

Texas A&M University System
2017 Student Learning Outcome Report
for Texas A&M University-Central Texas

DISCIPLINE-SPECIFIC KNOWLEDGE

Upon graduation, students will demonstrate mastery of the depth of knowledge required for their respective degrees.

ASSESSMENTS

- National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
- Educational Testing Service (ETS) Major Field Tests (MFT)
- Area Content Achievement Tests (ACAT)
- Texas Examination for Educator Standards (TExES)
- Individual Development of Educational Assessment (IDEA)
- Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (Value) Rubrics

RESULTS:

Sufficient

- NSSE Internships - **Emerging**
- NSSE Senior Experiences - **Sufficient**
- NSSE Work-Related Skills - **Proficient**
- NSSE Career - **Sufficient**
- NSSE Connecting Prior Experiences - **Sufficient**
- ETS MFT Psychology - **Sufficient**
- ETS MFT Sociology - **Exemplary**
- ACAT Criminology - **Emerging**
- TExES - **Proficient**
- IDEA Gaining Factual Knowledge - **Proficient**
- IDEA Learning Fundamental Principles, Generalizations, or Theories - **Proficient**
- IDEA Developing Specific Skills - **Proficient**
- Value Rubric Inquiry and Analysis – **Sufficient**

Results Descriptions: **Exemplary** – All criteria met and results exceed expectations with little room for improvement, **Proficient** – Most criteria met and results indicate mastery of objective with some room for improvement, **Sufficient** – Acceptable number of criteria met and results meet expectations with room for improvement, **Emerging** – Some criteria met and results indicate need for improvement, and **Insufficient** – Few criteria met, results indicate need for significant improvement or no/insufficient results reported to measure performance of objective.

ANALYSIS:

The university employs a wide array of instruments to assess this critical outcome with results ranging from Exemplary to Sufficient. Overall, these assessments indicate students sufficiently achieve the discipline-specific skills of their academic programs upon completing the degree programs at the university.

Additionally, both the university's annual academic program assessments and periodic external academic program reviews demonstrate students achieve the discipline-specific program-level learning outcomes in all programs at the university.

ACTION:

Continue to build an improvement culture by seeking out meaningful assessment instruments to identify areas for improvement. Specifically, employ more field-specific assessments with national benchmarks while ensuring faculty acceptance so that assessment results may be confidently used to improve institutional effectiveness.

COMMENTS:

None

ASSESSMENT: NSSE INTERNSHIPS

The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) assesses hundreds of four-year colleges and universities nationwide annually to determine student participation in programs and activities provided by institutions for student learning and personal development. The results indicate undergraduate students' use of their time and gains in attending college. Survey items represent empirically confirmed "good practices" in undergraduate education to reflect the extent of use of behaviors, by students and institutions, associated with desired outcomes of college. More than 1300 colleges and universities participated in NSSE since it was first administered in 2000 making rich national comparisons of the results possible.

The NSSE was administered by the University to seniors in Spring of 2015 and 2017. Students attending both face-to-face and online courses, on and off campus were included in the test group. The survey was distributed to 1,209 students in 2015 and 1,053 students in 2017 with a 30 percent response rate in both cases.

11.a. Have you or do you plan to do before you graduate participate in an internship, co-op, field experience, student teaching, or clinical placement?

RESULTS:

Emerging. The percentage of students responding to being engaged in internships was 22 percentage points below the Carnegie Classification (23% to 45%) in 2017. Students responded 30 percentage points below the Carnegie Classification (19% to 49%) in 2015.

The University uses the Carnegie Classification as a benchmark of NSSE performance and considers performance to be:

- **Exemplary** when equal to or above
- **Proficient** when no more than 10 percentage points below

- **Sufficient** when no more than 20 percentage points below
- **Emerging** when no more than 30 percentage points below
- **Insufficient** when more than 30 percentage points below

ANALYSIS:

In 2017, 193 seniors responded and 23% (n=46) indicated they completed or were completing an internship (or similar activity), 31% (n=60) planned to, 26% (n=50) did not plan to, and 20% (n=37) had not decided. The percentage of university students who completed or were completing an internship was 14, 22, and 26 percentage points below the three identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 37%, Carnegie Classification at 45%, and NSSE 2016 and 2017 at 49%).

In 2015, 181 seniors responded and 19% (n=34) indicated they completed or were completing an internship (or similar activity), 36% (n=65) planned to, 28% (n=51) did not plan to, and 17% (n=31) had not decided. The percentage of university students who completed or were completing an internship was 24, 30, and 32 percentage points below the three identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 43%, Carnegie Classification at 49%, and NSSE 2014 and 2015 at 51%).

Resources were dedicated to ensuring students have good internships and similar opportunities and a 4-percentage point increase is a big improvement for a university with an average student age of 34, nearly 50 percent online attendance, and higher percentages of the active and prior military enrollments. Specifically, the university filled the Director of Career and Professional Services highly-qualified professional with experience in attracting meaningful internships for students completing our degree programs. For example, she coordinated with local Texas representatives to offer internships in our State's Legislature.

ACTION:

Continue to increase internship opportunities for students.

The Office of Career and Professional Development will continue to identify and secure more internships and similar opportunities for students nearing the completion of their programs to engage.

COMMENTS:

None

ASSESSMENT: NSSE SENIOR EXPERIENCES.

11.f. Have you completed, or do you plan to complete before you graduate, a culminating senior experience (capstone course, senior project or thesis, comprehensive exam, portfolio, etc.)?

RESULTS:

Sufficient. The percentage of student responding as being engaged in senior experiences was 17 percentage points below the Carnegie Classification (27% to 44%) in 2017. Students responded 17 percentage points below the Carnegie Classification (28% to 45%) in 2015.

The University uses the Carnegie Classification as a benchmark of NSSE performance and considers performance to be:

- **Exemplary** when equal to or above
- **Proficient** when no more than 10 percentage points below
- **Sufficient** when no more than 20 percentage points below
- **Emerging** when no more than 30 percentage points below
- **Insufficient** when more than 30 percentage points below

ANALYSIS:

In 2017, 192 seniors responded and 27% (n=55) indicated they completed or were completing a senior experience (or similar activity), 26% (n=49) planned to, 20% (n=38) did not plan to, and 27% (n=50) had not decided. The percentage of university students who completed or were completing a senior experience was 8, 17, and 18 percentage points below the three identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 35%, Carnegie Classification at 44%, and NSSE 2016 and 2017 at 45%).

In 2015, 178 seniors responded and 28% (n=53) indicated they completed or were completing a senior experience (or similar activity), 30% (n=52) planned to, 19% (n=33) did not plan to, and 23% (n=40) had not decided. The percentage of university students who completed or were completing a senior experience was 8, 17, and 18 percentage points below the three identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 36%, Carnegie Classification at 45%, and NSSE 2014 and 2015 at 46%).

Faculty worked to add capstone courses to many degree programs during 2015 and 2016 to provide students with an opportunity to demonstrate their professional knowledge.

ACTION:

Continue to increase senior experience opportunities for students.

Encourage faculty to continue introducing curriculum designed to provide students with a culminating senior experience to practice the knowledge, skills, and abilities learning in our programs.

COMMENTS:

None

ASSESSMENT: NSSE WORK-RELATED SKILLS

17.e. How much has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in acquiring job- or work-related knowledge and skills?

RESULTS:

Proficient. The mean of students responding to identified coursework contributing to their acquiring job-related skills was on par with the Carnegie Classification (2.9 to 2.9) in 2017. Students responded identically in 2015 meaning both the university and the peer groups made no progress on this measure between 2015 and 2017.

The University uses the Carnegie Classification as a benchmark of NSSE performance and considers performance to be:

- **Exemplary** when 1 point or more above
- **Proficient** when equal to or above
- **Sufficient** when no more than 1 point below
- **Emerging** when no more than 2 points below
- **Insufficient** when more than 2 points below

ANALYSIS:

In 2017, 184 seniors responded and 32% (n=62) indicated the institution contributed to their acquiring job-related skills at a rate of very often, 35% (n=64) often, 23% (n=41) sometimes, and 10% (n=17) never. The university mean response was 2.9, on par with our three identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 2.9, Carnegie Classification at 2.9, and NSSE 2016 and 2017 at 2.9).

In 2015, 173 seniors responded and 31% (n=54) indicated the institution contributed to their acquiring job-related skills at a rate of very often, 32% (n=54) often, 27% (n=49) sometimes, and 9% (n=16) never. The university mean response was 2.9 on par with our three identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 2.9, Carnegie Classification at 2.9, and NSSE 2014 and 2015 at 2.9).

The university and the peer groups, on average, have seen no movement in this measure. However, the university has high response rates in the top tier answers.

ACTION:

None.

COMMENTS:

None

ASSESSMENT: NSSE CAREER

3.b. During the current school year, about how often have you talked about career plans with a faculty member?

RESULTS:

Sufficient. The mean of students responding to identified conversations about career plans with a faculty member was slightly below the Carnegie Classification (2.0 to 2.4) in 2017. Students responded identically in 2015 meaning both the university and the peer groups made no progress on this measure between 2015 and 2017.

The University uses the Carnegie Classification as a benchmark of NSSE performance and considers performance to be:

- **Exemplary** when 1 point or more above
- **Proficient** when equal to or above
- **Sufficient** when no more than 1 point below

- **Emerging** when no more than 2 points below
- **Insufficient** when more than 2 points below

ANALYSIS:

In 2017, 202 seniors responded and 10% (n=21) indicated they talked about career plans with a faculty member at a rate of very often, 18% (n=38) often, 38% (n=77) sometimes, and 34% (n=66) never. The university mean response was 2.0, 0.3 to 0.4 points below our three identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 2.3, Carnegie Classification at 2.4, and NSSE 2016 and 2017 at 2.4).

In 2015, 194 seniors responded and 7% (n=15) indicated they talked about career plans with a faculty member at a rate of very often, 17% (n=33) often, 49% (n=94) sometimes, and 27% (n=52) never. The university mean response was 2.0, 0.3 to 0.4 points below our three identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 2.3, Carnegie Classification at 2.4, and NSSE 2014 and 2015 at 2.4).

The university and the peer groups, on average, have seen no movement in this critical component of a student's college career while those who see themselves as having this engagement very often increased at our university. The university employees staff undergraduate advisors to start students on their academic career and then faculty work with students to ensure timely completion. Using two separate advisors reduces the burden on faculty freeing more time for faculty to engage student later in their academic careers when faculty and student conversations are more meaningful and critical to student success in and out of the classroom.

ACTION:

Continue the dual-advisor approach to guiding students and seek opportunities to see more student perceive engaging conversations about their careers with faculty members.

COMMENTS:

None

ASSESSMENT: ETS MFT PSYCHOLOGY

The Educational Testing Service (ETS) Major Field Test (MFT) for the field of Psychology consists of 140 multiple-choice questions, some of which are grouped in sets and based on such materials as a description of an experiment or graphs of psychological functions. The questions in the Psychology test are drawn from the courses of study most commonly offered in undergraduate programs within the broadly defined field of psychology. Questions often require students to identify theories, psychologists, methods and other information from the field. Some questions require students to analyze relationships, apply principles, draw conclusions from experimental data and evaluate experiments.

RESULTS:

Sufficient. The mean scaled score on the ETS MFT in Psychology was 18.1 points lower than the national mean (138.0 to 156.1).

The University uses the comparisons in the Annual Comparative Data Guide as a benchmark of student performance and considers performance to be:

- **Exemplary** when the mean test scaled score is equal to or above the national mean
- **Proficient** when the mean test scaled score 10 points or fewer below the national mean
- **Sufficient** when the mean test scaled score 20 points or fewer below the national mean
- **Emerging** when the mean test scaled score 30 points or fewer below the national mean
- **Insufficient** when the mean test scaled score is more than 30 points below the national mean

ANALYSIS:

In 2017, 35 students completed the ETS MFT in Psychology with a mean scaled score of 138 and a standard deviation of 11. These students scored 18.1 scaled points below the national mean of 156.1 (sd=15.1) of students completing the test between September 2014 and June 2017.

This result is a decline in student performance since 2012 when the test was first introduced to our students. In 2012, 30 students completed the test with a mean scaled score of 144.6 (sd=11.2). These students scored 11.2 scaled points below the national mean of 155.8 (sd=15.3).

A small group of students participated in the test in 2013, 2014, and 2015 prohibiting a valuable analysis of the results. The test was reintroduced to more students in 2016 when students achieved a mean score of 138.3 (n=46, sd=13.5).

The assessment instrument generates six assessment sub scores.

Assessment Indicator	University Mean Percent Correct	National Mean Percent Correct	Difference
Memory and Cognition	31	45.3	-14.3
Perception / Sensation / Physiology	35	53.1	-18.1
Developmental	32	48.6	-16.6
Clinical and Abnormal	55	69.5	-14.5
Social	38	62.8	-24.8
Measurement and Methodology	36	54.2	-18.2

University students show the largest deficit in the social assessment indicator, but also larger gaps in perception/sensation/physiology and measurement and methodology.

Faculty introduced changes in curriculum in 2016 to better sequence courses.

ACTION:

Continue to administer the assessment and ensure students completing the assessment are in their final semester. Monitor the results and determine if additional curriculum corrections are needed to meet a proficient level.

COMMENTS:

None

ASSESSMENT: ETS MFT SOCIOLOGY

The ETS® Major Field Test for Sociology consists of 140 multiple-choice questions, some of which are grouped in sets and based on such materials as diagrams, graphs and statistical data. Most of the questions require knowledge of specific sociological information, but the test also draws on the student's ability to interpret data, to apply concepts and ideas, and to analyze sociological data, theories and relationships, deductively and inductively.

RESULTS:

Exemplary. The mean scaled score on the ETS MFT in Sociology was 1.4 points lower than the national mean (146.8 to 148.2).

The University uses the comparisons in the Annual Comparative Data Guide as a benchmark of student performance and considers performance to be:

- **Exemplary** when the mean test scaled score is equal to or above the national mean
- **Proficient** when the mean test scaled score 10 points or fewer below the national mean
- **Sufficient** when the mean test scaled score 20 points or fewer below the national mean
- **Emerging** when the mean test scaled score 30 points or fewer below the national mean
- **Insufficient** when the mean test scaled score is more than 30 points below the national mean

ANALYSIS:

In 2016, 5 students completed the ETS MFT in Sociology with a mean scaled score of 146.8 and a standard deviation of 6. These students scored 1 scaled point below the national mean of 148.2 (sd=12.4) of students completing the test between September 2014 and June 2017.

The assessment instrument generates nine assessment sub scores.

Assessment Indicator Title	Mean Percent Correct	National Mean Percent Correct	Difference
General Theory	50	49	1
Methodology and Statistics	43	43.3	-0.3
Criminology and Deviance	27	41.7	-14.7
Social Stratification	55	54.1	0.9
Race, Ethnicity, Gender	53	55.4	-2.4
Social Institutions	40	42.1	-2.1
Social Psychology	56	59	-3
Gender	53	53.6	-0.6
Global	44	48.8	-4.8

University students show the largest deficit in the criminology and deviance assessment indicator.

ACTION:

None

COMMENTS:

None

ASSESSMENT: ACAT IN CRIMINOLOGY

The Area Content Achievement Test (ACAT) delivers the critical balance between locally developed and nationally referenced instruments for assessing content mastery in the major. The assessment provides faculty with learning outcomes assessment instruments matching their teaching and learning goals. Building nationally referenced tests from items contributed by the faculty using them and allowing departments to select content areas relevant to their learning goals provide the needed balance between locally developed and nationally referenced tests in recognition of the diversity of opinion and content as key strengths of higher education.

RESULTS:

Emerging. 55% of students who took the ACAT in 2017 scored above the 60th percentile.

The program seeks to prepare students to score in the upper 60th percentile of test takers considers performance to be:

- **Exemplary** when 80 percent or more score in the 60th percentile or above
- **Proficient** when 70 percent or more score in the 60th percentile or above
- **Sufficient** when 60 percent or more score in the 60th percentile or above
- **Emerging** when 50 percent or more score in the 60th percentile or above
- **Insufficient** when less than 50 percent score in the 60th percentile or above

ANALYSIS:

In 2016, 42 students completed the ACAT for criminology and 55 percent of the students scored in the top 60th percentile when compared to national test takers. The assessment instrument includes 9 content areas, which the students performed above the 60th percentile in high percentages except for Criminal Law, Law Enforcement, and Legal Aspects.

Stanine Counts	1 (0-4%)	2 (4-11%)	3 (11-23%)	4 (23-40%)	5 (40-60%)	6 (60-77%)	7 (77-89%)	8 (89-96%)	9 (96-100%)	Max	Min	Average	Stdev	%age in the top 4 stanines
Correction Processes	1	1	3	5	5	12	6	7	2	9	1	5.8	1.9	64%
Criminal Justice Systems	3	3	4	5	5	7	8	6	1	9	1	5.3	2.2	52%
Criminal Law	3	3	3	6	15	2	6	3	1	9	1	4.9	2.0	29%
Criminology	1	1	0	5	4	9	9	8	5	9	1	6.4	1.9	74%
Juvenile Justice	3	4	3	6	8	11	7	0	0	7	1	4.7	1.8	43%
Law Enforcement	11	6	2	7	4	5	6	1	0	8	1	3.7	2.3	29%
Legal Aspects	6	1	8	4	8	7	2	1	5	9	1	4.7	2.4	36%
Research Methods	4	4	4	7	5	10	5	2	1	9	1	4.7	2.1	43%
Administration	0	2	2	6	3	11	4	10	4	9	2	6.2	1.9	69%
Overall Score	1	3	4	5	6	6	8	8	1	9	1	5.6	2.0	55%

ACTION:

Continue to administer the assessment instrument to seniors to college three years of data then determine how to modify the curriculum to improve student learning.

COMMENTS:

None

ASSESSMENT: TEXES**Results:**

Proficient. Students completing their degree programs and sitting for the TExES passed at a rate of 98 percent in 2017; a decline from the 100 percent pass rate in 2015.

The program seeks to prepare students to pass the TExES within one year of graduation and considers performance to be:

- **Exemplary** when 100 percent of students pass
- **Proficient** when 96 to 99 percent of students pass
- **Sufficient** when 93 to 95 percent of students pass
- **Emerging** when 90 to 92 percent of students pass
- **Insufficient** when less than 90 percent of student pass

Analysis:

In 2017, 192 out of 196 or 98 percent of the students who sat for the exam passed. This compared to 11,822 out of 12,444 or 95 percent of the students statewide who sat for the exam passed.

In 2016, 127 out of 132 or 96 percent of the students who sat for the exam passed. This compared to 12,806 out of 13,770 or 93 percent of the students statewide who sat for the exam passed.

In 2015, 100 percent (n=120) of the students who sat for the exam passed. This compared to 12,671 out of 13,625 or 93 percent of the students statewide who sat for the exam passed.

Students at the university completed their programs and passed the TExES at record rates in 2015. This declined to 96 percent in 2016, but recovered some in 2017 returning to a 98 percent pass rate. Regardless, each year the pass rate was 3 or more percentage points above the statewide pass rate as reported by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board for all public universities.

Action:

Our goal is to consistently achieve a 100 percent pass rate for all types of exams. The programs underwent some curriculum design in 2016 to improve pass rates. Education Preparation Services is conducting an analysis to review pass rates by competency and identify where all students, passing or failing, are scoring low. The results will feed a series of curriculum adjustments to increase pass rates.

Comments:

None

ASSESSMENT: IDEA GAINING FACTUAL KNOWLEDGE

Individual Development of Educational Assessment (IDEA) Student Ratings provide students a series of 12 objective questions and ask students to indicate their perceived progress: No apparent progress, slight progress, moderate progress, substantial progress, and exceptional progress. Students complete the surveys at the end of each course. The results are aggregated for all undergraduate courses for use in estimating student perception related to the achievement of undergraduate learning outcomes.

RESULTS:

Proficient. Students perceived substantial or exception gains in factual knowledge at a rate of 86.7 percent in 2016.

The University measures the percent of students indicating substantial or exceptional gains in learning on the IDEA survey and considers performance to be:

- **Exemplary** when 90 percent or more
- **Proficient** when 80 percent or more
- **Sufficient** when 70 percent or more
- **Emerging** when 60 percent or more
- **Insufficient** when below 60 percent

ANALYSIS:

In 2016, 7,391 out of 8,526 students (or 86.7 percent) perceived substantial or exceptional progress in gaining factual knowledge (terminology, classifications, methods, trends). This compares to 7,001 out of 8,035 students (or 87.1 percent) in 2015, 3,010 out of 3,580 students (or 84.1 percent) in 2014, and 4,185 out of 5,012 students (or 83.5 percent) in 2013.

Students' perception of substantial or exception gains in factual knowledge consistently increased from 83.5 percent in 2013 to 86.7 percent in 2016. Results for 2017 are pending, but anticipated to show further gains associated with improvements in curriculum designed to increase student learning; specifically, prerequisite changes.

ACTION:

None

COMMENTS:

None

ASSESSMENT: IDEA LEARNING FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES, GENERALIZATIONS, OR THEORIES

RESULTS:

Proficient. Students perceived substantial or exceptional learning of fundamental principles, generalizations, or theories at a rate of 85.6 percent in 2016.

The University measures the percent of students indicating substantial or exceptional gains in learning on the IDEA survey and considers performance to be:

- **Exemplary** when 90 percent or more
- **Proficient** when 80 percent or more
- **Sufficient** when 70 percent or more
- **Emerging** when 60 percent or more
- **Insufficient** when below 60 percent

ANALYSIS:

In 2016, 7,303 out of 8,516 students (or 85.8 percent) perceived substantial or exceptional progress learning of fundamental principles, generalizations, or theories. This compares to 6,901 out of 8,022 students (or 86.0 percent) in 2015, 2,973 out of 3,576 students (or 83.1 percent) in 2014, and 4,156 out of 4,995 students (or 83.2 percent) in 2013.

Students' perception of substantial or exceptional gains in learning fundamental principles, generalizations, or theories increased from 83.2 percent in 2013 to 85.8 percent in 2016. Results for 2017 are pending, but anticipated to show further gains associated with improvements in curriculum designed to increase student learning; specifically, prerequisite changes.

ACTION:

None

COMMENTS:

None

ASSESSMENT: IDEA DEVELOPING SPECIFIC SKILLS

RESULTS:

Proficient. Students perceived substantial or exceptional learning in developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals at a rate of 83.9 percent in 2016.

The University measures the percent of students indicating substantial or exceptional gains in learning on the IDEA survey and considers performance to be:

- **Exemplary** when 90 percent or more
- **Proficient** when 80 percent or more
- **Sufficient** when 70 percent or more
- **Emerging** when 60 percent or more
- **Insufficient** when below 60 percent

ANALYSIS:

In 2016, 7,103 out of 8,463 students (or 83.9 percent) perceived substantial or exceptional progress in developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals. This compares to 6,652 out of

7,961 students (or 83.6 percent) in 2015, 2,947 out of 3,569 students (or 82.6 percent) 2014, and 4,072 out of 4,997 students (or 81.5 percent) in 2013.

Students' perception of substantial or exceptional gains in developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals increased from 81.5 percent in 2013 to 83.9 percent in 2016. Results for 2017 are pending, but anticipated to show further gains associated with improvements in curriculum designed to increase student learning; specifically, prerequisite changes.

ACTION:

None

COMMENTS:

None

ASSESSMENT: VALUE RUBRIC INQUIRY AND ANALYSIS

Inquiry is a systematic process of exploring issues, objects or works through the collection and analysis of evidence that results in informed conclusions or judgments. Analysis is the process of breaking complex topics or issues into parts to gain a better understanding of them. This rubric includes the following aspects: topic selection; existing knowledge, research, and/or views; design process, analysis, conclusions, and limitations and implications.

The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

RESULTS:

Sufficient. Student papers rated with an average overall score of 2.5 with subscores ranging from 2.0 to 2.8 in 2017.

The University considers the following breakpoints when applying the VALUE rubrics:

- **Exemplary** when the average rating is 4.0
- **Proficient** when the average rating is above 3.0
- **Sufficient** when the average rating is above 2.0
- **Emerging** when the average rating is above 1.0
- **Insufficient** when the average rating is 1 and below

ANALYSIS:

Of the 30 student artifacts rated using the VALUE Inquiry and Analysis rubric in 2017, the overall average rating was 2.5 with the following ratings for each aspect:

Average Score	Rater 1	Rater 2	Overall
Topic Selection	2.8	2.8	2.8
Existing Knowledge, Research, and/or Views	2.6	2.7	2.6
Design Process	2.6	2.4	2.5
Analysis	2.6	2.6	2.6
Conclusions	2.0	2.5	2.2
Limitations and Implications	2.0	1.9	2.0
Overall (Scale 0 to 4)	2.4	2.5	2.5

Students performed well in all aspects, but exhibited the most opportunity for improvement with the limitations and implications aspect.

The artifacts were rated by nine faculty members (Dr. Almond, Dr. Clark, Dr. Cross, Dr. Jancenelle, Dr. Roberts, and Dr. Shuler) on November 17, 2017, in a single rating session where each faculty member rated an artifact followed by a second faculty member. No artifact was rated by the same two faculty members. The ratings resulted in a lower than desired interrater reliability, but sufficient to apply the results with a Cohen's Kappa of 39.2%. We would like to see this above 50%.

Note: 9 out of the 30 documents were rated by a single rater due to an administrative error.

ACTION:

Continue to rate artifacts for this rubric for two more years to identify a trend.

COMMENTS:

None

INTEGRATION OF BROAD KNOWLEDGE

Upon completion of their degree program, students will be able to synthesize knowledge from general and specialized studies.

ASSESSMENTS

- Educational Testing Service (ETS) Proficiency Profile (PP)
- National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
- Individual Development of Educational Assessment (IDEA)
- Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (Value) Rubrics

RESULTS:

Sufficient

- ETS PP Critical Thinking - **Sufficient**

- ETS PP Humanities - **Sufficient**
- ETS PP Social Sciences - **Sufficient**
- ETS PP Natural Sciences - **Sufficient**
- NSSE Integration - **Sufficient**
- NSSE Societal Problems - **Proficient**
- NSSE Analyzing - **Proficient**
- NSSE Forming New Ideas - **Proficient**
- NSSE Real-World Problems - **Proficient**
- Value Rubric Integrative Learning – **Emerging**

Results Descriptions: **Exemplary** – All criteria met and results exceed expectations with little room for improvement, **Proficient** – Most criteria met and results indicate mastery of objective with some room for improvement, **Sufficient** – Acceptable number of criteria met and results meet expectations with room for improvement, **Emerging** – Some criteria met and results indicate need for improvement, and **Insufficient** – Few criteria met, results indicate need for significant improvement or no/insufficient results reported to measure performance of objective.

ANALYSIS:

Students sufficiently achieve this higher-order thinking skill upon completion of our baccalaureate degrees as demonstrated by the three assessment instruments, both direct and indirect, employed to evaluate program effectiveness. Comparing the result of the direct measures to those of the indirect indicates the expected Dunning-Kruger effect. Students assess themselves as proficient in this outcome while the results from the direct measures indicate emerging and sufficient achievement.

ACTION:

Encourage the development of curriculum designed to provide students the opportunity to integrate knowledge gained during both their academic career at our upper-level institution, our community college partner institutions, their employment, and their personal experiences in their culminating coursework at the university.

COMMENTS:

None

ASSESSMENT: ETS PROFICIENCY PROFILE CRITICAL THINKING

RESULTS:

Sufficient. The mean of students completing to ETS proficiency profile critical thinking question set was -0.2 standard deviations within the national average for master's colleges and universities in 2017. The results were an improvement to the emerging performance of 2013 when students scored 1.7 points or 0.8 standard deviations below the national average.

The University uses the average individual students' subscores for master's (comprehensive) colleges and universities I and II and considers performance to be as indicated when the university average is:

- **Exemplary** – more than 1.5 standard deviations from the national mean
- **Proficient** – 0.5 to 1.5 standard deviations from the national mean
- **Sufficient** – 0.5 to -0.5 standard deviation from the national mean
- **Emerging** – -0.5 to -1.5 standard deviations from the national mean
- **Insufficient** – more than -1.5 standard deviations from the national mean

ANALYSIS:

In 2017, 20 seniors scored an average of 110.1 on the critical thinking questions (sd=5.7) with a maximum score of 123 and a minimum score of 102; compared to the national average of 110.4 (sd=1.5) with a maximum score of 116 and a minimum score of 106. The difference in our students' average and the national average was -0.3 points or -0.2 standard deviations.

In 2013, 121 seniors scored an average of 109.0 on the critical thinking questions (sd=5.0) with a maximum score of 121 and a minimum score of 100; compared to the national average of 110.7 (sd=2.0) with a maximum score of 117 and a minimum score of 107. The difference in our students' average and the national average was -1.7 points or -0.8 standard deviations.

Critical thinking skills are an essential tool for integrating broad knowledge. Seniors' performance on this section of the test much improved from 2013 to 2017 when compared to the national average.

ACTION:

Continue to ask exiting seniors to complete the ETS proficiency profile to establish a trend.

COMMENTS:

None

ASSESSMENT: ETS PROFICIENCY PROFILE HUMANITIES

RESULTS:

Sufficient. The mean of students completing to ETS proficiency profile Humanities question set was 0.2 standard deviations within the national average for master's colleges and universities in 2017. The results were an improvement to the insufficient performance of 2013 when students scored -3.0 points or -1.7 standard deviations below the national average.

The University uses the average individual students' subscores for master's (comprehensive) colleges and universities I and II and considers performance to be as indicated when the university average is:

- **Exemplary** – more than 1.5 standard deviations from the national mean
- **Proficient** – 0.5 to 1.5 standard deviations from the national mean
- **Sufficient** – 0.5 to -0.5 standard deviation from the national mean
- **Emerging** – -0.5 to -1.5 standard deviations from the national mean
- **Insufficient** – more than -1.5 standard deviations from the national mean

ANALYSIS:

In 2017, 20 seniors scored an average of 110.1 on the humanities questions (sd=5.7) with a maximum score of 123 and a minimum score of 102; compared to the national average of 110.4 (sd=1.5) with a maximum score of 116 and a minimum score of 106. The difference in our students' average and the national average was 0.3 points or 0.2 standard deviations.

In 2013, 121 seniors scored an average of 111.8 on the humanities questions (sd=5.5) with a maximum score of 127 and a minimum score of 102; compared to the national average of 114.8 (sd=1.8) with a maximum score of 118 and a minimum score of 111. The difference in our students' average and the national average was -3.0 points or -1.7 standard deviations.

The content areas on this assessment tool indicate the breadth of knowledge exiting seniors possess within and outside of their disciplines. Seniors' performance on this section of the test improved from nearly two standard deviations below the national average to being within two-tenths of a standard deviation of the national average.

ACTION:

Continue to ask exiting seniors to complete the ETS proficiency profile to establish a trend.

COMMENTS:

None

ASSESSMENT: ETS PROFICIENCY PROFILE SOCIAL SCIENCES

RESULTS:

Sufficient. The mean of students completing to ETS proficiency profile social sciences question set was 0.1 standard deviations within the national average for master's colleges and universities in 2017. These results were an improvement to the emerging performance of 2013 when students scored -1.5 points or -0.8 standard deviations below the national average.

The University uses the average individual students' subscores for master's (comprehensive) colleges and universities I and II and considers performance to be as indicated when the university average is:

- **Exemplary** – more than 1.5 standard deviations from the national mean
- **Proficient** – 0.5 to 1.5 standard deviations from the national mean
- **Sufficient** – 0.5 to -0.5 standard deviation from the national mean
- **Emerging** – -0.5 to -1.5 standard deviations from the national mean
- **Insufficient** – more than -1.5 standard deviations from the national mean

ANALYSIS:

In 2017, 20 seniors scored an average of 111.3 on the social sciences questions (sd=5.9) with a maximum score of 122 and a minimum score of 101; compared to the national average of 112.6

(sd=1.4) with a maximum score of 118 and a minimum score of 109. The difference in our students' average and the national average was -1.3 points or -1.0 standard deviations.

In 2013, 121 seniors scored 111.5 on average on the social sciences questions (sd=5.8) with a maximum score of 123 and a minimum score of 106; compared to the national average of 113 (sd=1.8) with a maximum score of 118 and a minimum score of 109. The difference in our students' average and the national average was -1.5 points or -0.8 standard deviations.

The content areas on this assessment tool indicate the breadth of knowledge exiting seniors possess within and outside of their disciplines. Seniors' performance on this section of the test went from -0.8 standard deviations below the national average to -0.2 of a standard deviation of the national average. While our students' scores decreased, so did the national average, keeping us on par.

ACTION:

Continue to ask exiting seniors to complete the ETS proficiency profile to establish a trend.

COMMENTS:

None

ASSESSMENT: ETS PROFICIENCY PROFILE NATURAL SCIENCES

RESULTS:

Sufficient. The mean of students responding to ETS proficiency profile natural sciences critical thinking question set was 0.4 standard deviations within the national average for master's colleges and universities in 2017.

The University uses the average individual students' subscores for master's (comprehensive) colleges and universities I and II and considers performance to be as indicated when the university average is:

- **Exemplary** – more than 1.5 standard deviations from the national mean
- **Proficient** – 0.5 to 1.5 standard deviations from the national mean
- **Sufficient** – 0.5 to -0.5 standard deviation from the national mean
- **Emerging** – -0.5 to -1.5 standard deviations from the national mean
- **Insufficient** – more than -1.5 standard deviations from the national mean

ANALYSIS:

In 2017, 20 seniors scored an average of 114.7 on the natural sciences scaled questions (sd= 5.2) with a maximum score of 126 and minimum score of 106. This compares to the national average of 114.1 (sd= 1.4) with a maximum score of 118 and a minimum score of 110. The difference in our students' average and the national average was 0.6 or is 0.4 standard deviations.

In 2013, 121 seniors scored an average of 113.3 on the natural sciences questions (sd= 5.9) with a maximum score of 126 and minimum score of 100. This compares to the national average of 114.3

(sd= 1.9) with a maximum score of 119 and a minimum score of 110. The difference in our students' average and the national average was -1.0 or is -0.5 standard deviations.

The university's average score increased from 2013 to 2017 and the standard deviation decreased. In both cases, the national average and standard deviation decreased. However, our average score increased more than the national average and our standard deviation decreased numerically and proportionally more. This indicates students are learning and retaining more of their natural sciences core knowledge at program completion than they did back in 2013. This is likely attributable students being advised to complete their core curriculum before engaging in upper-level courses.

ACTION:

Continue to ask exiting seniors to complete the ETS proficiency profile to establish a trend.

COMMENTS:

None

ASSESSMENT: NSSE INTEGRATION

2.a. During the current school year, about how often have you combined ideas from different courses when completing assignments?

RESULTS:

Sufficient. The mean of students responding to the integration of class knowledge question was 0.1 points below the Carnegie Classification (2.8 to 2.9) in 2017. Students responded identically to the Carnegie Classification (3.0 to 3.0) in 2015.

The University uses the Carnegie Classification as a benchmark of NSSE performance and considers performance to be:

- **Exemplary** when 1 point or more above
- **Proficient** when equal to or above
- **Sufficient** when no more than 1 point below
- **Emerging** when no more than 2 points below
- **Insufficient** when more than 2 points below

ANALYSIS:

In 2017, 205 seniors responded and 25% (n=53) indicated they combined ideas from different courses at a rate of very often, 40% (n=80) often, 30% (n=62) sometimes, and 5% (n=10) never. The university mean response was 2.8, identical to our three identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 2.9, Carnegie Classification at 2.9, and NSSE 2016 and 2017 at 2.9).

In 2015, 196 seniors responded and 35% (n=71) indicated they combined ideas from different courses at a rate of very often, 33% (n=63) often, 28% (n=54) sometimes, and 5% (n=8) never. The university

mean response was 3.0, identical to our three identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 3.0, Carnegie Classification at 3.0, and NSSE 2014 and 2015 at 3.0).

On average, students perceive opportunities to integrate knowledge in courses at rates equal to those at peer institutions. This rate dropped 0.2 percentage points from the 2015 study. We see a similar decline in our peer institutions, but neither degree is material.

ACTION:

Continue providing students opportunities to integrate coursework across classes and discipline when possible.

COMMENTS:

None

ASSESSMENT: NSSE SOCIETAL PROBLEMS

2.b. During the current school year, about how often have you connected your learning to societal problems or issues?

RESULTS:

Proficient. The mean of students responding to the identified connection of learning to societal problems question was equal to the Carnegie Classification (2.8 to 2.8) in 2017. Students responded 0.1 points below the Carnegie Classification (2.8 to 2.9) in 2015.

The University uses the Carnegie Classification as a benchmark of NSSE performance and considers performance to be:

- **Exemplary** when 1 point or more above
- **Proficient** when equal to or above
- **Sufficient** when no more than 1 point below
- **Emerging** when no more than 2 points below
- **Insufficient** when more than 2 points below

ANALYSIS:

In 2017, 206 seniors responded and 25% (n=52) indicated they connected learning to societal issues at a rate of very often, 37% (n=79) often, 30% (n=57) sometimes, and 8% (n=18) never. The university mean response was 2.8, identical to our three identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 2.7, Carnegie Classification at 2.8, and NSSE 2016 and 2017 at 2.8).

In 2015, 196 seniors responded and 29% (n=58) indicated they combined connected learning to societal issues at a rate of very often, 31% (n=62) often, 32% (n=61) sometimes, and 9% (n=15) never. The university mean response was 2.8, identical to our three identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 2.8, Carnegie Classification at 2.9, and NSSE 2014 and 2015 at 2.9).

On average, students perceive opportunities to connect learning to societal issues in courses at rates nearly equal to those at peer institutions. We know students are given opportunities and in

increasing numbers to integrate knowledge and skills from many courses when completing assignments.

ACTION:

Continue to provide opportunities for students to connect societal problems to coursework.

COMMENTS:

None

ASSESSMENT: NSSE CONNECTING PRIOR EXPERIENCES

2.g. During the current school year, about how often have you connected ideas from your courses to your prior experience and knowledge?

RESULTS:

Sufficient. The mean of students responding to identifying the connection of ideas from their coursework to their prior experiences and knowledge was slightly below the Carnegie Classification (3.1 to 3.2) in 2017. Students responded 0.1 points below the Carnegie Classification (3.2 to 3.3) in 2015.

The University uses the Carnegie Classification as a benchmark of NSSE performance and considers performance to be:

- **Exemplary** when 1 point or more above
- **Proficient** when equal to or above
- **Sufficient** when no more than 1 point below
- **Emerging** when no more than 2 points below
- **Insufficient** when more than 2 points below

ANALYSIS:

In 2017, 202 seniors responded and 33% (n=69) indicated they connected ideas from their course to their prior experiences and knowledge at a rate of very often, 49% (n=96) often, 16% (n=32) sometimes, and 3% (n=5) never. The university mean response was 3.1, 0.1 points below our three identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 3.2, Carnegie Classification at 3.2, and NSSE 2016 and 2017 at 3.2).

In 2015, 194 seniors responded and 38% (n=77) indicated they connected ideas from their courses to their prior experiences and knowledge at a rate of very often, 43% (n=82) often, 18% (n=34) sometimes, and 1% (n=1) never. The university mean response was 3.2 and within 0.1 points of our three identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 3.2, Carnegie Classification at 3.3, and NSSE 2014 and 2015 at 3.3).

On average, students perceive opportunities to connect ideas from their courses to their prior experiences and knowledge in courses at rates nearly equal to those at peer institutions. We know

students are given opportunities and in increasing numbers to connecting ideas from their course to their prior experiences and knowledge.

ACTION:

Continue to pursue opportunities to enable students to connect idea from their coursework to their prior experiences.

COMMENTS:

None

ASSESSMENT: NSSE ANALYZING

4.c. During the current school year, how much has your coursework emphasized analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts?

RESULTS:

Proficient. The mean of students responding to identified coursework emphasized analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts was on par with the Carnegie Classification (3.1 to 3.1) in 2017. Students responded identically in 2015 meaning both the university and the peer groups made no progress on this measure between 2015 and 2017.

The University uses the Carnegie Classification as a benchmark of NSSE performance and considers performance to be:

- **Exemplary** when 1 point or more above
- **Proficient** when equal to or above
- **Sufficient** when no more than 1 point below
- **Emerging** when no more than 2 points below
- **Insufficient** when more than 2 points below

ANALYSIS:

In 2017, 203 seniors responded and 33% (n=70) indicated they analyzed an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts in their coursework at a rate of very often, 46% (n=92) often, 17% (n=33) sometimes, and 4% (n=7) never. The university mean response was 3.1, 0.0 to 0.1 points below our three identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 3.0, Carnegie Classification at 3.1, and NSSE 2016 and 2017 at 3.0).

In 2015, 191 seniors responded and 33% (n=64) indicated they analyzed an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts in their coursework at a rate of very often, 44% (n=81) often, 18% (n=36) sometimes, and 5% (n=10) never. The university mean response was 3.1 on par with our three identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 3.1, Carnegie Classification at 3.1, and NSSE 2014 and 2015 at 3.1).

The university and the peer groups, on average, have seen nearly no movement in this measure. However, the university has a high response rate in the top tier answer.

ACTION:

None

COMMENTS:

None

ASSESSMENT: NSSE FORMING NEW IDEAS

4.e. During the current school year, how much has your coursework emphasized forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of various pieces of information?

RESULTS:

Proficient. The mean of students responding to identified coursework emphasizing forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of various pieces of information was on par with the Carnegie Classification (3.0 to 3.0) in 2017. Students responded identically in 2015 meaning both the university and the peer groups made no progress on this measure between 2015 and 2017.

The University uses the Carnegie Classification as a benchmark of NSSE performance and considers performance to be:

- **Exemplary** when 1 point or more above
- **Proficient** when equal to or above
- **Sufficient** when no more than 1 point below
- **Emerging** when no more than 2 points below
- **Insufficient** when more than 2 points below

ANALYSIS:

In 2017, 202 seniors responded and 29% (n=61) indicated their coursework emphasized forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of various pieces of information at a rate of very often, 44% (n=89) often, 25% (n=46) sometimes, and 3% (n=6) never. The university mean response was 3.0, on par with our three identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 3.0, Carnegie Classification at 3.0, and NSSE 2016 and 2017 at 2.9).

In 2015, 193 seniors responded and 30% (n=58) indicated their coursework emphasized forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of various pieces of information at a rate of very often, 42% (n=79) often, 24% (n=47) sometimes, and 4% (n=9) never. The university mean response was 3.0 on par with our three identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 3.0, Carnegie Classification at 3.0, and NSSE 2014 and 2015 at 3.0).

The university and the peer groups, on average, have seen no movement in this measure. However, the university has high response rates in the top tier answers.

ACTION:

None

COMMENTS:

None

ASSESSMENT: NSSE REAL-WORLD PROBLEMS.

17.i. How much has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in solving complex real-world problems?

The University uses the Carnegie Classification as a benchmark of NSSE performance and considers performance to be:

RESULTS:

Proficient. The mean of students responding to identified coursework contributing to their ability to solve complex real-world problems was on par with the Carnegie Classification (2.8 to 2.8) in 2017. Students responded identically in 2015 meaning both the university and the peer groups made no progress on this measure between 2015 and 2017.

The University uses the Carnegie Classification as a benchmark of NSSE performance and considers performance to be:

- **Exemplary** when 1 point or more above
- **Proficient** when equal to or above
- **Sufficient** when no more than 1 point below
- **Emerging** when no more than 2 points below
- **Insufficient** when more than 2 points below

ANALYSIS:

In 2017, 185 seniors responded and 31% (n=59) indicated the institution contributed to their ability to solve complex real-world problems at a rate of very often, 31% (n=58) often, 26% (n=47) sometimes, and 12% (n=21) never. The university mean response was 2.8, on par with our three identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 2.8, Carnegie Classification at 2.8, and NSSE 2016 and 2017 at 2.8).

In 2015, 172 seniors responded and 29% (n=50) indicated the institution contributed to their ability to solve complex real-world problems at a rate of very often, 31% (n=52) often, 27% (n=47) sometimes, and 13% (n=23) never. The university mean response was 2.8 on par with our three identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 2.8, Carnegie Classification at 2.8, and NSSE 2014 and 2015 at 2.8).

The university and the peer groups, on average, have seen no movement in this measure. However, the university has high response rates in the top tier answers.

ACTION:

None

COMMENTS:

None

ASSESSMENT: VALUE INTEGRATIVE LEARNING

Integrative learning is an understanding and a disposition that a student builds across the curriculum and co-curriculum, from making simple connections among ideas and experiences to synthesizing and transferring learning to new, complex situations within and beyond the campus. This rubric includes the following aspects: Connections to Experience, Connections to Discipline, Transfer, Integrated Communication, and Reflection and Self-Assessment.

The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

RESULTS:

Emerging. Student papers rated with an average overall score of 1.7 with subscores ranging from 1.5 to 1.8 in 2017.

The University considers the following breakpoints when applying the VALUE rubrics:

- **Exemplary** when the average rating is 4.0
- **Proficient** when the average rating is above 3.0
- **Sufficient** when the average rating is above 2.0
- **Emerging** when the average rating is above 1.0
- **Insufficient** when the average rating is 1 and below

ANALYSIS:

Of the 30 student artifacts rated using the VALUE Integrative Learning rubric in 2017, the overall average rating was 1.7 with the following ratings for each aspect:

Average Score	Rater 1	Rater 2	Overall
Connections to Experience	1.7	1.8	1.8
Connections to Discipline	1.4	1.7	1.5
Transfer	1.6	1.5	1.6
Integrated Communication	1.6	1.9	1.8
Reflection and Self-Assessment	1.8	1.8	1.8
Overall (Scale 0 to 4)	1.6	1.8	1.7

Students below expected in all aspects with the most opportunity for improvement exhibited with the connections to discipline aspect.

The artifacts were rated by nine faculty members (Dr. Almond, Dr. Clark, Dr. Cross, Dr. Jancenelle, Dr. Roberts, and Dr. Shuler) on November 17, 2017, in a single rating session where each faculty member rated an artifact followed by a second faculty member. No artifact was rated by the same two faculty members. The ratings resulted in a lower than desired interrater reliability, but sufficient to apply the results with a Cohen's Kappa of 37.4%. We would like to see this above 50%.

Note: 11 out of the 30 documents were rated by a single rater due to an administrative error.

ACTION:

Continue to rate artifacts for this rubric for two more years to identify a trend. Identify a better process for collecting artifacts that directly apply to this complicated assessment.

COMMENTS:

The results of this measure may have been skewed due to the rubric being applied to less than ideal artifacts.

Prepared by: Paul Turcotte, Director of Institutional Research and Assessment and Trianna Owens, Academic Counselor on December 1, 2017