

**Texas A&M University System**  
**2020 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)
- End-of-Course Survey (EOC)
- 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 - **Emerging**
- NSSE Work-Related Skills - **Proficient**
- NSSE Career - **Sufficient**
- ETS MFT Psychology - **Proficient**
- ETS MFT Sociology - **Sufficient**
- ETS MFT Criminology - **Proficient**
- ETS MFT Biology - **Exemplary**
- TExES - **Sufficient**
- EOC Gaining Factual Knowledge - **Proficient**
- EOC Learning Fundamental Principles, Generalizations, or Theories - **Proficient**
- EOC Developing Discipline-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 the 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 the Spring of 2015, 2017, and 2019. Students attending both face-to-face and online courses, on and off-campus, were included in the test group. The survey was distributed to 1,051 in 2019 with a 19 percent response rate. Additionally, 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 to participate in an internship, co-op, field experience, student teaching, or the clinical placement?

---

### **RESULTS:**

**Emerging.** The percentage of students responding to being engaged in internships was 31 percentage points below the Carnegie Classification (23% to 54%) in 2019. Students responded 22 percentage points below the Carnegie Classification (23% to 45%) in 2017 and 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 2019, 128 seniors responded and 23% (n=23) indicated they completed or were completing an internship (or similar activity), 33% (n=33) planned to, 24% (n=28) did not plan to, and 20% (n=27) 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 54%, and NSSE 2018 and 2019 at 49%).

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%).

Despite the continued resources dedicated to ensuring students have good internships and similar opportunities, the percentage of students responding to the survey indicating they participated in an internship remained the same while our peer group increased 9 percentage points.

---

## ACTION:

Continue to increase internship opportunities for students.

The Office of Career and Professional Development will continue to identify and secure internships and similar opportunities.

---

## 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:

**Emerging.** The percentage of students responding as being engaged in senior experiences was 26 percentage points below the Carnegie Classification (26 to 52%) in 2019. Students responded 17 percentage points below the Carnegie Classification (27% to 44%) in 2017 and 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 2019, 127 seniors responded and 26% (n=31) indicated they completed or were completing a senior experience (or similar activity), 30% (n=41) planned to, 22% (n=27) did not plan to, and 22% (n=28) had not decided. The percentage of university students who completed or were completing a senior experience was 7, 16, and 19 percentage points below the three identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 33%, Carnegie Classification at 52%, and NSSE 2016 and 2017 at 45%).

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 on adding capstone courses to many degree programs during 2015 and 2016 to provide students with an opportunity to demonstrate their professional knowledge, and this work continues to maintain our performance on this question. We see a big jump in Carnegie Classification institutions on this measure, but not in the Southwest Public or the overall NSSE results.

---

## ACTION:

Capstone courses are challenging for many lower enrolled programs that struggle to fill a single class in a given semester where the prerequisite is to have completed all or most of the program requirements. Continued increases in the percentage of undergraduate students engaging in capstone or senior project courses would require established a more structured curriculum, and in many disciplines, the structuring could result in a reduced educational experience for the student.

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, but be mindful to ensure the effort increases the educational experience.

---

#### 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 one-tenth of a point below the Carnegie Classification (2.9 to 3.0) in 2019. Students responded identically in 2015, and 2017 meaning both the University and the peer groups made no progress on this measure between 2015 and 2019.

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 2019, 122 seniors responded and 36% (n=46) indicated the institution contributed to their acquiring job-related skills at a rate of very much, 30% (n=37) quite a bit, 26% (n=30) some, and 8% (n=9) very little. The University mean response was 2.9, on par with our three identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 2.9, Carnegie Classification at 3.0, and NSSE 2016 and 2017 at 3.0).

In 2017, 184 seniors responded and 32% (n=62) indicated the institution contributed to their acquiring job-related skills at a rate of very much, 35% (n=64) quite a bit, 23% (n=41) some, and 10% (n=17) very little. 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 much, 32% (n=54) quite a bit, 27% (n=49) some, and 9% (n=16) very little. 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 made gains in the percentage of respondents indicating their experiences at the University contributed to acquiring marketable skills. However, the average response remained the same.

---

#### **ACTION:**

Identify marketable skills in each program, share with area employer, and consider input, ensure students know the marketable skills of their programs upon graduation.

---

#### **COMMENTS:**

The University worked with BurningGlass and EMSI Skillabi to provide faculty data on common marketable skills for each degree program at the University. Faculty identified marketable skills for their programs and continue to revise those skills based on input from community stakeholders.

#### **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 (1.8 to 2.1) in 2019. Students responded identically in 2015, and 2017 meaning both the University and the peer groups made no progress on this measure between 2015 and 2019.

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 2019, 133 seniors responded and 10% (n=15) indicated they talked about career plans with a faculty member at a rate of very often, 14% (n=19) often, 23% (n=28) sometimes, and 53% (n=71) never. The University mean response was 1.8, 0.1 to 0.3 of a point below our three identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 1.8, Carnegie Classification at 2.1, and NSSE 2016 and 2017 at 2.0).

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 of a point 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 of a point below our three identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 2.3, Carnegie Classification at 2.4, and NSSE 2014 and 2015 at 2.4).

We see very little change in average scores between the university and peer groups, but a large increase in the percentage of respondents indicating they never worked with a faculty member on activities other than coursework.

---

### **ACTION:**

Adopt strategies in programs to ensure students identify career-related interactions with faculty.

---

### **COMMENTS:**

Our low student to faculty ratio provides more opportunities for faculty to have meaningful interactions with students and is a strength and advantage of our University over the large majority of universities and colleges across the nation.

### **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:**

**Proficient.** The mean scaled score on the ETS MFT in Psychology was 9 points lower than the national mean (148 to 157).

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 2020, 11 students completed the ETS MFT in Psychology with a mean scaled score of 148 and a standard deviation of 14. These students scored 9 scaled points below the national mean of 157 (sd=14.9) of students completing the test between September 2019 and June 2020.

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.

The 2020 results are an improvement in student performance over the 2017 results.

---

#### **ACTION:**

Continue to seek curriculum improvements to reach the national mean.

---

#### **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:**

**Sufficient.** The mean scaled score on the ETS MFT in Sociology was 12.1 points lower than the national mean (136 to 148.1).

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 2020, 6 students completed the ETS MFT in Sociology with a mean scaled score of 136 and a standard deviation of 10. These students scored 12 scaled points below the national mean of 148.1 (sd=12.4) of students completing the test between September 2012 and June 2020.

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 2020 results indicate a decline of 11 scaled points. However, the number of test-takers is quite low. Additional data would be needed to make an evaluation.

---

**ACTION:**

Encourage graduating seniors to complete the assessment.

---

**COMMENTS:**

None

**ASSESSMENT: ETS MFT CRIMINAL JUSTICE**

The ETS® Major Field Test for Criminal Justice consists of 150 multiple-choice questions that require knowledge of specific information about the criminal justice system. However, the test also draws on the student's critical thinking ability – the ability to interpret data, to apply concepts and ideas, and to analyze data, theories, and relationships, deductively and inductively.

---

**RESULTS:**

**Proficient.** The mean scaled score on the ETS MFT in Criminal Justice was 1.5 points lower than the national mean (150 to 151.5).

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 2020, 32 students completed the ETS MFT in Criminal Justice with a mean scaled score of 150 and a standard deviation of 13. These students scored 1.5 scaled points below the national mean of 151.5 (sd=15.0) of students completing the test between September 2015 and June 2020.

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

Comparatively, the program performance on the new assessment improved considerably between 2019 and 2020.

---

**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: ETS MFT BIOLOGY**

The ETS® Major Field Test for Biology is organized into four major areas: cell biology; molecular biology and genetics; organismal biology; and population biology, evolution, and ecology. The test contains approximately 150 multiple-choice questions, several of which are grouped in sets and based on descriptions of laboratory and field situations, diagrams, or experimental results.

---

**RESULTS:**

**Exemplary.** The mean scaled score on the ETS MFT in Biology was 12.1 points lower than the national mean (158 to 152.6).

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 2020, 4 students completed the ETS MFT in Biology with a mean scaled score of 158 and a standard deviation of 14. These students scored 5.4 scaled points above the national mean of 152.6 (sd=13.1) of students completing the test between September 2012 and June 2020.

---

**ACTION:**

Encourage graduating seniors to complete the assessment.

---

**COMMENTS:**

None

**ASSESSMENT: TEXES****Results:**

**Sufficient.** Students completing their degree programs and sitting for the TExES passed at a rate of 95 percent in 2020, a five percentage point 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 2020, 57 out of 60 or 95 percent of the students who sat for the exam passed. This compared to 15,752 out of 16,581 or 95 percent of the students statewide who sat for the exam passed.

In 2019, 33 out of 36 or 92 percent of the students who sat for the exam passed. This compared to 13,293 out of 13,993 or 95 percent of the students statewide who sat for the exam passed.

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 three 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. A new director of Education Preparation Services is reviewing the courses relating to certification preparation to determine the next steps in improving outcomes.

**Comments:**

None

**ASSESSMENT: END-OF-COURSE SURVEY GAINING GENERAL KNOWLEDGE**

The End-Of-Course survey provides students a series of learning objective questions and asks 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 89.0 percent in 2020.

The University measures the percentage of students indicating substantial or exceptional gains in learning on the end of course 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 2020, 4,715 out of 5,298 students (or 89.0 percent) perceived substantial or exceptional progress in gaining factual knowledge (terminology, classifications, methods, trends).

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 remained the same when compared to 2016.

---

#### ACTION:

None

---

#### COMMENTS:

None

---

### ASSESSMENT: END-OF-COURSE SURVEY DEVELOPING DISCIPLINE-SPECIFIC SKILLS

---

#### RESULTS:

**Proficient.** Students perceived substantial or exceptional learning in developing discipline-specific skills at a rate of 86.8 percent in 2020.

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 2020, 4,601 out of 5,298 students (or 86.8 percent) perceived substantial or exceptional progress in developing discipline-specific skills.

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 discipline-specific skills remained about the same between 2016 and 2020.

---

#### **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 2.7 with subscores ranging from 2.0 to 3.0 in 2019.

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 one and below

---

## ANALYSIS:

Of the 61 student artifacts rated using the VALUE Inquiry and Analysis rubric in 2020, the overall average rating was 2.7 with the following ratings for each aspect:

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

Aspect	0	1	2	3	4	Total	PCT 1	PCT 2	PCT 3	PCT 4
Topic Selection	1	0	9	45	6	60	0%	15%	75%	10%
Existing Knowledge, Research, and/or Views	1	0	13	32	15	60	0%	22%	53%	25%
Design Process	0	2	17	38	4	61	3%	28%	62%	7%
Analysis	0	2	16	33	10	61	3%	26%	54%	16%
Conclusions	4	2	18	32	5	57	4%	32%	56%	9%
Limitations and Implications	16	14	18	12	1	45	31%	40%	27%	2%

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.

In both 2017 and 2019, students score well below the target in the limitations and implications aspect of the rubric.

---

## ACTION:

One issue may be associated with the artifacts rated not being specifically designed for the rubric. The prompts may not specifically be directing students to address the underperforming aspect.

---

## 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)
- 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 - **Exemplary**
- NSSE Forming New Ideas - **Exemplary**
- NSSE Real-World Problems - **Sufficient**
- 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 the 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 a 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 0.3 standard deviations within the national average for master's colleges and universities in 2020. 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 2020, 71 seniors scored an average of 110.7 on the critical thinking questions (sd=6.8) with a maximum score of 124 and a minimum score of 100; compared to the national average of 111.3 (sd=1.8) with a maximum score of 116 and a minimum score of 106. The difference in our students' average and the national average was -0.6 points or -0.3 standard deviations.

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 is unchanged from the 2017 assessment.

---

### 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 0.6 standard deviations within the national average for master's colleges and universities in 2020. 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 2020, 71 seniors scored an average of 116.5 on the natural sciences scaled questions (sd= 6.2) with a maximum score of 128 and a minimum score of 102. This compares to the national average of 115.3 (sd= 1.9) with a maximum score of 118 and a minimum score of 110. The difference in our students' average and the national average was 1.2 or are 0.6 standard deviations.

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 a 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 are 0.4 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 remains practically the same between 2017 and 2020.

---

## 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 0.3 standard deviations within the national average for master's colleges and universities in 2020. 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 2020, 71 seniors scored an average of 113.0 on the questions of the social sciences (sd=7.0) with a maximum score of 127 and a minimum score of 101; compared to the national average of 113.5 (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 -0.5 points or -0.3 standard deviations.

In 2017, 20 seniors scored an average of 111.3 on the questions of the social sciences (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 questions of the social sciences (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 -0.3 standard deviations below 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 0.1 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 2020, 71 seniors scored an average of 114.7 on the natural sciences scaled questions (sd= 6.4) with a maximum score of 126 and a minimum score of 100. This compares to the national average of 114.9 (sd= 1.8) with a maximum score of 118 and a minimum score of 110. The difference in our students' average and the national average was 0.2 or are 0.1 standard deviations.

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 a 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 are 0.4 standard deviations.

In 2013, 121 seniors scored an average of 113.3 on the questions of the natural sciences (sd= 5.9) with a maximum score of 126 and a 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 are -0.5 standard deviations.

The University's average score remained precisely the same from 2017 to 2020.

---

### 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 2019. Students responded identically to the Carnegie Classification (2.9 to 2.9) in 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 2019, 136 seniors responded and 23% (n=33) indicated they combined ideas from different courses at a rate of very often, 36% (n=52) often, 34% (n=43) sometimes, and 6% (n=8) 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 2018 and 2019 at 2.9).

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 by 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 on par with the Carnegie Classification (2.8 to 2.9) in 2019. Students responded identically to the Carnegie Classification (2.8 to 2.8) in 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 2019, 136 seniors responded and 30% (n=43) indicated they combined ideas from different courses at a rate of very often, 27% (n=39) often, 37% (n=46) sometimes, and 7% (n=8) 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 2018 and 2019 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:

**Proficient.** The mean of students responding to identifying the connection of ideas from their coursework to their prior experiences and knowledge was on par with the Carnegie Classification (3.2) in 2019. Students responded 0.1 points below the Carnegie Classification (3.1 to 3.2) in 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 2019, 134 seniors responded, and 38% (n=55) indicated they connected ideas from their course to their prior experiences and knowledge at a rate of very often, 39% (n=52) often, 21% (n=26) sometimes, and 1% (n=1) never. The University mean response was 3.2, on par with our three identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 3.2, Carnegie Classification at 3.2, and NSSE 2018 and 2019 at 3.2).

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 ideas 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:

**Exemplary.** The mean of students responding to identified coursework emphasized analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts was 3.2, 0.2 points higher than the Carnegie Classification (3.2 to 3.0) in 2019.

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 2019, 133 seniors responded, and 38% (n=52) 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, 47% (n=63) often, 15% (n=18) sometimes, and 0% (n=0) never. The University mean response was 3.2, 0.2 points above our three identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 3.0, Carnegie Classification at 3.0, and NSSE 2018 and 2019 at 3.0).

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:

**Exemplary.** The mean of students responding to identified coursework emphasizing forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of various pieces of information was 3.1, 0.1 points above the Carnegie Classification (3.1 to 3.0) in 2019.

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 2019, 131 seniors responded, and 30% (n=41) indicated their coursework emphasized forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of various pieces of information at a rate of very often, 48% (n=65) often, 20% (n=23) sometimes, and 1% (n=2) never. The University mean response was 3.1, 0.1 points higher than our three identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 2.9, Carnegie Classification at 3.0, and NSSE 2018 and 2019 at 3.0).

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:

**Sufficient.** The mean of students responding to identified coursework contributing to their ability to solve complex real-world problems was .01 points below the Carnegie Classification (2.7 to 2.8) in 2019. Students responded 0.1 points higher in 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 2019, 121 seniors responded and 33% (n=43) indicated the institution contributed to their ability to solve complex real-world problems at a rate of very often, 25% (n=31) often, 25% (n=29) sometimes, and 18% (n=19) never. The University mean response was 2.7, on par to 0.1 points below our three identified comparison groups (Southwest Public at 2.7, Carnegie Classification at 2.8, and NSSE 2018 and 2019 at 2.7).

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 1.6 to 1.8 in 2019.

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 one and below

---

### ANALYSIS:

Of the 61 student artifacts rated using the VALUE Integrative Learning rubric in 2019, the overall average rating was 1.7 with the following ratings for each aspect:

Aspect	0	1	2	3	4	Total	PCT 1	PCT 2	PCT 3	PCT 4
Connections to Experience	26	14	14	6	1	35	40.00%	40.00%	17.10%	2.90%
Connections to Discipline	34	15	6	5	1	27	55.60%	22.20%	18.50%	3.70%
Transfer	14	27	14	5	1	47	57.40%	29.80%	10.60%	2.10%
Integrated Communication	6	29	17	7	2	55	52.70%	30.90%	12.70%	3.60%
Reflection and Self-Assessment	13	26	16	6	0	48	54.20%	33.30%	12.50%	0.00%

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.

Students performed below the target in both 2017 and 2019, with the large majority of artifacts rating below 3.

**ACTION:**

While the performance may be genuinely low, the prompts for the student work may not have been explicitly aligned with the rubric causing the scores to be artificially low.

**COMMENTS:**

Prepared by: Paul Turcotte, Director of Institutional Research and Assessment, August 2020