

Texas A&M University System
2018 Student Learning Outcome Report
for Texas A&M University-Central Texas

ETHICAL & SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Upon completion of their degree program, students will articulate multiple cultural perspectives in local, national and global communities. Students will identify and analyze social and ethical challenges, including possible resolutions.

ASSESSMENTS

- 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
- ETS HEIghten

RESULTS:

Sufficient

- NSSE Personal Code - **Proficient**
- NSSE Informed and Active Citizen - **Proficient**
- IDEA Personal Values - **Sufficient**
- VALUE Rubric Civic Engagement - **Emerging**
- VALUE Rubric Ethical Reasoning - **Proficient**
- HEIghten Civic Competency and Engagement - **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 a need for improvement
- **Insufficient** – Few criteria met, results indicate a need for significant improvement or no/insufficient results reported to measure the performance of the objective

ANALYSIS:

The university employs a wide array of instruments to assess this critical outcome with results ranging from Proficient to Emerging. Overall, these assessments indicate students perceive they proficiently attain the ethical and social responsibility skills of their academic programs upon completing their degree at the university.

ACTION:

The University continues to find ways to include affective components in existing program outcomes with the belief the attainment of ethics is best accomplished when integrated into our educational programs. In 2016, the University established a Service Learning Advisory Board (SLAB) charged with reviewing existing proposed course for designation as service-learning courses. Once designated, sections of these courses may include service learning components. These sections include social responsibility objectives.

COMMENTS:

We strive to ensure our students are exposed to ethical decision-making opportunities and attain a strong sense of social responsibility while enrolled in their undergraduate programs. A&M-Central Texas was selected as one of 20 universities to be a part of AASCU's American Democracy Project's Economic Inequality Initiative. The University continues its lecture series as part of this initiative on inequality and youth homelessness. In 2018, the College of Business Administration gained approval to offer its Master of Science in One Planet Leadership in cooperation with the global OPEN initiative. The degree includes outcomes for sustainability, social responsibility, and ethics. The college is working to include these types of outcomes into undergraduate feeder programs. These initiatives are anticipated to further the attainment of the ethical and social responsibility outcome.

ASSESSMENT: NSSE PERSONAL CODE

17.g. How much has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics?

RESULTS:

Proficient. The mean score for students responding to identified coursework contributing to their developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics was identical with the Carnegie Classification of 2.9 in 2017. In 2015, the university students scored on average 2.9 compared to the Carnegie Classification score of 2.8. Both the university and the peer groups made no measurable 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 37% ($n=69$) indicated the institution contributed to their developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics to the degree of very much, 31% ($n=59$) quite a bit, 19% ($n=33$) some, and 13% ($n=23$) very little. The university mean response was 2.9, one-

tenth of a percentage point higher or on par with our three identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 2.8, Carnegie Classification at 2.9, and NSSE 2016 and 2017 at 2.8).

In 2015, 172 seniors responded and 33% ($n=56$) indicated the institution contributed to their developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics to the degree of very much, 32% ($n=56$) quite a bit, 23% ($n=39$) some, and 12% ($n=21$) very little. The university mean response was 2.9, one-tenth of a percentage point higher than 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 on this measure.

ACTION:

None

COMMENTS:

None

Prepared by: Paul Turcotte, Director of Institutional Research and Assessment on November 17, 2018

ASSESSMENT: NSSE INFORMED AND ACTIVE CITIZEN

17.j. How much has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in being an informed and active citizen?

RESULTS:

Proficient. The mean for the university's students responding to identified coursework contributing to their being an informed and active citizen was one-tenth of a point higher than the Carnegie Classification (2.9 to 2.8) in 2017. In 2015, the university students scored on average 2.6 compared to the Carnegie Classification score of 2.7. The university surpassed the peer groups 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 27% ($n=51$) indicated the institution contributed to their being an informed and active citizen to the degree of very much, 34% ($n=64$) quite a bit, 28% ($n=50$) some, and 11% ($n=20$) very little. The university mean response was 2.8, one-tenth of a percentage point

higher than our three identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 2.7, Carnegie Classification at 2.7, and NSSE 2016 and 2017 at 2.7).

In 2015, 171 seniors responded and 23% ($n=40$) indicated the institution contributed to their being an informed and active citizen to the degree of very much, 32% ($n=54$) quite a bit, 30% ($n=51$) some, and 15% ($n=26$) very little. The university mean response was 2.6, one-tenth of a percentage point lower than our three identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 2.7, Carnegie Classification at 2.7, and NSSE 2014 and 2015 at 2.7).

The university, on average, experienced a moderate improvement on this measure between 2015 and 2017.

ACTION:

None

COMMENTS:

None

Prepared by: Paul Turcotte, Director of Institutional Research and Assessment on November 17, 2018

ASSESSMENT: IDEA PERSONAL VALUES

RESULTS:

Sufficient. Students perceived substantial or exceptional learning in developing a clearer understanding of, and commitment to, personal values at a rate of 75.5 percent in 2017.

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 2017, 5,645 out of 7,479 university students (or 75.5 percent) perceived substantial or exceptional progress in developing a clearer understanding of, and commitment to, personal values. This compares to 6,061 out of 7,314 students (or 76.3 percent) in 2016, and 4,863 out of 6,342 students (or 76.7 percent) in 2015.

Students' perception of substantial or exceptional gains in learning in developing a clearer understanding of, and commitment to, personal values decreased from 76.7 percent in 2015 to 75.5 percent in 2017. Results for 2018 are pending but anticipated to show gains.

ACTION:

None

COMMENTS:

None

Prepared by: Paul Turcotte, Director of Institutional Research and Assessment on November 17, 2018

ASSESSMENT: VALUE RUBRIC CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

Civic engagement is "working to make a difference in the civic life of our communities and developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values, and motivation to make that difference. It means promoting the quality of life in a community, through both political and non-political processes." Also, civic engagement encompasses actions wherein individuals participate in activities of personal and public concern that are both individually life enriching and socially beneficial to the community.

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 by university faculty resulted in an average overall score of 1.7 with subscores ranging from 1.3 to 1.9 in 2018.

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 Reading rubric in 2018, the overall average rating was 1.7 with the following ratings for each aspect:

Average Score	Rater 1	Rater 2	Overall
Diversity of Communications	1.9	1.9	1.9
Analysis of Knowledge	1.9	1.6	1.7
Civic Identity	1.6	1.7	1.6
Civic Communications	1.8	1.3	1.6
Civic Actions	1.6	1.5	1.5
Civic Contexts	1.6	1.2	1.4
Overall (Scale 0 to 4)	1.7	1.6	1.7

The artifacts rated below expected in all aspects with the most opportunity for improvement exhibited in the Civic Context aspect.

The artifacts were rated by five faculty members (Dr. Roberts, Dr. Jancenelle, Dr. Greenwood, Ms. Moore, Ms. Klein) on February 2, 2018, in a single rating session where each faculty member rated an artifact followed by a second faculty member. The same two faculty members did not rate the same artifacts. The ratings resulted in a lower than desired interrater reliability, but sufficient to apply the results with a Cohen's kappa of -0.66. We would like to see this above 0.5

Note: a single rater rated 16 out of the 30 documents due to an administrative error.

ACTION:

None

COMMENTS:

The application of the rubric to less than ideal artifacts may have skewed the results of this measure.

Prepared by: John Carroll, Institutional Research Analyst on July 9, 2018

ASSESSMENT: VALUE RUBRIC ETHICAL REASONING

Ethical Reasoning is reasoning about right and wrong human conduct. It requires students to be able to assess their own ethical values and the social context of problems, recognize ethical issues in a variety of settings, think about how different ethical perspectives might be applied to ethical dilemmas and consider the ramifications of alternative actions. Students' ethical self-identity evolves as they practice ethical decision-making skills and learn how to describe and analyze positions on ethical issues.

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:

Proficient. The rating of student papers resulted in an average overall score of 3.1 with subscores ranging from 2.8 to 3.2 in 2018.

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 Reading rubric in 2018, the overall average rating was 3.1 with the following ratings for each aspect:

Average Score	Rater 1	Rater 2	Overall
Ethical Self-Awareness	3.2	3.0	3.1
Understanding Ethical Concepts	3.5	3.0	3.3
Ethical Recognition	2.9	2.8	2.9
Use Ethical Concepts	3.2	3.1	3.2
Evaluate Ethical Concepts	3.2	2.9	3.0
Overall (Scale 0 to 4)	3.2	3.0	3.1

The artifacts rated above expected in all aspects, however the most opportunity for improvement was exhibited in the Ethical Recognition aspect.

The artifacts were rated by five faculty members (Dr. McDaniel, Dr. Hanik, Ms. Ramsey, Ms. Britt, Ms. Morgan-Scott) on February 2, 2018, in a single rating session where each faculty member rated an artifact followed by a second faculty member. The same two faculty members did not rate the artifacts. The ratings resulted in a lower than desired interrater reliability, but sufficient to apply the results with a Cohen's kappa of 0.154. We would like to see this above 0.5.

ACTION:

None

COMMENTS:

The application of the rubrics to less than ideal artifacts may have skewed the results of this measure.

Prepared by: John Carroll, Institutional Research Analyst on July 9, 2018

ASSESSMENT: HEIGHTEN CIVIC COMPETENCY AND ENGAGEMENT

The HEIghten Civic Competency & Engagement assessment evaluates college students' civic learning, including knowledge of civic practices and institutions, skills in understanding and participating in civic-related situations, general attitudes, preferences and degrees of engagement in civics and civic-related activities. The assessment focuses on three key areas: Civic Competency, Civic Attitudes and Civic Participation. Civic Competency measures the test takers ability in civic knowledge and civic skills. Civic Attitudes measures the test takers ability in responding to Civic efficacy, and Democratic norms and values. Civic participation measures the test takers ability in responding to general participation, volunteering across campus and across local, state, national and international contexts, discussion of political/civic issues on campus and social media, and with friends and family, personal.

RESULTS:

Sufficient Students responded to the assessment with a scaled score of 164 in 2017 compared to a comparison group score of 163.3.

The University considers the following breakpoints when applying the HEIghten assessment:

- **Exemplary** when the average scaled score is between 176-180
- **Proficient** when the average scaled score is between 171-175
- **Sufficient** when the average scaled score is between 161-170
- **Emerging** when the average scaled score is between 156-160
- **Insufficient** when the average scaled score is between 150-155

ANALYSIS:

In 2017, 75 students completed the assessment. The results exclude 6 students. The remaining 69 students rated between 150 and 176 a scale of 150 to 180 for a mean score of 164. The comparison group consisting of 23 institutions and 1,818 students achieved a mean score of 163.3; 0.7 points below our students.

The assessment indicates our students' level of civic competency and engagement is on par with the other students participating in the pilot.

ACTION:

The assessment was a pilot with limited participation. Recommend dedicating the resources to repeat the assessment in two years.

COMMENTS:

None

Prepared by: John Carroll, Institutional Research Analyst on July 9, 2018

GLOBALIZATION AND CULTURAL DIVERSITY

Upon completion of their degree program, students will utilize multidisciplinary perspectives to evaluate initiatives that have been employed to address global issues. Students will describe the nature of global interdependence and its impacts. Students will articulate an understanding of cultural differences from diverse perspectives in specific disciplines.

ASSESSMENTS

- National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
- ETS HEIghten

RESULTS:

Proficient

- NSSE People of Other Backgrounds - **Proficient**
- NSSE Diverse Perspectives - **Sufficient**
- NSSE Diverse Race - **Proficient**
- NSSE Diverse Economic - **Proficient**
- NSSE Diverse Religion - **Proficient**
- NSSE Diverse Political - **Proficient**
- HEIghten® Intercultural Competency & Diversity - **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 a need for improvement
- **Insufficient** – Few criteria met, results indicate a need for significant improvement or no/insufficient results reported to measure the performance of the objective

ANALYSIS:

Students proficiently achieve this outcome upon completion of our baccalaureate degrees as demonstrated by the two assessment instruments, both indirect, employed to evaluate program effectiveness.

In 2018, the university established a Diversity Committee charged with recommending initiatives to increase campus diversity and globalization. Central Texas is a region of diverse cultures and the University's student, faculty, and staff populations mostly mirror that diversity. Despite the results of these assessments, the campus community believes we have room for improvement.

The assessment could be enhanced by adding a direct measure that will provide a more objective analysis of the outcome. However, the rich nature of the NSSE instrument on this subject should be adequate in the assessment of the diversity perspectives of our students.

ACTION:

The university should employ a direct measure for this outcome by asking faculty to identify assignments applicable to the AAC&U VALUE rubric for “Intercultural Knowledge and Competence” and “Global Learning” and rate student work to directly assess student’s achievement of this outcome.

COMMENTS:

Attaining and maintaining awareness of the diverse cultures and backgrounds of our stakeholders enriches our campus environment and is at the heart of our core values and essential to achieving our university’s mission.

ASSESSMENT: NSSE PEOPLE OF OTHER BACKGROUNDS

17.h. How much has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in understanding people of other backgrounds (economic, racial/ethnic, political, religious, nationality, etc.)?

RESULTS:

Proficient. The mean score for university students responding to identified coursework contributing to their understanding people of other backgrounds was on par with the Carnegie Classification (2.9 to 2.9) in 2017. Students score on average 2.8 with the Carnegie Classification responding 2.8. Both the university and the peer groups made no measurable 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 36% ($n=68$) indicated the institution contributed to their understanding people of other backgrounds to the degree of very much, 28% ($n=54$) quite a bit, 26% ($n=45$) some, and 10% ($n=18$) very little. The university mean response was 2.9, between one-tenth of a percentage point higher to on par with our three identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 2.9, Carnegie Classification at 2.9, and NSSE 2016 and 2017 at 2.8).

In 2015, 171 seniors responded and 34% ($n=57$) indicated the institution contributed to their understanding people of other backgrounds to the degree of very much, 31% ($n=54$) quite a bit, 20% ($n=34$) some, and 15% ($n=26$) very little. The university mean response was 2.8, one-tenth of a percentage point higher than our three identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 2.8, Carnegie Classification at 2.8, and 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 slightly higher response rates for two most positive responses for this question than our comparison group.

ACTION:

None.

COMMENTS:

None

Prepared by: Veeru Konangi, Institutional Research Analyst on July 16, 2018

ASSESSMENT: NSSE DIVERSE PERSPECTIVES

2.c. During the current school year, about how often have you included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments?

RESULTS:

Sufficient. The mean score of students responding to the diverse perspectives question was 0.1 points below the Carnegie Classification (2.6 to 2.7) in 2017. Students responded identically (2.6 to 2.7) 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:

Of the 206 seniors responding to this item in 2017, 26% ($n=56$) of the respondents indicated that course discussions or assignments included diverse perspectives at a rate of very often, 25% ($n=52$) often, 36% ($n=72$) sometimes, and 13% ($n=26$) never. The university mean response was 2.6, on par or one-tenth of a point above and below our identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 2.5, Carnegie Classification at 2.7, and NSSE 2016 and 2017 at 2.6).

Of the 193 seniors responding to this item in 2015, 25% ($n=49$) of the respondents indicated that course discussions or assignments included diverse perspectives at a rate of very often, 26% ($n=51$)

often, 31% ($n=61$) sometimes, and 18% ($n=32$) never. The university mean response was 2.6, on par or one-tenth of a point below our identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 2.6, Carnegie Classification at 2.7, and NSSE 2014 and 2015 at 2.7).

On average, students perceived that course discussions or assignments included diverse perspectives in courses at rates equal to those at peer institutions. This rate remained the same as the 2015 study, while we see our peer institutions increasing by one-tenth of a point.

ACTION:

None

COMMENTS:

None

Prepared by: Veeru Konangi, Institutional Research Analyst on July 16, 2018

ASSESSMENT: NSSE DIVERSE RACE

8.a. During the current school year, about how often have you had discussions with people of a race or ethnicity other than your own?

RESULTS:

Proficient. The mean score of students responding to the diverse race question was 0.2 points above the Carnegie Classification (3.3 to 3.1) in 2017. University students responded slightly higher (3.2 to 3.1) 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, 196 seniors responded and 53% ($n=106$) indicated they had discussions with people of a race or ethnicity other than your own at a rate of very often, 28% ($n=54$) often, 12% ($n=21$) sometimes, and 8% ($n=15$) never. The university mean score response was 3.3, two-tenths of a point above our identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 3.1, Carnegie Classification at 3.1, and NSSE 2016 and 2017 at 3.1).

In 2015, 183 seniors responded and 50% ($n=95$) indicated they had discussions with people of a race or ethnicity other than your own at a rate of very often, 30% ($n=54$) often, 11% ($n=19$) sometimes, and 9% ($n=15$) never. The university mean score response was 3.2, on par or one-tenth of a point

below our identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 3.2, Carnegie Classification at 3.1, and NSSE 2014 and 2015 at 3.1).

On average, students perceive they had discussions with people of a race or ethnicity other than their own in courses at rates above those at peer institutions. This rate increased one-tenth of a point from the 2015 study, while we see our peer institutions remaining the same or decreasing.

ACTION:

None

COMMENTS:

None

Prepared by: Paul Turcotte, Director of Institutional Research and Assessment on November 17, 2018

ASSESSMENT: NSSE DIVERSE ECONOMIC

8.b. During the current school year, about how often have you had discussions with people from an economic background other than your own?

RESULTS:

Proficient. The mean score of students responding to the diverse economic question was 0.1 points above the Carnegie Classification (3.1 to 3.0) in 2017. University students responded slightly higher (3.2 to 3.1) 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, 195 seniors responded and 46% ($n=92$) indicated they had discussions with people from an economic background other than their own at a rate of very often, 30% ($n=58$) often, 17% ($n=32$) sometimes, and 7% ($n=13$) never. The university mean score response was 3.1, on par to one-tenth of a point above our identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 3.1, Carnegie Classification at 3.0, and NSSE 2016 and 2017 at 3.0).

In 2015, 181 seniors responded and 48% ($n=90$) indicated they had discussions with people from an economic background other than their own at a rate of very often, 31% ($n=54$) often, 12% ($n=20$) sometimes, and 10% ($n=17$) never. The university mean score response was 3.2, one-tenth of a point

above our identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 3.1, Carnegie Classification at 3.1, and NSSE 2014 and 2015 at 3.1).

On average, students perceive they had discussions with people from an economic background other than their own in courses at rates above those at peer institutions. This rate decreased one-tenth of a point from the 2015 study, the same as our institutional peers.

ACTION:

None

COMMENTS:

None

Prepared by: Paul Turcotte, Director of Institutional Research and Assessment on November 17, 2018

ASSESSMENT: NSSE DIVERSE RELIGION

8.c. During the current school year, about how often have you had discussions with people with religious beliefs other than your own?

RESULTS:

Proficient. The mean score of students responding to the diverse region question was 0.1 points above the Carnegie Classification (3.1 to 3.0) in 2017, the same as in the 2015 study (3.1 to 3.0).

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, 195 seniors responded and 42% ($n=82$) indicated they had discussions with people with religious beliefs other than their own at a rate of very often, 32% ($n=63$) often, 19% ($n=37$) sometimes, and 7% ($n=13$) never. The university mean score response was 3.1, one-tenth of a point above our identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 3.0, Carnegie Classification at 3.0, and NSSE 2016 and 2017 at 3.0).

In 2015, 183 seniors responded and 43% ($n=81$) indicated they had discussions with people with religious beliefs other than their own at a rate of very often, 28% ($n=52$) often, 20% ($n=35$) sometimes, and 9% ($n=15$) never. The university mean score response was 3.1, on par or one-tenth of a point above our identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 3.1, Carnegie Classification at 3.0, and NSSE 2014 and 2015 at 3.1).

On average, students perceive they had discussions with people with religious beliefs other than their own in courses at rates above those at peer institutions. No change from the 2015 study and our institutional peers.

ACTION:

None

COMMENTS:

None

Prepared by: Paul Turcotte, Director of Institutional Research and Assessment on November 17, 2018

ASSESSMENT: NSSE DIVERSE POLITICAL

8.d. During the current school year, about how often have you had discussions with people with political views other than your own?

RESULTS:

Proficient. The mean score of students responding to the diverse political question was 0.1 points above the Carnegie Classification (3.1 to 3.0) in 2017, the same as in the 2015 study (3.1 to 3.0).

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, 195 seniors responded and 45% ($n=89$) indicated they had discussions with people with political views other than their own at a rate of very often, 28% ($n=55$) often, 19% ($n=37$) sometimes, and 7% ($n=14$) never. The university mean score response was 3.1, one-tenth of a point above our identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 3.0, Carnegie Classification at 3.0, and NSSE 2016 and 2017 at 3.0).

In 2015, 181 seniors responded and 43% ($n=80$) indicated they had discussions with people with political views other than their own at a rate of very often, 31% ($n=56$) often, 16% ($n=28$) sometimes, and 10% ($n=17$) never. The university mean score response was 3.1, on par or one-tenth of a point above our identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 3.1, Carnegie Classification at 3.0, and NSSE 2014 and 2015 at 3.1).

On average, students perceive they had discussions with people with political views other than their own in courses at rates above those at peer institutions. No change in our score from the 2015 study but our institutional peers increased slightly.

ACTION:

None

COMMENTS:

None

Prepared by: Paul Turcotte, Director of Institutional Research and Assessment on November 17, 2018

ASSESSMENT: HEIGHTEN® INTERCULTURAL COMPETENCY & DIVERSITY

Intercultural competence is defined as the ability to communicate effectively and appropriately in intercultural situations based on one's intercultural knowledge, skills and attitudes. The HEIghten Intercultural Competency & Diversity assessment evaluates college students' ability to demonstrate central aspects of intercultural competence. The assessment focuses on three stages of intercultural competence: Approach, Analyze and Act. The Approach dimension looks at the overall positivity with which an individual views and responds to cross-cultural interactions. Test takers are asked to self-report on their reactions to hypothetical situations by demonstrating tolerance of ambiguity, positive cultural orientation, and cross-cultural self-efficacy. The Analyze dimension measures the test taker's ability to take in, evaluate and synthesize relevant information without the bias of preconceived judgments and stereotyped thinking. Areas of emphasis include self-awareness, social monitoring, suspending judgment/perspective taking, and cultural knowledge application. The Act dimension incorporates the behaviors determined by the Analyze stage to assess individuals' ability to translate thought into action while maintaining control in potentially challenging and stressful situations. Test takers are assessed in areas reflecting behaviors and emotions in cross-cultural situations, including behavior regulation, and emotion regulation.

RESULTS:

Sufficient Students responded to the assessment with a scaled score of 161.9 in 2017 compared to a comparison group score of 166.3.

The University considers the following breakpoints when applying the HEIghten assessment:

- **Exemplary** when the average scaled score is between 176-180
 - **Proficient** when the average scaled score is between 171-175
 - **Sufficient** when the average scaled score is between 161-170
 - **Emerging** when the average scaled score is between 156-160
 - **Insufficient** when the average scaled score is between 150-155
-

ANALYSIS:

In 2017, 25 students completed the assessment and rated between 150 and 177 on a scale of 150 to 180 for a mean score of 161.9. The comparison group consisted of 25 institutions and 1,889 students achieved a mean score of 166.3; 4.4 points above our students.

The assessment indicates our students' level of civic competency and engagement is slightly below that of the other students participating in the pilot.

ACTION:

The assessment was a pilot with limited participation. Recommend dedicating the resources to repeat the assessment in two years.

COMMENTS:

None

Prepared by: John Carroll, Institutional Research Analyst on July 9, 2018