25).

Reported Religion: (n = 4,366)

- 47.7% of participants responded Christian - Protestant (*n* = 2,083),
- 23.0% responded No religious affiliation (*n* = 1,006),
- 14.7% responded Christian - Catholic (*n* = 641),
- 3.7% responded Prefer not to answer (*n* = 162),
- 3.7% responded Other (*n* = 161),
- 2.5% responded Hindu (*n* = 107),
- 2.4% responded Muslim (*n* = 103),
- 1.2% responded Buddhist (*n* = 51),
- 0.8% responded Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints (*n* = 33), and
- 0.4% responded Jewish (*n* = 19).

Reported Marital Status: (n = 4,358)

- 75.7% of participants responded Single (*n* = 3,298),
- 12.4% of participants responded Married (*n* = 541),
- 7.6% of participants responded Not married but living with a partner (*n* = 333),
- 1.5% of participants responded Divorced (*n* = 65),
- 1.3% of participants responded Other (*n* = 58),
- 1.1% of participants responded Prefer not to answer (*n* = 49),
- 0.2% of participants responded Widowed (*n* = 9), and
- 0.1% of participants responded Separated (*n* = 5).

¹² Response options for these items were edited or added halfway through the data collection period. This could account for a lower total number of responses for some response options



Race, Ethnicity, or Nationality: (*n* = 4,857)

- 61.1% of participants were reported as White or European American (*n* = 2,967),
- 9.5% were reported as Multiracial (*n* = 462),
- 9.3% were reported as International (*n* = 450),
- 8.8% were reported as Hispanic, Latin(a/o), or Latinx (*n* = 428),
- 4.8% were reported as Black or African American (*n* = 233),
- 3.6% were reported as Native American or Alaska Native (*n* = 176),
- 2.7% were reported as Asian or Asian American (*n* = 130),
- 0.1% were reported as Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (*n* = 6), and
- 0.1% were reported as Unknown (*n* = 5).

Reported Disability: (*n* = 4,369)

- No: 95.1%; *n* = 4,155
- Yes: 4.9%; *n* = 214

Of those who responded “Yes”: Multiple response item

- 27.6% of participants responded Psychological and Mental Health (*n* = 98),
- 14.9% responded Physical Disability (*n* = 53),
- 14.4% responded Chronic Illness (*n* = 51),
- 9.0% responded Learning Disability (*n* = 32),
- 6.5% responded Hearing Loss and Deafness (*n* = 23),
- 6.2% responded Other (*n* = 22),
- 5.9% responded Vision Loss and Blindness (*n* = 21),
- 4.5% responded Autism (*n* = 16),
- 3.9% responded Memory Loss (*n* = 14),
- 3.4% responded Prefer not to answer (*n* = 12),
- 2.0% responded Intellectual Disability (*n* = 7), and
- 1.7% responded Speech and Language Disorder (*n* = 6)



Key Findings: Highest or Lowest Ranking Items (n=4,857)

Top 10 Positively-Rated Items:

- At OSU, I am personally treated with respect by faculty and staff. **(91.1% Strongly Agree/Agree)**
- When I graduate from OSU, I will be confident in my ability to work with individuals from different backgrounds and cultures than my own. **(90.2% Strongly Agree/Agree)**
- In class at OSU, I am able to work with classmates with backgrounds and cultures different from my own. **(89.4% Strongly Agree/Agree)**
- I believe that meaningful interactions with individuals different from me is an essential part of my college education at OSU. **(88.3% Strongly Agree/Agree)**
- At OSU, I am personally treated with respect by peers. **(87.6% Strongly Agree/Agree)**
- At OSU, I am able to work well with my peers/classmates in class. **(85.7% Strongly Agree/Agree)**
- There is a fellow student at OSU that I feel comfortable turning to if I need support. **(83.2% Strongly Agree/Agree)**
- At OSU, I have opportunities for academic success that are similar to those of my classmates. **(82.3% Strongly Agree/Agree)**
- At OSU, I feel that I personally have experienced discrimination. **(80.0% Strongly Disagree/Disagree)**
- It is important for OSU's leaders to talk about racial and ethnic issues to help work through and solve the problems. **(79.2% Strongly Agree/Agree)**

Top 5 Negatively-Rated Items:

- I hesitate to talk about issues of diversity at OSU because of the fear of offending others. **(31.4% Strongly Agree/Agree)**
- I participate in OSU campus events often. **(29.3% Strongly Disagree/Disagree)**
- At OSU, in the past year, I have witnessed insulting or disparaging remarks about someone's ethnic background. **(22.9% Strongly Agree/Agree)**
- At OSU, I feel that I personally have experienced being ignored. **(22.8% Strongly Agree/Agree)**
- At OSU, I feel that I personally have experienced exclusion/isolation. **(66.5% Strongly Agree/Agree)**



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.

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 or excluded at OSU.

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. 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.



- The CCS-S was administered in spring 2019 and again in spring 2021. By administering the survey for a second time, we are beginning to establish a baseline and track student self-reported climate at OSU. Student performance on the survey will be tracked by developing a Campus Climate Survey for Students Comparison Report. In this report, student performance will be compared and analyzed based on the multiple years of data.
- The diversity artifact review subcommittee will continue to discuss the newly created and implemented OSU Diversity Rubric as well as discussion on 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.
- We will continue to streamline the General Education assessment for each cycle and eventually integrate the information in the Nuventive Improvement Platform system for ease of distribution and transparency of information. This will also make longitudinal comparisons and examination of trends much easier.

