

**Oklahoma State University
Committee for the Assessment of General Education
and
University Assessment and Testing
Annual Report, 2024**

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
Michael Rabens, 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., Assistant Vice Provost Accreditation, Assessment, and Testing
Kelva Hunger, Ph.D., Associate Director Assessment & Analysis
Kaitlynn Holcomb, M.S., Assessment Coordinator
Paola Sainz Sujet, M.S., Statistical Analyst Graduate Research Associate



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).....	13
Discussion	15
Overall Implications and Future Direction	15



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 2023-2024 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, 270 student artifacts were assessed using the OSU Diversity Rubric by two teams of two reviewers per team.
 - 47.8% of student artifacts were rated as Milestones ($n = 129$), and 50% of student artifacts were rated as Capstones ($n = 135$). In other words, the majority of students **met or exceeded expectations** in diversity artifacts.
- The OSU Campus Climate Survey for Students (CCS-S) was conducted during the spring semester of 2024 at Oklahoma State University. The CCS-S was administered to students in the Stillwater and Tulsa campuses. A total of 738 students responded to the CCS-S, which was 3.1% of the target population (24,105 students), and 596 student responses (2.5%) were analyzed after data cleaning procedures.
 - Most of the students (92.2%) believe they will be able to work well with individuals from different cultures and backgrounds when they graduate from OSU, and they also feel they have a strong ability to work together with their peers/classmates from different cultures and backgrounds (91.8%). These results suggest successful efforts to promote diversity and inclusion initiatives.
 - The majority of surveyed students (88.5%) feel that they are treated with respect by faculty and staff and consider that meaningful interactions with individuals different from themselves are an essential part of their experience at OSU (84.9%).

Recommendations:

- In the future, in terms of the assessment of Diversity and intercultural knowledge among undergraduate students at Oklahoma State University, these endeavors will become the responsibility of the Access and Community Impact office. The CAGE will be adding a new learning outcome to the General Education Assessment rotation, Civic Engagement, so efforts will be placed in developing the assessment plan and logistics.
- If diversity is adopted back into the cycle rotation for the Assessment of General Education, the new method for artifact collection will continue, as well as administration of the Campus Climate Survey for Students.
- We will continue to streamline the General Education assessment for each cycle and eventually integrate the information into the Nuventive Improvement Platform system for ease of distribution and transparency of information. We are beginning to pilot this new process of integration between general education assessment and institutional assessment. We will align this information with program outcomes assessment report



information on specific topics. This process is ongoing and will span over a number of years.

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.
Assistant Vice Provost Accreditation, Assessment, and Testing
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 14 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 2023-24 academic year, Diversity was assessed; here is the current 4-year cycle:

Current Cycle

1. **2021-22 | Professionalism and Ethics** (student artifacts and behavioral ratings)
2. **2022-23 | Written Communication and Critical Thinking** (student artifacts)
3. **2023-24 | Diversity (student artifacts and survey) REPORTING YEAR**
4. **2024-25 | Civic Engagement**

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 2024, for the review of Diversity artifacts, OSU used the updated 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 during the Fall of 2023 and the instructors of the randomly selected courses with the D designation for the Spring 2024. Instructors were contacted by their respective college CAGE representative and given information on what type of assignment we would be able to use, the rubric used to review, instructions on how to collect the artifacts, and assurance that the artifacts would be anonymized and in no way identifiable to any student.

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

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

For more information about the above four categories or to view the OSU Diversity Rubric, refer to: <https://uat.okstate.edu/assessment/assessgenedrubs.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 = 0.928; n = 270).

Key Findings

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

Analysis tables follow.



Table 1. 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	Number of Artifacts Included in Analysis ⁴
CAS	ENGL 2883	Survey of American Literature II	(D, H)	76	47	42
	TH 3633	Diverse American Drama	(D, H)	20	8	8
	SPCH 2713	Introduction to Speech Communication	(S)	162	24	24
	GWST 2123	Introduction to Gender Studies	(D, H)	13	13	13
	HIST 3303	Nations on the Move: Latin American Migration and Latinx Communities in the U.S.	(D, H)	8	8	8
	AMST 3303	Nations on the Move: Latin American Migration and Latinx Communities in the U.S.	(D, H)	7	7	7
	HIST 3683	United States History Since 1945	(D, H)	51	51	42
	HIST 3703	Oklahoma History	(D, H)	27	27	27
CEHS	HLTH 3113	Health Issues in Diverse Populations	(D)	21	21	21
	LLCE 2003	American Stories: Diverse Peoples in YA Literature	(D, H)	23	7	7
	RT 2443	Contemporary Issues in Diversity	(D, S)	12	12	12
	SPED 3202	Educating Exceptional Leaders	(N/A)	62	62	32
SSB	MGMT 4650	Leadership Issues	(N/A)	27	27	27
Total Number of Diversity Artifacts:				509	314	270

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	2024	Total
		# of artifacts	# of artifacts	# of artifacts	# of artifacts	# of artifacts	# of artifacts
		(% of total)	(% of total)	(% of total)	(% of total)	(% of total)	(% of total)
Class	Freshman	45 (9.6)	24 (32.8)	7 (5.3)	49 (21.2)	25 (9.3)	150 (12.7)
	Sophomore	118 (25.1)	8 (10.9)	38 (28.8)	69 (29.9)	58 (21.5)	291(24.7)
	Junior	162 (34.4)	24 (32.8)	42 (31.8)	66 (28.6)	68 (25.2)	362 (30.8)
	Senior	146 (31.0)	17 (23.2)	45 (34.1)	47 (20.3)	94 (34.8)	349 (29.7)
	Special Undergraduate	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	25 (9.3)	25(2.1)
	Total	n = 471	n = 73	n = 132	n = 231	n = 270	n = 1177
College ⁵	CAS	181 (38.4)	27 (36.9)	41 (31.1)	107 (46.1)	74 (27.4)	430 (36.4)
	AGRI	28 (5.9)	22 (30.1)	21 (15.9)	13 (5.6)	17 (6.3)	101 (8.6)
	CEAT	50 (10.6)	3 (4.1)	6 (4.5)	20 (8.6)	20 (7.4)	99 (8.4)
	CEHS	151 (31.8)	9 (12.3)	55 (41.7)	53 (22.8)	86 (31.9)	354 (30.3)
	SSB	28 (5.9)	9 (12.3)	6 (4.5)	27 (11.6)	45 (16.7)	115 (9.7)
	UC	35 (7.4)	3 (4.1)	3 (2.3)	12 (5.2)	28 (10.4)	81 (6.9)
	Total	n = 473	n = 73	n = 132	n = 232	n = 270	n = 1180
Gender	Female	255 (54.1)	25 (34.2)	101 (76.5)	161 (69.4)	172 (63.7)	714 (60.6)
	Male	216 (45.9)	48 (65.7)	31 (23.5)	71 (30.6)	98 (36.3)	464 (39.4)
	Total	n = 471	n = 73	n = 132	n = 232	n = 270	n = 1178
OSU GPA	< 2.0	28 (5.9)	2 (2.7)	3 (2.3)	4 (1.7)	5 (1.9)	42 (3.5)
	2.0 to 2.49	70 (14.9)	3 (4.1)	11 (8.3)	15 (6.5)	20 (7.4)	119(10.0)
	2.50 to 2.99	118 (25.1)	15 (20.5)	35 (26.5)	34 (14.7)	43 (15.9)	245(20.6)
	3.00 to 3.49	126 (26.6)	19 (26.0)	33 (25.0)	55 (23.7)	62 (23.0)	295(24.8)
	3.50 to 4.00	130 (27.6)	34 (46.5)	50 (37.9)	124 (53.4)	136 (50.4)	474(39.9)
	Missing	10 (2.1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (1.5)	14(1.2)
	Total	n = 482	n = 73	n = 132	n = 232	n = 270	n = 1189

⁵ 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

Table 6. Diversity Artifact Scores

	SCORE: n (%)					
	Benchmark	Milestones		Capstones		
	1	2	3	4	5	n
Class						
Freshman	0 (0.0)	8 (3.0)	9 (3.3)	8 (3.0)	0 (0.0)	25 (9.3)
Sophomore	1 (0.4)	2 (0.7)	28 (10.4)	26 (9.6)	1 (0.4)	58 (21.5)
Junior	0 (0.0)	3 (1.1)	24 (8.9)	37 (13.7)	4 (1.5)	68 (25.2)
Senior	1 (0.4)	5 (1.9)	32 (11.9)	53 (19.6)	3 (1.1)	94 (34.8)
Special Undergraduate	4 (1.5)	3 (1.1)	15 (5.6)	3 (1.1)	0 (0.0)	25 (9.3)
College6						
CAS	1 (0.4)	2 (0.7)	25 (9.3)	43 (15.9)	3 (1.1)	74 (27.4)
CEAT	1 (0.4)	2 (0.7)	6 (2.2)	11(4.1)	0 (0.0)	20 (7.4)
CEHS	0 (0.0)	7 (2.6)	37 (13.7)	38 (14.1)	4 (1.5)	86 (31.9)
AGRI	0 (0.0)	2 (0.7)	8 (3.0)	7 (2.6)	0 (0.0)	17 (6.3)
SSB	0 (0.0)	4 (1.5)	16 (5.9)	24 (8.9)	1 (0.4)	45 (16.7)
UC	4 (1.5)	4 (1.5)	16 (5.9)	4 (1.5)	0 (0.0)	28 (10.4)
Gender						
Male	5 (1.9)	16 (5.9)	69 (25.6)	78 (28.9)	4 (1.5)	172 (63.7)
Female	1 (0.4)	5 (1.9)	39 (14.4)	49 (18.1)	4 (1.5)	98 (36.3)
Overall	6 (2.3)	21 (7.8)	108 (40.0)	127 (47.0)	8 (3.0)	270 (100.0)

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

	SCORE: n (%)					
	Benchmark	Milestones		Capstones		n
	1	2	3	4	5	
A7	5 (1.9)	18 (6.7)	95 (35.2)	137 (50.7)	15 (5.6)	270 (100)
B	5 (1.9)	25 (9.3)	101 (37.4)	132 (48.9)	7 (2.6)	270 (100)
C	4 (1.5)	24 (8.9)	143 (53.0)	94 (34.8)	5 (1.9)	270 (100)
Overall	6 (2.2)	21 (7.8)	108 (40.0)	127 (47.0)	8 (3.0)	270 (100)

⁶ 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

⁷ A = Knowledge of Cultural Context; B = Conceptual Understanding; C = Values & Attitudes



Campus Climate Survey for Students

Assessment Administration

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

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

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

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

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



Analyses and Findings

Model Fit: Reliability & Validity

Overall Model Fit (n=596)

Reliability:

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

Validity:

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

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

Key Findings: Demographic Information

Classification: (n=596⁸)

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

Campus: (n=596)

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

Gender: (n=596)

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

Race: (n=596)

- 72.3% of participants were White (n=431),

⁸ 10 students could not be grouped into these classifications.



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

Key Findings: Highest or Lowest Ranking Items (n=596)

Top 10 Positively-Rated Items:

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

Top 5 Negatively-Rated Items:

- I participate in OSU campus events often – Belonging (25.1%)
- OSU can improve diversity by focusing its efforts on recruiting/retention of faculty/staff from diverse backgrounds - Improvement (21.5%)
- At OSU, I feel comfortable expressing my views regarding race/ethnicity – Discussion with Others (20.8)
- At OSU, I feel free and comfortable discussing diversity issues in school with others - Discussion with Others (20.6%)
- OSU can improve diversity by focusing its efforts on events related to diversity - Improvement (19.2%)



Discussion

The vast majority of students 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. Most students surveyed feel they were treated with respect by faculty and staff. The majority of students believe that having meaningful interactions with individuals different from me is an essential part of their college education at OSU

The highest rated “Strongly Disagree” or “Disagree” items lead to the conclusion on student’s sense of belonging indicating that they don’t participate in OSU campus events often. Other dissatisfied items have to do with discussion with others with some students not feeling comfortable expressing my views regarding race/ethnicity or discussing diversity issues in school with others

Overall Implications and Future Direction

- Assessment data collected from the general education assessment process has been 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 the future, in terms of the assessment of Diversity and intercultural knowledge among undergraduate students at Oklahoma State University, these endeavors will become the responsibility of the Access and Community Impact office. The CAGE will be adding a new learning outcome to the General Education Assessment rotation, Civic Engagement, so efforts will be placed in developing the assessment plan and logistics.
- If diversity is adopted back into the cycle rotation for the Assessment of General Education, the new method for artifact collection will continue, as well as administration of the Campus Climate Survey for Students.



- We will continue to streamline the General Education assessment for each cycle and eventually integrate the information 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.

