



**Sam Houston
State University**

Texas Core Objectives Assessment Report

Submitted to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board

December, 2018

Report prepared by the Office of Academic Planning and Assessment

Correspondence regarding this report can be directed to:

Dr. Somer Franklin (somer@shsu.edu), Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs

Dr. Jeff Roberts (jeff.roberts@shsu.edu), Director of Assessment

**Office of Academic
Planning and Assessment**

MEMBER THE TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM

This page is intentionally left blank.

Executive Summary

Following the state-wide Texas General Education Core Curriculum redesign, SHSU implemented a new University-wide core curriculum in the fall 2014 semester. As part of this redesign, SHSU adopted the THECB’s core learning objectives as the general education outcomes for all undergraduate students at the University:

- Critical Thinking (CT) – to include creative thinking, innovation, inquiry, and analysis, evaluation, and synthesis of information;
- Communication (COM)– to include effective development, interpretation, and expression of ideas through written (WC), oral (OC), and visual communication (VC);
- Empirical and Quantitative Skills (EQS) – to include the manipulation and analysis of numerical data or observable facts resulting in informed conclusions;
- Teamwork (TW)– in include the ability to consider different points of view and to work effectively with others to support a shared purpose or goal;
- Personal Responsibility (PR) – to include the ability to connect choices, actions, and consequences to ethical decision-making; and
- Social Responsibility (SR) – to include intercultural competence, knowledge of civic responsibility, and the ability to engage effectively in regional, national, and global communities.

These core learning objectives represent essential intellectual and practical skills and abilities needed by SHSU students to successfully graduate and to succeed in a diverse world. Student attainment of these core learning objectives represents a vital component of SHSU’s mission to promote high-quality education to students for the benefit of regional, state, national, and international constituencies.

SHSU has developed a robust assessment plan designed to evaluate student learning and attainment of these six core learning objectives. The assessment methods used at SHSU to evaluate student attainment of these objectives are identified here:

Core Learning Objective	Assessment Methods
Critical Thinking	Critical Thinking Assessment (CAT) Test
	Texas Assessment of Critical Thinking Skills (TACTS)
	National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
Communication	Assessment of Written Communication (AWC)

	Freshman English Course-Level Writing Assessment
	Critical Thinking Assessment (CAT) Test
	National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning	Critical Thinking Assessment (CAT) Test
	Texas Assessment of Critical Thinking Skills (TACTS)
	National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
Teamwork	Teamwork Self-Reflection Instrument (TSRI)
	National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
Personal Responsibility	Course-Embedded Contemporary Moral Issues Assessment
	National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
Social Responsibility	Course-Embedded American Government Assessment
	Course-Embedded Texas Government Assessment
	Course-Embedded Contemporary Moral Issues Assessment
	National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
	National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) 2016 Civic Engagement Topical Module
	National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) 2016 Global Learning Topical Module

These measures represent a mixture of direct and indirect, course-embedded and external assessments designed to provide multiple sources of student learning and achievement data from multiple points throughout the curriculum. One of the primary strengths of SHSU's core assessment approach is the use of faculty developed instruments and authentic student learning artifacts at multiple points within the undergraduate curriculum. This triangulation of data provides institutional leaders with deeper insight into student attainment of these core learning objectives throughout the curriculum and as students approach graduation.

This report extensively details the overarching philosophy and approach to core assessment being used by SHSU, the assessment measures being used to evaluate student learning and attainment, University targets for student success, and whether those targets have been met. An in-depth examination is provided of the results gathered from the core learning assessments since the implementation of the new assessment plan in fall 2014, and it highlights the actions being taken across the University in response to these results to improve teaching and student learning. Finally, the report details the general strengths and weaknesses of SHSU's core

assessment approach and identifies some of the planned improvements for core assessment processes and assessments moving forward.

Although SHSU is only five years out from the transition to the new Texas Core Curriculum and the adoption of the THECB's Core Learning Objectives, SHSU's core assessment processes is already yielding valuable data and results. These data have already proven useful to the University, its colleges, and degree programs for use in improving student learning and attainment of the Core Learning Objectives. Moving forward, it is expected that SHSU's core assessment plan will continue to serve as a vital tool for institutional improvement.

Table of Contents

Assessment of the Core Objectives	1
Description of Assessment	1
Assessment Methods	4
Targets for Success for Each Core Objective	12
Results and Analysis	16
Actions and Follow-ups	27
Evaluation of the Assessment Process	38
Summary	40
Appendicies	41

Assessment of the Core Objectives

Description of Assessment

Sam Houston State University (SHSU) identifies expected collegiate-level undergraduate general education objectives, regularly assesses the extent to which students achieve these objectives, and seeks to identify actions for improvement based on an analysis of the results from its general education objectives assessment processes. Following the state-wide Texas General Education Core Curriculum redesign, SHSU implemented a new University-wide core curriculum in the fall 2014 semester. As part of the 2014 core curriculum redesign SHSU adopted the THECB's core learning objectives as the general education outcomes for all undergraduate students at the University:

- Critical Thinking (CT) – to include creative thinking, innovation, inquiry, and analysis, evaluation, and synthesis of information;
- Communication (COM)– to include effective development, interpretation, and expression of ideas through written (WC), oral (OC), and visual communication (VC);
- Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning (EQS) – to include the manipulation and analysis of numerical data or observable facts resulting in informed conclusions;
- Teamwork (TW)– in include the ability to consider different points of view and to work effectively with others to support a shared purpose or goal;
- Personal Responsibility (PR) – to include the ability to connect choices, actions, and consequences to ethical decision-making; and
- Social Responsibility (SR) – to include intercultural competence, knowledge of civic responsibility, and the ability to engage effectively in regional, national, and global communities.

These core learning objectives represent essential intellectual and practical skills and abilities for all student learning and will help prepare SHSU students for living in a diverse world. Student attainment of these core learning objectives represents a vital component of SHSU's mission to promote high-quality education to students for the benefit of regional, state, national, and international constituencies. SHSU has developed a robust assessment plan designed to assess student learning and attainment of these six core learning objectives using a

mixture of direct and indirect student learning measures. Table 1 identifies the various assessment measures employed for each of SHSU's core learning objectives. These measures represent a mixture of course-embedded and external assessments designed to provide multiple sources of student learning and achievement data from multiple points throughout the curriculum, from introductory, core curriculum courses to end-of-experience capstone courses within the students' majors. This triangulation of direct and indirect sources of data from multiple points within the undergraduate curriculum provides SHSU with deeper insight into student attainment of these core learning objectives.

Table 1.

Assessment Methods Being Used to Evaluate Student Attainment of the THECB's Core Learning Objectives

Core Learning Objective	Assessment Methods
Critical Thinking	Critical Thinking Assessment (CAT) Test
	Texas Assessment of Critical Thinking Skills (TACTS)
	National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
Communication	Assessment of Written Communication (AWC)
	Freshman English Course-Level Writing Assessment
	Critical Thinking Assessment (CAT) Test
	National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning	Critical Thinking Assessment (CAT) Test
	Texas Assessment of Critical Thinking Skills (TACTS)
	National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
Teamwork	Teamwork Self-Reflection Instrument (TSRI)
	National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
Personal Responsibility	Course-Embedded Contemporary Moral Issues Assessment
	National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
Social Responsibility	Course-Embedded American Government Assessment
	Course-Embedded Texas Government Assessment
	Course-Embedded Contemporary Moral Issues Assessment
	National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
	National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) 2016 Civic Engagement Topical Module
	National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) 2016 Global Learning Topical Module

Responsibility for facilitating the assessment of SHSU's core learning outcomes rests with the Office of Academic Planning and Assessment (OAPA). OAPA coordinates logistics related to the assessment processes, conducts scoring sessions of student artifacts, completes basic analysis of the assessment results, and reports the data to a wide range of constituents so the University community can use those data to identify actions for improvement. To accomplish these activities, OAPA partners with various constituents from across campus, including University administrators, deans, associate deans, and faculty members.

To promote transparency and encourage use of core assessment data, findings and results from the assessment of the core learning outcomes are made available on the OAPA website (<http://www.shsu.edu/dept/academic-planning-and-assessment/assessment/results.html>). Additionally, college- and department-specific data are provided to the colleges, departments, and programs for further analysis and development of actions for improvement within their areas. Data are also provided to the University administration to inform development of institutional-level actions. Finally, core assessment data are provided to the Core Curriculum Assessment Committee for review and recommendations. This committee is chaired by the Director of Assessment and consists of an associate dean and a senior faculty member from each of the seven academic colleges, as well as one ex-officio representative from the Division of Student Affairs. The purpose of this committee is to review and recommend changes, as needed, to the core curriculum assessment process at SHSU; to help facilitate the assessment of SHSU's core learning outcomes; to review all collected assessment data; and to provide recommendations for ways to improve student learning across the University.

Assessment of the core learning objectives at SHSU is an ongoing process and assessment approaches continue to evolve over time. The University is constantly seeking ways

to improve its core learning assessment processes and to collect additional data for use in improving student learning at the University. Early efforts have focused on implementing the different components of SHSU's core assessment plan, developing new assessments, collecting baseline data, and refining assessment processes and methods. Despite the evolving nature of SHSU's core assessment processes, the University has already been able to use much of the data to identify areas for improvement and implement actions. This report provides a detailed description of SHSU's approach to assessing each of the six core learning objectives, the targets identified for student success for each core assessment, the assessment results for each of the core objectives, the actions being implemented in response to these collected data, the strengths and weaknesses of the assessment process, and the plans for improving the assessment processes in the future.

Assessment Methods

SHSU employs a wide range of assessment measures, both direct and indirect, from multiple points in the students educational experiences to evaluate student attainment of the Core Learning Objectives. As identified in Table 1, many of these assessments are used to evaluate more than one of the Core Learning Objectives. This section of the report describes each assessment measure in alphabetical order, including the frequency, timeline, and sampling schema being employed for each.

Assessment of Written Communication (AWC). The AWC has been conducted annually since the 2014-2105 academic year. Each fall semester approximately 500 student writing artifacts are collected from upper division (i.e., 3000- and 4000-level) writing-enhanced and capstone courses. Over a 3-year cycle all academic colleges are expected to participate in

this assessment. A general timeline for college participation in the AWC is provided in Table 2; however, flexibility is provided to the Colleges when appropriate.

Table 2.

Timeline for Assessment of Written Communication (AWC) Administration

College	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020
College of Business Administration		AWC			AWC	
College of Criminal Justice		AWC			AWC	
College of Education	AWC			AWC ²		
College of Fine Arts and Mass Communication			AWC ¹			AWC
College of Health Sciences			AWC			AWC
College of Humanities and Social Sciences			AWC			AWC
College of Sciences and Engineering Technology	AWC			AWC		

¹ College of Fine Arts and Mass Communication Participation was delayed to 2017-2018 due to an administrative error by the Director of Assessment.

² College of Education participation was delayed until 2018-2019 to allow the College to pilot a new capstone writing project during the 2017-2018 academic year.

The collected student writing artifacts are scored by an interdisciplinary group of faculty using a locally developed writing rubric (See Appendix A). Using this rubric, student written communication skills are examined across four separate domains: (a) Ideas/Critical Thinking/Synthesis, (b) Style, (c) Organization, and (d) Conventions. Student scores are calculated for each individual domain of written communication ability, as well as an overall writing score. College-level reports are created and returned to the respective colleges following each College's participation for use by the colleges and departments to improve student written communication skills in their areas. Data are also used at the institutional-level to better understand student written communication skills and to understand and improve the effectiveness of campus-wide interventions to increase student written communication skills.

Course-Embedded American Government Assessment. Each fall semester a locally developed, 12-question test is administered in a pre-to-post format for all sections of POLS

2305: American Government. This test was developed by faculty teaching the course and is designed to measure social responsibility, particularly as it relates to students' civic responsibility and students' abilities to engage in national communities. POLS 2305: American Government is a course within the core curriculum at SHSU that a large number of students take annually and represents an effective place to assess improvements to student social responsibility skills. Pre- and post-test scores are analyzed using a paired-samples *t*-test to determine whether students are making statistically significant gains in social responsibility over the course of the semester. Data from this assessment are used by the Political Science Department as part of their ongoing programmatic assessment efforts, as well as at the institutional level to evaluate student social responsibility.

Course-Embedded Contemporary Moral Issues Assessment. Each fall and spring semester a locally developed, 25-question assessment is administered within all sections of PHIL 2306: Contemporary Moral Issues. This instrument was developed by faculty teaching the course and is designed to evaluate student understanding of different moral and ethical issues as they relate to themselves and to larger society. PHIL 2306: Contemporary Moral Issues is a course within the core curriculum at SHSU that a large number of students take annually and represents an effective place to assess improvements to student social responsibility skills. Pre- and post-test scores are analyzed using a paired-samples *t*-test to determine whether students are making statistically significant gains over the course of the semester. Data from this assessment are used by the Philosophy Program as part of their ongoing programmatic assessment efforts, as well as at the institutional level to evaluate student social responsibility.

Course-Embedded Texas Government Assessment. Each fall semester a locally developed, 10-question test is administered in a pre-to-post format for all sections of POLS

2306: Texas Government. This test was developed by faculty teaching the course and is designed to measure social responsibility, particularly as it relates to students' civic responsibility and students' abilities to engage in national communities. POLS 2306: Texas Government is a course within the core curriculum at SHSU that a large number of students take annually and represents an effective place to assess improvements to student social responsibility skills. Pre- and post-test scores are analyzed using a paired-samples *t*-test to determine whether students are making statistically significant gains in social responsibility over the course of the semester. Data from this assessment are used by the Political Science Department as part of their ongoing programmatic assessment efforts, as well as at the institutional level to evaluate student social responsibility.

Critical Thinking Assessment Test (CAT). The CAT is a nationally normed short answer essay test designed to assess student critical thinking (CT), empirical and quantitative reasoning (EQR), and written (WC) and visual communication (VC) skills. The faculty-scored test evaluates students' abilities in twelve different skill areas across four broader domains. These domains and skill areas, along with their alignment to the Core Learning Objectives, are identified in Table 3. The alignment of learning domains to the specific CAT questions can be found in Table 4.

Table 3.

Alignment of CAT Learning Domains and Skill Areas with SHSU Core Learning Objectives

CAT Learning Domain	Skill Area	Core Learning Objective
Student Ability to Evaluate Information	Separate Factual Information From Inferences	CT
	Interpret Numerical Relationships in Graphs	EQR, VC
	Understand the Limitations of Correlational Data	CT, EQR
	Evaluate Evidence and Identify Inappropriate Conclusions	CT, EQR
Student Ability to Creatively Think	Identify Alternative Interpretations for Data or Observations	CT, EQR

	Identify New Information that Might Support or Contradict a Hypothesis	CT, EQR
	Explain How New Information Can Change a Problem	CT, WC
Student Ability to Learn and Problem Solve	Separate Relevant From Irrelevant Information	CT
	Integrate Information to Solve Problems	CT, EQR
	Learn and Apply New Information	CT
	Use Mathematical Skills to Solve Real-world Problems	CT, EQR
Student Ability to Communicate	Communicate Ideas Effectively	WC

Table 4.

Alignment of CAT Learning Domains to the Skills Being Assessed by CAT Questions

CAT Question	Evaluate and Interpret Information	Problem Solving	Creative Thinking	Effective Communication
Q1 – Summarize the pattern of results in a graph without making inappropriate inferences.	X			
Q2 – Evaluate how strongly correlational-type data supports a hypothesis.	X			X
Q3 – Provide alternative explanations for a pattern of results that has many possible causes			X	X
Q4 – Identify additional information needed to evaluate a hypothesis.		X	X	X
Q5 – Evaluate whether spurious information strongly supports a hypothesis.	X			
Q6 – Provide alternative explanations for spurious associations.			X	X
Q7 – Identify additional information needed to evaluate a hypothesis.		X	X	X
Q8 – Determine whether an invited inference is supported by specific information.	X			
Q9 – Provide relevant alternative interpretations for a specific set of results.			X	X
Q10 – Separate relevant from irrelevant information when solving a real-world problem.	X	X		
Q11 – Use and apply relevant information to evaluate a problem.	X	X		X
Q12 – Use basic mathematical skills to help solve a real-world problem.		X		
Q13 – Identify suitable solutions for a real-world problem using relevant information.	X	X		
Q14 – Identify and explain the best solution for a real-world problem using relevant information.	X	X		X
Q15 – Explain how changes in a real-world problem situation might affect the solution.		X	X	X

The CAT is administered each year to approximately 500 students within upper division courses (i.e., 3000- and 4000-level) identified within the undergraduate departments from each college. Over a 3-year cycle all colleges at SHSU participate in the CAT assessment. A general timeline for college participation in the CAT is provided in Table 5; however, flexibility is provided to the Colleges when appropriate.

Table 5.

Timeline for Critical Thinking Assessment Test (CAT) Administration

College	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021
College of Business Administration		CAT			CAT	
College of Criminal Justice			CAT			CAT
College of Education		CAT			CAT	
College of Fine Arts and Mass Communication			CAT			CAT
College of Health Sciences			CAT			CAT
College of Humanities and Social Sciences	CAT			CAT		
College of Sciences and Engineering Technology	CAT			CAT		

Following the annual scoring sessions, reports are created and distributed to the respective colleges for use in improving student skills. Data are also used at the institutional-level to better understand student critical thinking, problem-solving skills, quantitative reasoning, and written and visual communication, and to understand and improve the effectiveness of campus-wide interventions to improve these skills.

English Course-Level Writing Assessment. During the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 academic years writing samples from freshman, sophomore, and senior English writing-enhanced courses were collected, reviewed, and evaluated against a common, internally developed, holistic rubric by the faculty within the Department of English. This assessment was historically one conducted by the Department of English as part of their ongoing programmatic assessments for their degree program. Data from this assessment were incorporated into SHSU's

Core Assessment Plan to complement other written communication assessments and to better understand student written communication skills. This assessment was placed on hold during the 2016-2017 academic year due to changes within the leadership in the Department of English. Efforts are underway to revamp this assessment and possibly reintroduce it during the 2018-2019 academic year.

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). The NSSE is a student perceptions survey designed to assess student and institution behaviors related to good practices in undergraduate education. Through institution self-selected peer group and student population cohorts, institutions are able to compare student responses on individual questions and nationally on the five NSSE Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice. The NSSE is administered to first-year and senior students every third year at SHSU. The NSSE was last administered in the spring semester of 2016, with planning currently underway for the next NSSE administration in spring 2019. Approximately 40 questions from the NSSE aligned with the SHSU's Core Learning Objectives. Results for these specific questions were compiled into reports for first-year and senior students and were distributed to a wide range of University constituents for use in improving student curricular and co-curricular experiences.

National Survey of Student Engagement 2016 Civic Engagement Topical Module. As part of the 2016 NSSE administration first-year and senior students participated in the NSSE 2016 Civic Engagement Topical Module. This module was adapted from a pilot survey developed by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and asked students to assess their conflict resolution skills and examine how often they have engaged with local, campus, and state/national/global issues. The module complemented questions from the main NSSE survey about service learning, community service, volunteer work, and becoming an

informed and active citizen. SHSU will participate in the Civic Engagement Topical Module again as part of the spring 2019 NSSE administration.

National Survey of Student Engagement 2016 Global Learning Topical Module. As part of the 2016 NSSE administration first-year and senior students participated in the NSSE 2016 Global Learning Topical Module. This module evaluated student experiences and coursework emphasizing global affairs, world cultures, nationalities, religions, and other international topics. This module complemented the core NSSE questionnaire regarding student experiences with people from different backgrounds, course emphasis on integrative and reflective learning, and participation in study abroad. This Topical Module was not offered as part of the spring 2019 NSSE administration. SHSU will employ the Inclusiveness and Engagement with Cultural Diversity Topical Module in its place.

Teamwork Self-Reflection Instrument (TSRI). Adapted from the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) Teamwork VALUE Rubric, the locally-developed TSRI was piloted during the fall 2016 semester to assess students' self-perceived actions, attitudes, and behaviors in team settings. Data gathered from this pilot administration helped to inform changes to the TSRI instrument design and implementation. The revised version of this instrument, now administered online using Qualtrics, was tested further during the fall 2017 and spring 2018 semesters. A total of 889 students participated in the 2017-2018 TSRI administration, 300 lower-division students (i.e., freshman and sophomores) and 589 upper-division students (i.e., juniors and seniors). The TSRI is scheduled for full implementation beginning in the fall 2018 semester with the expectation that lower- and upper-division students from all SHSU colleges will regularly participate as part of this assessment.

Texas Assessment of Critical Thinking Skills (TACTS). The TACTS is a locally developed, proprietary instrument designed to measure student critical thinking, empirical, and quantitative skills. This multiple choice exam is administered every fall and spring semester to all students in PHIL 2303: Critical Thinking. This course is a standalone critical thinking course within the Core Curriculum at SHSU and is taken by large numbers of students annually and represents an effective place to assess improvements to student critical thinking, empirical, and quantitative reasoning skills. For the 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 academic years the TACTS was a 35-question, multiple-choice instrument. The TACTS was revised prior to the start of the 2017-2018 academic year into a 20-question, multiple-choice exam that is more focused on the specific skills being taught within that course. Pre- and post-test scores are analyzed using a paired-samples *t*-test to determine whether students are making statistically significant gains over the course of the semester. Data from this assessment are used by the Philosophy Program as part of their ongoing programmatic assessment efforts, as well as at the institutional level to evaluate student critical thinking, empirical, and quantitative reasoning skills.

Core Objective Success Targets

SHSU has established targets for success for each of the assessment methods used to evaluate student learning and attainment of the Core Learning Objectives. These targets are provided to the reader in Table 6, along with an assertion as to whether the target was Not Met, Partially Met, or Met for each applicable time period.

Table 6.

Success Targets for Core Learning Objective Measures at SHSU

Core Learning Objective	Assessment Methods	Targets for Success	Target			
			Not Met / Partially Met / Met			
			2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018
Critical Thinking	Critical Thinking Assessment (CAT) Test	SHSU Students Will Meet or Exceed the National Norm for the CAT	N/A	Partially Met	Not Met	Not Met

	Texas Assessment of Critical Thinking Skills (TACTS)	Students Will Demonstrate Statistically Significant Pre-to-Post Improvement in Overall Scores Each Year	N/A	Met	Met	Met
	National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)	SHSU First-Year Students Will Meet or Exceed Comparison Groups for Questions Aligned with Critical Thinking	N/A	Partially Met	N/A	N/A
		SHSU Senior Students Will Meet or Exceed Comparison Groups for Questions Aligned with Critical Thinking	N/A	Partially Met	N/A	N/A
Communication	Assessment of Written Communication (AWC)	Overall Average Score will be 2.5 or Higher for Each College	Partially Met	Not Met	Partially Met	Met
		Overall Domain Scores will be 2.5 or Higher for Each College	Partially Met	Not Met	Partially Met	Met
		SHSU Colleges will Meet or Exceed Locally established benchmarks	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	Met
		Overall Average Score will be 2.5 or Higher for the University	Not Met			
		Overall Domain Scores will be 2.5 or Higher for the University	Partially Met			
		SHSU will Meet or Exceed Locally established benchmarks	Not Met			
		English Course-Level Writing Assessment	Overall Average Scores for Students in 1000-level English Courses (ENGL 1301 and ENGL 1302) Will be 5 or Higher on a 10-point Scale	Met	Met	N/A
		Overall Average Scores for Students in 2000-level English Courses Will be 5 or	Met	Met	N/A	N/A

		Higher on a 10-point Scale				
		Overall Average Scores for Students in 4000-level English Courses Will be 5 or Higher on a 10-point Scale	Met	Met	N/A	N/A
	Critical Thinking Assessment (CAT) Test	SHSU Students Will Meet or Exceed the National Norm for CAT Questions Aligned with Communication	N/A	Partially Met	Partially Met	Not Met
	National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)	SHSU First-Year Students Will Meet or Exceed Comparison Groups for Questions Aligned with Communication	N/A	Partially Met	N/A	N/A
		SHSU Senior Students Will Meet or Exceed Comparison Groups for Questions Aligned with Critical Thinking	N/A	Partially Met	N/A	N/A
Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning	Critical Thinking Assessment (CAT) Test	SHSU Students Will Meet or Exceed the National Norm for CAT Questions Aligned with Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning	N/A	Partially Met	Not Met	Not Met
	Texas Assessment of Critical Thinking Skills (TACTS)	Students Will Demonstrate Statistically Significant Pre-to-Post Improvement in Overall Scores Each Year	N/A	Met	Met	Met
	National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)	SHSU First-Year Students Will Meet or Exceed Comparison Groups for Questions Aligned with Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning	N/A	Not Met	N/A	N/A
		SHSU Senior Students Will Meet or Exceed Comparison Groups for Questions Aligned with Empirical and	N/A	Met	N/A	N/A

		Quantitative Reasoning				
Teamwork	Teamwork Self-Reflection Instrument (TSRI)	SHSU Students will Demonstrate Increases in TSRI Scores From the Freshman/Sophomore Levels to the Junior/Senior Levels	N/A	N/A	Met	Met
		SHSU Students Reporting Engaging in More Teamwork Experiences will Have Higher TSRI Scores Than Students with Fewer Teamwork Experiences	N/A	N/A	Met	Met
	National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)	SHSU First-Year Students Will Meet or Exceed Comparison Groups for Questions Aligned with Teamwork	N/A	Not Met	N/A	N/A
		SHSU Senior Students Will Meet or Exceed Comparison Groups for Questions Aligned with Teamwork	N/A	Not Met	N/A	N/A
Personal Responsibility	Course-Embedded Contemporary Moral Issues Assessment	Students Will Demonstrate Statistically Significant Pre-to-Post Improvement in Overall Scores Each Year	N/A	Met	Met	Met
	National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)	SHSU First-Year Students Will Meet or Exceed Comparison Groups for Questions Aligned with Personal Responsibility	N/A	Met	N/A	N/A
		SHSU Senior Students Will Meet or Exceed Comparison Groups for Questions Aligned with Personal Responsibility	N/A	Met	N/A	N/A
Social Responsibility	Course-Embedded American Government Assessment	Students Will Demonstrate Statistically Significant Pre-to-Post Improvement in Overall Scores Each Year	N/A	Met	Met	Met

	Course-Embedded Texas Government Assessment	Students Will Demonstrate Statistically Significant Pre-to-Post Improvement in Overall Scores Each Year	N/A	Met	Met	Met
	Course-Embedded Contemporary Moral Issues Assessment	Students Will Demonstrate Statistically Significant Pre-to-Post Improvement in Overall Scores Each Year	N/A	Met	Met	Met
	National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)	SHSU First-Year Students Will Meet or Exceed Comparison Groups for Questions Aligned with Social Responsibility	N/A	Partially Met	N/A	N/A
		SHSU Senior Students Will Meet or Exceed Comparison Groups for Questions Aligned with Social Responsibility	N/A	Met	N/A	N/A
	National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) 2016 Civic Engagement Topical Module	SHSU First-Year Students Will Meet or Exceed Comparison Groups	N/A	Partially Met	N/A	N/A
		Senior Students Will Meet or Exceed Comparison Groups	N/A	Partially Met	N/A	N/A
	National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) 2016 Global Learning Topical Module	First-Year Students Will Meet or Exceed Comparison Groups	N/A	Partially Met	N/A	N/A
		Senior Students Will Meet or Exceed Comparison Groups	N/A	Partially Met	N/A	N/A

Results and Analysis

Data from the Core Learning Objective assessments are regularly collected and analyzed by OAPA, and reports are created and distributed as appropriate to the departments, colleges, and University leadership for further analysis and action. Full copies of these reports are also made available at the OAPA Core Assessment Results webpage

(<http://www.shsu.edu/dept/academic-planning-and-assessment/assessment/results.html>). At the institutional level, a Core Curriculum Assessment Committee, comprised of associate deans and

senior faculty member from each of the academic colleges, regularly meets to review data and results from the various core curriculum assessments and to provide recommendations for steps to be taken to improve student learning across campus. A summary of the findings and results for each of the assessments for the Core Learning Objectives are provided below. Full data tables are provided in the Appendix of this report.

Critical Thinking.

Critical Thinking Assessment Test (CAT). The CAT has been administered for Core Learning Assessment purposes since the 2015-2016 academic year. With the 2017-2018 administration all seven academic colleges have participated in the CAT. A full breakdown of the individual college-level results is available in Appendix B. While variability existed between student performance across colleges, all colleges generally underperformed when compared to CAT national norms. When examining specific CAT questions, students performed best on questions focused on students' abilities to evaluate information, potentially indicating that might be an area of higher performance for SHSU students. Students performed the worst on questions focused on creative thinking, problem solving, and effective communication, potentially indicating that these might be areas that SHSU will need to specifically target for student improvement.

Texas Assessment of Critical Thinking Skills (TACTS). The TACTS has been administered for Core Learning Assessment purposes every fall and spring semester since fall 2015. Pre- and post-test results were analyzed each year using a paired samples *t*-test to determine what, if any, gains students were making each year. Starting with the fall 2016 semester, student data and results were disaggregated between online and face-to-face students. In fall 2017, the institution implemented a shortened version of the TACTS test that was

designed to better match the specific elements of critical thinking skills being taught with PHIL 2306: Critical Thinking. Students demonstrated statistically significant gains in critical thinking skills from pre-to-post each academic year. However, these gains, as evidenced by small to moderate effect sizes, translated to small gains in the total number of questions being answered correctly. Furthermore, when examining the online vs. face-to-face data for 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 it was determined that face-to-face students were making statistically significant gains, while online students were not. A complete breakdown of TACTS results is available in Appendix C.

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). The NSSE was administered to first-year and senior students during the spring 2016 semester. Ten questions from the NSSE specifically aligned with critical thinking. For first-year students, the mean scores for three of the twelve questions were lower when compared to our IPEDS Comparison Group. First-year students mean scores were also lower for nine of the twelve questions when compared to our THECB Peer Group. However, results were improved for senior students. Senior students met or exceeded the scores for eleven of the twelve questions when compared to the IPEDS Comparison group and for eight of the twelve questions when compared to the THECB Peer Group. A complete breakdown of NSSE results is available in Appendix D.

Communication.

Assessment of Written Communication (AWC). SHSU had mixed success in meeting its targets for student written communication skills. A full breakdown of AWC results can be found in Appendix E. At the University-level, student scores across all four writing domains were lower than those observed in the 2013 baseline project. Furthermore, the overall average University score of 2.46 was lower than the target of 2.50 or higher on a 4.0 scale. When

looking at student scores for the individual domains of written communication, two domains (Ideas/Critical Thinking/Synthesis, Organization) exceeded the target of 2.50 while student scores in two domains (Style, Conventions) failed to meet the target. The lowest scoring domain at the University-level was Conventions at 2.31, and Conventions was the lowest scoring domain for six of the seven colleges (College of Criminal Justice, 1.98; College of Science and Engineering Technology, 2.08; College of Business Administration, 2.34; College of Humanities and Social Sciences, 2.38; College of Education, 2.40). The Conventions domain was also the lowest scoring domain at the University-level in the 2013 baseline scores.

Mixed results were also observed within individual colleges. Student scores for only one college, Fine Arts and Mass Communication, exceeded their 2013 baseline scores for all domains and for the overall average score. Two colleges saw partial success. For the Colleges of Business Administration and Education, scores for the Organization domain exceeded 2013 baseline totals. The scores for the Colleges of Humanities and Social Sciences, Criminal Justice, and Science and Engineering Technology were all lower than their 2013 baseline scores.

Fine Arts and Mass Communication was also the only college to exceed the target of 2.5 or higher for all four domains of student writing skills and the overall average score. For both the Colleges of Humanities and Social Sciences and Education, three of the four domains and the overall average score exceeded the 2.5 target, with only Conventions falling below that mark. For the College of Business Administration, only the Organization domain exceeded the target of 2.5. The domain and overall scores for the Colleges of Health Sciences, Criminal Justice, and Science and Engineering Technology did not meet the 2.5 target.

English Course-level Assessment. The average student scores were above a 5, on an 8-point scale, at the 1000, 2000, and 4000 course levels for both the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016

academic years. These scores indicated that students were generally writing at a competent level. When the student scores for 1000-level course were broken down by course type (i.e., ENGL 1301 versus ENGL 1302), students in ENGL 1301 averaged below a 5, while ENGL 1302 students averaged above a 5 for 2014-2015. This trend was reversed for 2015-2016, with ENGL 1301 students averaging above a 5 and ENGL 1302 students averaging just below a 5.

A breakdown of the percentages of students scoring a 5 or higher, indicating competent work, is also revealing. For the 2014-2015 academic year, 63.64% of students enrolled in ENGL 1301, 64.94% of student enrolled in ENGL 1302, 76.67% of students enrolled in a 2000-level English course, and 73.53% of students enrolled in a 4000-level English course scored a 5 or higher indicating they were writing at a competent level or better. For the 2015-2016 academic year, 62.7% of students enrolled in ENGL 1301, 65.2% of student enrolled in ENGL 1302, 71.4% of students enrolled in a 2000-level English course, and 77.7% of students enrolled in a 4000-level English course scored a 5 or higher indicating they were writing at a competent level or better. A full breakdown of student results is provided in Appendix G.

Critical Thinking Assessment Test (CAT). A total of nine of the fifteen questions on the CAT test align with the broader communication outcome. In general, students across all colleges performed lower than the national mean on CAT questions related to communication. SHSU scores for all colleges were blow the national mean for five of the nine questions. These questions primarily focused on students' abilities to provide alternative explanations for data, problems, or scenarios. This indicates a potential area of focus for improving student communication skills moving forward. A breakdown of the data for the nine CAT questions related specifically to communication are provided in Appendix F.

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). The NSSE was administered to first-year and senior students during the spring 2016 semester. Eight questions from the NSSE specifically aligned with communication for first-year students and nine questions aligned for senior students. For first-year students the mean scores for three of the eight questions were lower when compared to our IPEDS Comparison Group. First-year students' mean scores were also lower for four of the eight questions when compared to our THECB Peer Group. For senior students the mean scores for eight of the nine questions were lower when compared to our IPEDS Comparison Group. Senior students' scores were also lower for five of the nine questions when compared to our THECB Peer Group. A complete breakdown of NSSE results is available in Appendix D.

Empirical and Quantitative Skills.

Critical Thinking Assessment Test (CAT). All fifteen of the questions on the CAT exam also help evaluate student empirical and quantitative skills. A full breakdown of the individual college-level results is available in Appendix B. While variability existed between student performance across colleges, all colleges generally underperformed when compared to CAT national norms. As it relates specifically to Empirical and Quantitative Skills, students performed best on questions focusing on their ability evaluate information, potentially indicating that might be an area of higher performance for SHSU students. Students performed the worst on questions focused on creative thinking, problem solving, potentially indicating that these might be areas that SHSU will need to specifically target for student improvement.

Texas Assessment of Critical Thinking Skills (TACTS). As with the CAT, the TACTS Test is also designed to evaluate student Empirical and Quantitative Skills. Pre- and post-test results were analyzed each year using a paired samples *t*-test to determine what, if any, gains

students were making each year. Starting with the fall 2016 semester, student data and results were disaggregated between online and face-to-face students. However, these gains, as evidenced by small to moderate effect sizes, translated to small gains in the total number of questions being answered correctly. Furthermore, when examining the online vs. face-to-face data for 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 it was determined that face-to-face students were making statistically significant gains, while online students were not. A complete breakdown of TACTS results is available in Appendix C.

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). The NSSE was administered to first-year and senior students during the spring 2016 semester. Four questions from the NSSE specifically aligned with empirical and quantitative skills. For first-year students, the mean scores for three of the four questions were lower when compared to our IPEDS Comparison Group. First-year students' scores were also lower for all four questions when compared to our THECB Peer Group. However, scores for seniors showed great improvement. The mean scores for senior students were equivalent to those of the IPEDS and THECB comparison groups for all four questions. A complete breakdown of NSSE results is available in Appendix D.

Teamwork.

Teamwork Self Reflection Instrument (TSRI). The TSRI was developed by OAPA and was piloted during the 2016-2017 academic year. Data from this pilot were used to make revisions and to create a web-based version of this instrument that was piloted again during the 2017-2018 academic year. Data from the 2017-2018 pilot administration provide insight into the teamwork skills of students at SHSU.

An independent samples *t*-test revealed statistically significant differences in the scores of lower- and upper-division students, with upper-division students (i.e., juniors and seniors)

scoring higher on the TSRI than lower-division students (i.e., freshman and sophomores); however, the effect size for this difference was small (Cohen's $d = 0.28$). The TSRI scores for students with more teamwork experiences were generally higher than those of students with fewer teamwork experiences. An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) revealed that statistically significant differences in student scores existed by number of teamwork experiences, although again with a small effect size. The TSRI scores for students with 10 or more teamwork experiences were statistically significantly higher than students with 1-3 experiences, students with 4-6 experiences, and students with 7-9 experiences. A complete breakdown of TSRI results is available in Appendix H.

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). The NSSE was administered to first-year and senior students during the spring 2016 semester. Three questions from the NSSE specifically aligned with teamwork. For first-year students, the mean scores for one of the three was lower when compared to our IPEDS Comparison Group. First-year students' scores were also lower for all three questions when compared to our THECB Peer Group. For senior students, the mean scores for two of the three questions were lower when compared to our IPEDS Comparison Group. Senior students' scores were also lower for two of the three questions when compared to our THECB Peer Group. A complete breakdown of NSSE results are available in Appendix D.

Personal Responsibility.

Course Embedded Contemporary Moral Issues Assessment. The Philosophy program administers a locally-developed, course embedded assessment within PHIL 2306: Contemporary Moral Issues each fall and spring semester. Pre- and post-test results were analyzed each year using a paired samples t -test to determine what, if any, gains students were making. Starting

with the 2016-2017 academic year student data and results were disaggregated between online and face-to-face students. The students in PHIL 2306: Contemporary Moral Issues, regardless of learning modality (i.e., face-to-face vs. online), demonstrated statistically significant gains from pre-to-post each academic year. A full breakdown of results from the Course Embedded Contemporary Moral Issues Assessment are available in Appendix I.

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). The NSSE was administered to first-year and senior students during the spring 2016 semester. Two questions from the NSSE specifically aligned with personal responsibility. For both first-year and senior students, the mean scores for both questions were higher when compared to our IPEDS Comparison Group and were equivalent when compared to our THECB Peer Group. A complete breakdown of NSSE results is available in Appendix D.

Social Responsibility.

Course Embedded American Government Assessment. The Political Science Department administers a locally-developed, course embedded assessment within POLS 2305: American Government each fall semester. Pre- and post-test results were analyzed each year using a paired samples *t*-test to determine what, if any, gains students were making. Students demonstrated statistically significant gains from pre-to-post each academic year. A complete breakdown of results from the Course Embedded American Government Assessment are available in Appendix J.

Course Embedded Texas Government Assessment. The Political Science Department administers a locally-developed, course embedded assessment within POLS 2306: Texas Government each spring semester. Pre- and post-test results were analyzed each year using a paired samples *t*-test to determine what, if any, gains students were making. Students

demonstrated statistically significant gains from pre-to-post each academic year. A complete breakdown of results from the Course Embedded Texas Government Assessment are available in Appendix K.

Course Embedded Contemporary Moral Issues Assessment. The Philosophy program administers a locally-developed, course embedded assessment within PHIL 2306: Contemporary Moral Issues each fall and spring semester. Pre- and post-test results were analyzed each year using a paired samples *t*-test to determine what, if any, gains students were making. Starting with the 2016-2017 academic year, student data and results were disaggregated between online and face-to-face students. The students in PHIL 2306: Contemporary Moral Issues, regardless of learning modality (i.e., face-to-face vs. online), demonstrated statistically significant gains from pre-to-post each academic year. A full breakdown of results from the Course Embedded Contemporary Moral Issues Assessment are available in Appendix I.

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). The NSSE was administered to first-year and senior students during the spring 2016 semester. Eleven questions from the NSSE specifically aligned with social responsibility. For first-year students, the mean scores for five of the eleven questions were higher, with others being equivalent, when compared to our IPEDS Comparison Group. Mean scores were higher for two questions, lower for two questions, and equivalent for seven questions when compared to our THECB Peer Group. Scores for seniors were similar to those of the first-year students. For seniors, the mean scores for five of the eleven questions were higher than our IPEDS Comparison Group, and mean scores for two questions were higher when compared to our THECB Peer Group. A complete breakdown of NSSE results is available in Appendix D.

NSSE Civic Engagement Topical Module. The NSSE Civic Engagement Topical Module consisted of 14 questions specifically related to civic engagement topics. SHSU first-year student responses exceeded the scores of the comparison group for three of the fourteen questions. These questions focused on asking others to address local or campus issues, and organizing others to work on local, campus, state, national, or global issues. SHSU first-year student responses were lower than the comparison group for two of the questions. These questions focused on students informing themselves about local, campus, state, national, or global issues. Senior student responses were lower than the comparison group for three of the fourteen questions, and were equivalent for the other eleven. These questions on which students scored lower than the comparison group focused on students informing themselves of local or campus issues, discussing local or campus issues with others, and raising awareness about local or campus issues. A complete breakdown of results from the NSSE Civic Engagement Topical Module can be found in Appendix L.

NSSE Global Learning Topical Module. The NSSE Global Learning Topical Module consisted of twenty questions specifically related to global learning topics. SHSU first-year student responses and were lower than the comparison group for fourteen of the twenty questions. These questions focused on students informing themselves about local, campus, state, national, or global issues. Senior student performance was similar to that of first-year students, with responses lower than the comparison group for thirteen of the twenty questions. A complete breakdown of results from the NSSE Global Learning Topical Module can be found in Appendix M.

Actions and Follow-ups

Based on analysis of data gathered through the core objective assessment efforts, SHSU has identified a number of planned improvements. Examples are provided here to highlight these recommendations.

Review of Core Learning Outcomes Data by the Core Curriculum Assessment Committee. During the 2017-2018 academic year members of the Core Curriculum Assessment Committee were tasked with reviewing data collected through SHSU's core learning outcomes assessment efforts. Subcommittees for each of the six core learning outcomes were charged with providing the following:

- Recommendations for further ways to explore collected core learning outcomes data
- Recommendations regarding what additional data were needed to fill in any remaining assessment gaps
- Recommendations for improvements that could be made in response to currently available data that could be taken to the University administration

Reports were completed for critical thinking, empirical and quantitative reasoning, personal responsibility, and social responsibility. A summary of the recommendations from the subcommittees are provided.

Critical Thinking Subcommittee. After reviewing various data measures related to critical thinking the sub-committee determined that SHSU students, when compared to their peers, were performing slightly under national averages and that variations were apparent in student critical thinking performance by college and department. The subcommittee determined a need to further investigate institutional definitions of critical thinking and classroom assessment approaches.

As a result, the subcommittee immediately developed and pursued an action to request information from instructors (via the appropriate associate deans) regarding the instructors' definitions and approaches to teaching critical thinking. The following questions were asked:

- How do you define (perceive) critical thinking as it relates to your efforts to teach critical thinking?
- How do you attempt to teach critical thinking?
- How do you assess it and how do you know whether your students are developing their critical thinking ability?

Ultimately, a total of 26 faculty responses were received by the subcommittee. From these responses the sub-committee was able to determine that the most common element of critical thinking identified was related to problem solving, which includes the application of knowledge to address problems. The second and third most commonly cited elements were related to evaluation and to analysis and argument. Metacognition, which includes the avoidance of bias and use of self-regulation of thought processes, was cited by less than a third of the respondents. Only two instructors specifically mentioned valuing or seeking truth/valuing correctness, and only one course included reference to ethical thinking. The sub-committee also determined that discussion, whether in face-to-face groups or online, was, by far, the most commonly used method to teach critical thinking. The second most commonly used method was some form of application of the concepts taught in class to address real-world problems. In five cases in-class group work was done, and in three cases assignments or active learning were mentioned. Finally, the sub-committee determined that exams and quizzes were the dominant assessment methods. Term papers and writing assignments were also used by some instructors, although it may be the case that other instructors also use writing but did not specifically state so. Informal questioning and listening to provide informal feedback was also cited by a few

instructors. Only one course specifically cited the use of instruments specifically designed to measure critical thinking, though one cited a critical thinking rubric.

The subcommittee concluded that the literature on critical thinking, as well as the results of their informal survey of courses at SHSU, suggest that the first step to improving the teaching of critical thinking is to define it as specifically as possible. Such definition will help guide the process of teaching and assessing it. Finally, the use of group work/active learning significantly enhances the critical thinking ability of students. The findings and recommendations of the critical thinking subcommittee will be highlighted as a continued focus of SHSU's assessment efforts moving forward.

Empirical and Quantitative Reasoning Subcommittee. The empirical and quantitative reasoning subcommittee recommended conducting an item analysis of both CAT and TACTS data to better understand how each question aligned with different components of empirical and quantitative reasoning. Examining data from the CAT, the subcommittee concluded that SHSU students scored lower than the national mean on almost all measures of empirical and quantitative reasoning. The committee recommended exploring these data further to determine whether the lower scores were a result of students not obtaining enough knowledge of these skills at SHSU, or if students within comparison groups could have significant demographic differences that could explain why SHSU students were performing at a lower level. The subcommittee also recommended disaggregating empirical and quantitative data by the students' college, department, and/or major. Such breakdown will aid in addressing problems that may pertain to specific colleges and majors.

The subcommittee discussed major-specific courses covering empirical and quantitative reasoning. For example, in the College of Business Administration every student is required to

take BANA 3363: Intermediate Business Analysis. Similarly, every student in the College of Criminal Justice is required to take CRIJ 3378: Intro to Methods of Research. The subcommittee recommended that similar courses be found within all colleges at SHSU. Such courses could provide additional data regarding student attainment of these outcomes as they approach graduation.

The subcommittee also recommended comparing student scores on the CAT and/or TACTS for students enrolled in courses in Mathematics and Life and Physical Science Component Areas. Pre- and post-effect analyses could also be compared by student grade-level, with the expectation that senior students should be scoring higher on empirical and quantitative reasoning than lower division students. These comparisons could yield data that captures practice and application of empirical and quantitative skills in the classroom.

The subcommittee also noticed a trend among the CAT scoring for the 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 assessment cycles. The CAT data indicated that SHSU students have consistently scored the lowest on questions related to identifying additional information needed to evaluate a hypothesis and explaining how changes in a real-world problem might affect the solution. The subcommittee recommended further investigation of these areas and they will be a focus of the University moving forward.

Finally, the subcommittee concluded that although there was not a considerable difference in SHSU student NSSE responses when compared to peer groups, the data did indicate that SHSU students did not feel that they were utilizing empirical and quantitative skills. The subcommittee concluded that this might be due to the phrasing of the question, which asked students to reflect on their experiences “during the current school year...;” however, the subcommittee acknowledged that this was something that may require further review.

Personal Responsibility Subcommittee. The subcommittee expressed concern that too often social responsibility and personal responsibility were being linked within the curriculum, with the assumption that if social responsibility was being covered in course content, then personal responsibility was being covered as well. The subcommittee concluded that the data from the various sections of Contemporary Moral Issues were useful; however, it was limited in timeframe and scope. To complement existing data, the subcommittee recommended developing a list of learning experiences in specific courses and co-curricular activities designed to increase student personal responsibility. These specific courses or activities could then be targeted for assessment.

Social Responsibility Subcommittee. The subcommittee recommended that additional social responsibility data from different sources would complement currently existing data from the NSSE, the Course Embedded American Government Exam, the Course Embedded Texas Government Exam, and the Course Embedded Contemporary Moral Issues Exam and would be useful in helping evaluate student social responsibility skills. They recommended that the University work with the colleges to identify courses addressing social responsibility, determine what formal assessments were being conducted, and work to incorporate them as part of University-wide core learning outcome assessment efforts. The subcommittee further recommended that all students should be exposed to a course within their majors that included personal and professional ethics, and that further efforts could be made to develop student social responsibility skills within non-academic settings as well.

The subcommittee concluded that data from the courses POLS 2305: American Government and POLS 2306: Texas Government revealed that students were increasing their awareness of social responsibility and engagement within those courses. On the other hand, a

review of NSSE data was not as promising. Although the subcommittee observed impressive gains in student perceptions of learning in some areas, they were surprised to note that there were also several areas in which no significant gains were taking place, and some in which the seniors scored lower than the first-year students. Regarding comparison to our peer institutions, the subcommittee observed that first-year students at SHSU scored close to the peer averages and exceed them in several areas. However, SHSU seniors fared worse.

Efforts to Improve Student Written Communication Skills. Improving student written communication skills remains a point of focus for faculty, staff, and administrators at SHSU. Reviews of SHSU written communication data indicate several areas in which student written communication skills could be improved. Furthermore, student responses to the NSSE indicated that SHSU students reported writing less than peers at similar institutions. Therefore, SHSU has taken several steps to improve student written communication skills.

SHSU has long had a program to incorporate writing-enhanced courses into degree plans throughout the curriculum; however, the program was recently re-evaluated and questions were raised as to whether or not it should continue. With data from the written communication core assessments continuing to demonstrate areas for needed improvements, SHSU academic leadership opted for restructuring the writing-enhanced program. Rather than being centralized within Academic Affairs, each academic college was empowered to develop local policies for writing enhanced courses. Each college was required to submit annual reports in which they detail their college-level writing enhanced policies, describe how those policies are implemented and what oversight is in place to ensure compliance and effectiveness, describe how the college is assessing student writing, identify strengths and weaknesses in student written communication skills, and detail a plan for improving student writing in the college. Colleges are expected to

use written communication data gathered through core curriculum assessment efforts, along with any locally collected data, to help examine the written communication performance of their students and to develop further actions for improvement. The first college reports are expected to be submitted by the end of the fall 2018 semester.

With the conclusion of the first complete AWC cycle, the Office of Academic Planning and Assessment has made several recommendations for actions to be taken in response to the core writing data. These recommendations included a closer examination of the efficacy of writing-enhanced courses by studying the relationship between the number of writing-enhanced courses a student takes and the student's written communication performance, examining the relationship between the quality of the writing assignments and student writing performance, and examining differences in student written communication skills by student demographic characteristics (e.g., race/ethnicity, gender, first-generation status, first-time-freshman/transfer status).

Critical Thinking Course Content Alignment and Assessment Redesign. In reviewing longitudinal data gathered through the TACTS test, the Philosophy Program, in conjunction with the Director of Assessment, determined that although students consistently made statistically significant gains in pre- to post-test performance, the size of these gains had declined over time. Furthermore, disaggregating the TACTS data by face-to-face and online learning modalities revealed online students were not making the same gains as face-to-face students. Several steps were taken by the Philosophy Program in order to address these identified issues.

First, the program has extensively revised the TACTS assessment instrument used to evaluate student critical thinking skills within PHIL 2303: Critical Thinking. Prior to the 2017-

2018 academic year the program used the original version of the TACTS instrument, which presented students with questions and concepts beyond those covered in PHIL 2303. In order to improve the quality and usefulness of data being collected, a revised version of the TACTS was developed by faculty teaching PHIL 2303 that focused only on the concepts being taught within that course. While the original TACTS instrument provided necessary data, it is expected that the revised instrument will yield more accurate results regarding student critical thinking skills and abilities within that course and will allow the program and University to set more consistent benchmarks for student success.

Second, the decline in student pre- to post-test performance, as well as the differences in in online and face-to-face student performance, prompted the Philosophy Program to examine the curriculum and content of each of the sections of PHIL 2303. Over time, the program has expanded the number of sections of PHIL 2303 being taught, as well as the number of different faculty teaching the course. This examination revealed that some of the newer faculty members were not covering all of the expected content areas and outcomes for the course. Further investigation revealed that curriculum expectations and requirements had not been adequately explained to these newer faculty. In response, the program has corrected cases of misinformation and has taken steps to ensure that in the future all faculty members are given clear expectations regarding required course/program outcomes. These steps will help ensure that all sections of PHIL 2303 are covering all expected outcomes. It is expected that these changes should improve student learning within those course sections and lead to further increases in student critical thinking skills.

Third, the Philosophy Program has partnered with the OAPA to develop and implement an additional assessment of student metacognition and intellectual humility. This new

instrument has been incorporated into the revised TACTS test and is administered to students in a pre- to post-test approach each semester. Metacognition and intellectual humility are both important facets of critical thinking requiring additional assessment. The data from these additional assessments will provide valuable insight into these student skills and will serve as potential models of assessment for other core curriculum outcomes.

Core Curriculum Core Course Syllabi Review. A broad examination of student performance across several of the core objectives indicated that efforts could be made to strengthen student performance. As part of larger efforts to improve student core objective knowledge, it was determined that a review was needed of existing core curriculum courses to help ensure these courses were adequately covering necessary core objectives. During the spring 2018 semester, members of the SHSU Core Curriculum Assessment Committee reviewed a sample of core curriculum course syllabi from the fall 2017 semester. A total of 151 course syllabi were reviewed by the committee, representing approximately 25% of the core curriculum courses offered in the fall of 2017. A stratified random sampling process was used to select the courses for review to ensure that a representative number of courses from all nine SHSU core curriculum component areas were included. Reviewers were asked to determine whether required core learning objectives were present within course syllabi using the following scale: “No Emphasis Present,” “Minimal Emphasis Present,” or “Major Emphasis Present.” It should be noted that if an outcome was not present within the syllabus of a course it did not necessarily mean that the outcome was not being addressed within the course, only that evidence was not present within the course syllabus.

The review revealed several areas in which core curriculum outcomes were not present within course syllabi. The data from this review were distributed to leadership in the Division of

Academic Affairs and to the Council of Academic Deans for review and action. Individual college-level reports were also provided to the appropriate deans and associate deans of each college. It was determined that during the 2018-2019 academic year the Director of Assessment and the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs will hold meetings with the leadership of each college to discuss their college-level results, to develop strategies for improving the articulation of necessary core curriculum learning outcomes within course material, and, when necessary, to develop strategies for better incorporation and assessment of these outcomes within the course curriculum. Preliminary discussion and findings reveal that while course content and instruction is addressing the required Core Learning Objectives, instructors are not always explicitly addressing the Core Learning Objectives within their syllabi. A follow-up review of core curriculum course syllabi will be conducted in fall 2019 to determine what improvements have been made.

2016 National Survey of Student Engagement Executive Summary Report.

Following the spring 2016 NSSE administration, the SHSU President formed an ad hoc committee to review SHSU's data and to develop recommendations for improving student learning and experiences. The committee recommended that SHSU work to promote greater student engagement in High Impact Practices (HIPs) across the institution. HIPs include First-year Seminars/Experiences, Common Intellectual Experiences, Learning Communities, Writing-intensive Courses, Collaborative Assignments and Projects, Undergraduate Research, Diversity/Global Learning, Service Learning/Community-based Learning, Internships, and Capstone Courses and Projects. The committee noted that all students can benefit from HIPs, but that SHSU students could gain greater benefit if they were engaged early in HIPs during their first year.

The committee also recommended students be provided more opportunities, both within the curriculum and within co-curricular activities, to be better informed about campus, local, state, national, and global issues. Additionally, the committee recommended that the University take steps to encourage all students to discuss these issues with others, to work to raise awareness of these issues, and to work with others to respond to them within curricular and co-curricular environments. The committee recommended similar actions related to engaging students in global learning. Such examples could include expanded study abroad and international internships; however, the committee recommended that the University explore other means for bringing global and international topics and experiences to the local campus. Colleges and departments could be encouraged to examine where additional global learning topics could be infused within the curriculum and existing student programming within both the Divisions of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs.

The committee noted that first-year students indicated being less engaged with quantitative reasoning activities than students from other institutions. SHSU first-year students reported less frequency in (a) reaching conclusions based on analysis of numerical information, (b) using numerical information to examine real world issues, and (c) evaluating what others have concluded from numerical information. The committee recommended further examinations of direct data related to student quantitative reasoning skills in order to identify specific areas in need of improvement.

Finally, the committee also noted that senior students reported being less engaged with collaborative learning. SHSU senior students reported less frequency in working with other students on course projects or assignments and in preparing for exams by discussing or working through course materials with other students. As with quantitative reasoning, the committee

recommended further examination of data related to teamwork skills and consideration of targeted initiatives to address any identified areas for improvement.

Evaluation of the Assessment Process

Since the implementation of the revised core curriculum in fall 2014, SHSU has instituted a robust core objective assessment plan employing multiple measures, both direct and indirect, from multiple points across the curriculum. The assessment plan used by SHSU has several strengths. SHSU's core assessment plan focuses on using authentic student learning artifacts and measures to assess student learning. Examples include the AWC project, which employs a faculty derived rubric to evaluate authentic examples of student writing; faculty designed course-embedded measures in American Government, Texas Government, Critical Thinking, and Contemporary Moral Issues, and the locally developed TSRI instrument.

External measures, like the CAT and the NSSE, were chosen carefully and were selected because of the value of the data they provide and their alignment with SHSU's approach to the Core Learning Objectives. For example, although the CAT was developed outside of SHSU, it was a faculty designed and developed instrument. Its scenario-based questions and short-answer format provide a better measure of student critical thinking, empirical and quantitative reasoning, and communication skills than other commercially available instruments. Furthermore, assessments like the AWC and the CAT are locally-scored using faculty scorers and provide valuable faculty development and exposure to the teaching and assessment of the core learning objectives.

This authentic and robust assessment approach yields valuable data that is extensively applied at the program, department, college, and university levels to improve student attainment of the Core Learning Objectives throughout the curriculum. However, core learning assessment

at SHSU remains an ongoing and evolving process and efforts are always underway to address any weaknesses within the plan. Additional course-embedded measures for all the core learning objectives, particularly from other courses within the core, would help complement the measures that are already in place. Furthermore, the plan would benefit from additional institutional-level assessments of visual communication, oral communication, teamwork, and personal responsibility.

There are a number of planned actions to improve the core assessment process at SHSU. First, OAPA is actively working with the academic colleges to identify additional course-embedded measures from core curriculum courses. Additional measures for all core objectives would provide useful data; however, a particular focus will be on potential measures for oral/visual communication, teamwork, and personal responsibility. Second, opportunities for assessment within Academic Community Engagement (ACE) courses is being explored. Existing measures within these courses are being used by the Center for Community Engagement and could potentially provide valuable direct and indirect data related to several of the core objectives, including communication, social responsibility, and personal responsibility. Third, while initial analysis of the core learning data has proven fruitful, more robust analysis efforts are needed to fully understand, and ultimately improve, student learning. Where data are available, SHSU will be looking to establish equity targets for student learning and achievement by student race/ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status, first-generation status, and transfer status. By disaggregating and analyzing the core learning data by these factors, strengths and weaknesses can be identified that are not evident when analyzing the data in aggregate.

Summary

In summary, SHSU has implemented an extensive and robust assessment plan designed to evaluate student attainment of each of the THECB's Core Learning Objectives. Data from these assessments have helped SHSU better understand student learning and attainment of the Core Learning Objectives both within the curriculum and as students approach graduation. The data gathered from these assessments have revealed interesting patterns in student learning and attainment of the Core Learning Objectives. Across many areas, SHSU students have shown many strengths. Where areas of student underperformance have been identified, SHSU has implemented steps to improve student learning and success. Overtime it is expected that student performance will increase and the University will be gradually raising its expectations for student attainment of the Core Learning Objectives. Throughout this process, SHSU's core assessment plan will remain an invaluable tool for improving the quality of the education for all students at the University.

Appendix A

Assessment of Written Communication (AWC) Writing Assessment Rubric

Writing Assessment Rubric

This rubric asks you to identify features of the writing present in the sample. You should *apply the numerical score based on degree of presence* of the characteristic features. The writing features selected for the rubric are those most likely present in any disciplinary writing sample and represent a writing level expected of a senior-level college student.

Legend: N/A = Not Applicable
 1 = few features are present
 2 = features are not often present
 3 = features are often present
 4 = features are most always present

CATEGORY	CHARACTERISTIC FEATURES
<p>Ideas/Critical Thinking/Synthesis <i>The depth of sophistication of thoughts and ideas.</i> Features may include research, reasoning, evidence, detail, and development (appropriate to the field and genre)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central subject or argument of the assignment is easily identified, clearly emphasized, consistent with the evidence, and intriguing • Reasoning is fully developed throughout the assignment with logical examples, details, and evidence where and as appropriate • Assignment contains information that addresses counterarguments, biases, or reader's expectations as appropriate
<p>Style <i>The choices the writer makes for specific audiences.</i> Features may include word choice, tone, and sentence length and structure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustained awareness of audience throughout the assignment • Writing tone suits the audience and enhances the assignment's purpose • Sentence structure varies according to the content, purpose, and audience • Sentences are consistently clear and logical • Word choice is appropriate to the writing task
<p>Organization <i>The coherence of the writing.</i> Features may include balance and ordering of ideas, flow, transition, and appropriate format (as defined in assignment)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Text is purposefully organized and substantially developed in a way that clarifies the argument and enhances style • Arrangement of ideas (overall structure) is clear, logical, and compelling as appropriate to the assignment; the reader moves through the text easily • Internal structure is cohesive and coherent; text flows and ideas are clearly and logically connected • Transitions used appropriately
<p>Conventions <i>Adherence to standard American edited English.</i> Features include grammar, punctuation, capitalization, spelling, and documentation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grammar and mechanics support the reader's understanding of the writer's purpose without distracting errors • Documentation style is consistent, if appropriate to assignment • Sources, when appropriate, are effectively integrated into the body of the assignment • Minor errors do not interfere with readability or damage the writer's credibility (as appropriate to the assignment parameters)

Appendix B
CAT Results by College, 2015-2018

CAT Results, by College, 2015-2018

	National Mean	COSET		CHSS		COBA		COE		COCJ		COFAMC		COHS	
		Mean	Effect Size	Mean	Effect Size	Mean	Effect Size	Mean	Effect Size	Mean	Effect Size	Mean	Effect Size	Mean	Effect Size
Q1	0.67	0.69		0.73		0.61*	-0.13	0.69		0.64		0.55**	-0.26	0.59**	-0.18
Q2	1.21	1.22		1.11		0.78***	-0.42	0.86***	-0.33	0.86***	-0.35	0.70***	-0.51	0.92***	-0.28
Q3	1.35	1.01***	-0.35	0.84***	-0.50	0.66***	-0.69	0.47***	-0.97	0.67***	-0.70	0.78***	-0.60	0.78***	-0.56
Q4	1.41	1.21		0.85***	-0.48	0.48***	-0.90	0.41***	-0.98	0.73***	-0.61	0.83***	-0.52	0.89***	-0.45
Q5	0.73	0.73		0.72		0.70		0.67		0.73		0.74		0.70	
Q6	1.56	1.68		1.39*	-0.20	1.13***	-0.52	1.13***	-0.53	1.19***	-0.43	1.28**	-0.33	1.31***	-0.31
Q7	0.82	0.45***	-0.57	0.34***	-0.77	0.30***	-0.87	0.21***	-1.01	0.21***	-1.06	0.35***	-0.78	0.31***	-0.84
Q8	0.68	0.65		0.59*	-0.20	0.52***	-0.34	0.66		0.53***	-0.34	0.64		0.66	
Q9	0.93	0.61***	-0.45	0.58***	-0.49	0.52***	-0.59	0.59***	-0.48	0.54***	-0.57	0.68***	-0.37	0.70***	-0.31
Q10	3.14	3.16		2.96*	-0.19	3.02*	-0.13	2.93**	-0.22	2.94**	-0.20	3.19		3.06	
Q11	1.11	0.81***	-0.44	0.68***	-0.66	0.53***	-0.92	0.39***	-1.21	0.80***	-0.48	0.79***	-0.51	0.85***	-0.40
Q12	0.82	0.80		0.68***	-0.31	0.78		0.70***	-0.28	0.66***	-0.37	0.77		0.80	
Q13	1.18	1.03		0.96*	-0.21	0.80***	-0.41	0.63***	-0.62	0.74***	-0.48	0.85**	-0.33	0.81***	-0.37
Q14	2.29	2.38		1.78**	-0.28	1.77***	-0.30	1.45***	-0.49	1.85**	-0.24	1.89*	-0.22	2.16	
Q15	1.15	0.57***	-0.62	0.56***	-0.61	0.43***	-0.79	0.25***	-1.04	0.52***	-0.66	0.56***	-0.62	0.67***	-0.47
Total Score	19.04	16.98***	-0.35	14.75***	-0.70	13.04***	-1.13	12.04***	-1.31	13.61***	-0.96	14.58***	-0.85	15.22***	-0.67

Note. *p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001 (2-tailed)

Appendix C
TACTS Results, 2015-2018

TACTS Results, 2015-2018

Year		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M%</i>	<i>SD%</i>
2015-2016						
	Pre-test	394	12.49	n/a	35.70	10.33
	Post-test	394	14.18	n/a	40.50	12.43
2016-2017						
	Pre-test					
	Face-to-Face	326	10.42	3.94	29.76	11.27
	Online	22	12.68	3.14	36.23	8.97
	Overall	348	10.56	3.93	30.17	11.23
	Post-test					
	Face-to-Face	326	11.53	4.48	32.95	12.81
	Online	22	13.68	3.34	39.09	9.55
	Overall	348	11.67	4.45	33.34	12.71
2017-2018						
	Pre-test					
	Face-to-Face	321	6.79	2.25	33.94	11.25
	Online	26	4.46	1.45	22.31	7.24
	Overall	347	6.61	2.28	33.07	11.41
	Post-test					
	Face-to-Face	321	8.33	2.53	41.65	12.65
	Online	26	4.54	1.50	22.69	7.51
	Overall	347	8.05	2.66	40.23	13.31

Appendix D
NSSE Results for First-year and Senior Students

2016 NSSE Comparison Report for First-Year Students

NSSE Items	SHSU Mean	IPEDS Comparison Group	Effect Size	THECB Peer Group	Effect Size
Critical Thinking Attainment Target					
During the current school year, about how often have you done the following?					
2a. Combined ideas from different courses when completing assignments	2.5	2.6***	-0.14	2.7***	-0.22
2d. Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue	2.7	2.8		2.8***	-0.16
2e. Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective	2.8	2.9		2.9***	-0.15
2f. Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept	2.8	2.8		2.9***	-0.16
2g. Connected ideas from your courses to your prior experiences and knowledge	2.9	3.0*	-0.10	3.1***	-0.18
4b. Applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations	2.9	2.9*	-0.09	2.9	
4c. Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts	2.9	2.9		3.0*	-0.09
4d. Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source	2.9	2.9		3.0*	-0.09
4e. Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information	2.8	2.8		2.9**	-0.11
9a. Identified key information from reading assignments	3.0	3.0		3.1*	-0.11
How much has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, personal development in the following areas?					
17c. Thinking critically and analytically	3.0	3.0		3.1	
17i. Solving complex real-world problems	2.6	2.6		2.7	
Communication Attainment Target					
During the current school year, about how often have you done the following?					
1i. Given a course presentation	2.2	2.2		2.2	

9c. Summarized what you learned in class or from course materials	2.8	2.8		2.8	
How much has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following?					
17a. Writing clearly and effectively	2.8	2.8		2.9	
17b. Speaking clearly and effectively	2.7	2.7		2.8**	-0.13
During the current school year, about how many papers, reports, or other writing tasks of the following length have you been assigned? (Include those not yet completed)					
7a. Up to 5 pages	5.6	6.3**	-0.13	5.5	
7b. Between 6 and 10 pages	1.4	2.0***	-0.21	2.0***	-0.19
7c. 11 pages or more	0.6	0.7		0.9*	-0.10
Estimated number of assigned pages of student writing	34	43.3***	-0.16	43.1***	-0.13
Empirical and Quantitative Skills Attainment Target					
During the current school year, about how often have you done the following?					
6a. Reached conclusions based on your own analysis of numerical information (numbers, graphs, statistics, etc.)	2.5	2.6**	-0.12	2.6**	-0.12
6b. Used numerical information to examine a real-world problem or issue (unemployment, climate change, public health, etc.)	2.3	2.3		2.3*	-0.10
6c. Evaluated what others have concluded from numerical information	2.2	2.3**	-0.11	2.3*	-0.11
How much has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following?					
17d. Analyzing numerical and statistical information	2.5	2.7**	-0.12	2.7***	-0.16
Teamwork Attainment Target					
During the current school year, about how often have you done the following?					
1g. Prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students	2.5	2.5		2.6***	-0.14
1h. Worked with other students on course projects or assignments	2.5	2.6*	-0.10	2.7***	-0.20
How much has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following?					
17f. Working effectively with others	2.9	2.8		3.0*	-0.12
Personal Responsibility Attainment Target					

How much has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following?					
17g. Developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics	2.8	2.6**	0.12	2.8	
17j. Being an informed and active citizen	2.7	2.6***	0.16	2.8	
Social Responsibility Attainment Target					
During the current school year, about how often have you done the following?					
2b. Connected your learning to societal problems or issues	2.5	2.6		2.6*	-0.09
2c. Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments	2.6	2.5		2.6	
During the current school year, about how often have you had discussions with people from the following groups?					
8a. People of a race or ethnicity other than your own	3.1	3.0***	0.16	3.0**	0.13
8b. People from an economic background other than your own	3.1	3.0**	0.12	3.0*	0.10
8c. People with religious beliefs other than your own	2.9	3.0		3.0	
8d. . . people with political views other than your own	3.0	3.0		3.0	
How much does your institution emphasize the following?					
14d. Encouraging contact among students from different backgrounds (social, racial/ethnic, religious, etc.)	2.7	2.7		2.9*	-0.12
14i. Attending events that address important social, economic, or political issues	2.5	2.5		2.7***	-0.16
About how many hours do you spend in a typical 7-day week doing the following?					
15e. Doing community service or volunteer work	3.2	2.4***	0.18	3.1	
How much has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following?					
17h. Understanding people of other backgrounds (economic, racial/ethnic, political, religious, nationality, etc.)	2.9	2.7***	0.24	2.9	
17j. Being an informed and active citizen	2.7	2.6***	0.16	2.8	

Note: Items with mean differences that are larger than would be expected by chance are noted with asterisk referring to three significance levels (* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$). Where statistically significant differences were observed, effect sizes are provided to help judge the practical meaning of the differences. Effect sizes of less than 0.20 are considered trivial, 0.20 - 0.49 are considered small, 0.50 - 0.80 are considered large.

2016 NSSE Comparison Report for Seniors

NSSE Items	SHSU Mean	IPEDS Comparison Group	Effect Size	THECB Peer Group	Effect Size
Critical Thinking Attainment Target					
During the current school year, about how often have you done the following?					
2a. Combined ideas from different courses when completing assignments	2.9	3.0*	-0.06	3.0*	-0.06
2d. Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue	2.9	2.8		2.8	
2e. Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective	2.9	2.9		3.0*	-0.06
2f. Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept	2.9	2.9		3.0*	-0.07
2g. Connected ideas from your courses to your prior experiences and knowledge	3.2	3.2		3.2	
4b. Applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations	3.1	3.1		3.1	
4c. Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts	3.0	3.0		3.1*	-0.07
4d. Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source	3.0	2.9**	0.08	3.0	
4e. Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information	3.0	2.9		3.0	
9a. Identified key information from reading assignments	3.1	3.2		3.2	
How much has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following?					
17c. Thinking critically and analytically	3.3	3.3		3.3	
17i. Solving complex real-world problems	2.9	2.8*	0.07	2.9	
Communication Attainment Target					
During the current school year, about how often have you done the following?					
1i. Given a course presentation	2.6	2.6		2.7**	-0.09

9c. Summarized what you learned in class or from course materials	3.0	2.9***	0.11	3.0	
How much has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following?					
17a. Writing clearly and effectively	3.0	3.0*	0.08	3.0	
17b. Speaking clearly and effectively	3.0	2.9***	0.11	3.0	
During the current school year, about how many papers, reports, or other writing tasks of the following length have you been assigned? (Include those not yet completed)					
7a. Up to 5 pages	6.0	7.2***	-0.19	6.3	
7b. Between 6 and 10 pages	2.4	3.1***	-0.19	2.9***	-0.13
7c. 11 pages or more	1.3	1.7***	-0.13	1.8***	-0.14
Estimated number of assigned pages of student writing	53.5	69.5***	-0.20	66.1***	-0.15
Which of the following have you done or do you plan to do before you graduate?					
11f. Complete a culminating Senior Experience (capstone course, senior project or thesis, etc.)	18%	41%***	-0.51	34%***	-0.38
Empirical and Quantitative Skills Attainment Target					
During the current school year, about how often have you done the following?					
6a. Reached conclusions based on your own analysis of numerical information (numbers, graphs, statistics, etc.)	2.6	2.7		2.7	
6b. Used numerical information to examine a real-world problem or issue (unemployment, climate change, public health, etc.)	2.5	2.5		2.5	
6c. Evaluated what others have concluded from numerical information	2.4	2.5		2.4	
How much has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following?					
17d. Analyzing numerical and statistical information	2.8	2.8		2.9	
Teamwork Attainment Target					
During the current school year, about how often have you done the following?					
1g. Prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students	2.5	2.5*	-0.07	2.6**	-0.09

1h. Working with other students on course projects or assignments	2.8	2.9*	-0.07	2.9*	-0.07
How much has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following?					
17f. Working effectively with others	3.0	3.0		3.1	
Personal Responsibility Attainment Target					
How much has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following?					
17g. Developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics	2.9	2.8**	0.10	2.9	
17j. Being an informed and active citizen	2.7	2.6**	0.10	2.7	
Social Responsibility Attainment Target					
During the current school year, about how often have you done the following?					
2b. Connected your learning to societal problems or issues	2.9	2.8		2.8	
2c. Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments	2.6	2.6		2.6	
During the current school year, about how often have you had discussions with people from the following groups?					
8a. People of a race or ethnicity other than your own	3.2	3.0***	0.16	3.1**	0.09
8b. People from an economic background other than your own	3.1	3.0**	.08	3.1	
8c. People with religious beliefs other than your own	3.0	3.0		3.0	
8d. People with political views other than your own	3.0	3.0		3.0	
How much does your institution emphasize the following?					
14d. Encouraging contact among students from different backgrounds (social, racial/ethnic, religious, etc.)	2.7	2.5***	0.20	2.7*	0.08
14i. Attending events that address important social, economic, or political issues	2.4	2.4		2.4	
About how many hours do you spend in a typical 7-day week doing the following?					
15e. Doing community service or volunteer work	3.3	3.1		3.6	
How much has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following?					

17h. Understanding people of other backgrounds (economic, racial/ethnic, political, religious, nationality, etc.)	2.9	2.8***	0.12	2.9	
17j. Being an informed and active citizen	2.7	2.6**	0.10	2.7	

Note: Items with mean differences that are larger than would be expected by chance are noted with asterisk referring to three significance levels (* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$). Where statistically significant differences were observed, effect sizes are provided to help judge the practical meaning of the differences. Effect sizes of less than 0.20 are considered trivial, 0.20 - 0.49 are considered small, 0.50 - 0.80 are considered large.

Appendix E
AWC Results, 2014-2018

Comparison of 2013 and 2014-2015 Scores for the College of Education

	2013 Baseline (<i>n</i> = 93)		2014-2015 (<i>n</i> = 240)	
Writing Skills Domain	<i>M</i>		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Ideas/Critical Thinking/Synthesis	2.67		2.60	0.72
Style	2.67		2.61	0.59
Organization	2.73		2.74	0.64
Conventions	2.59		2.40	0.74
Overall Average	2.67		2.59	0.55

Comparison of 2013 and 2014-2015 Scores for the College of Sciences and Engineering Technology

	2013 Baseline (<i>n</i> = 77)		2014-2015 (<i>n</i> = 241)	
Writing Skills Domain	<i>M</i>		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Ideas/Critical Thinking/Synthesis	2.72		2.24	0.70
Style	2.65		2.32	0.66
Organization	2.40		2.34	0.67
Conventions	2.23		2.08	0.68
Overall Average	2.40		2.24	0.58

Comparison of 2013 and 2015-2016 Scores for the College of Business Administration

	2013 Baseline (<i>n</i> = 60)		2015-2016 (<i>n</i> = 320)	
Writing Skills Domain	<i>M</i>		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Ideas/Critical Thinking/Synthesis	2.60		2.46	0.62
Style	2.65		2.37	0.55
Organization	2.59		2.63	0.62
Conventions	2.58		2.34	0.61
Overall Average	2.60		2.45	0.50

Comparison of 2013 and 2015-2016 Scores for the College of Criminal Justice

	2013 Baseline (<i>n</i> = 54)		2015-2016 (<i>n</i> = 227)	
Writing Skills Domain	<i>M</i>		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Ideas/Critical Thinking/Synthesis	2.71		2.32	0.78
Style	2.74		2.19	0.71
Organization	2.69		2.45	0.76
Conventions	2.65		1.98	0.74
Overall Average	2.70		2.23	0.64

Comparison of 2013 and 2016-2017 Scores for the College of Humanities and Social Sciences

	2013 Baseline (<i>n</i> = 71)		2016-2017 (<i>n</i> = 249)	
Writing Skills Domain	<i>M</i>		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Ideas/Critical Thinking/Synthesis	2.80		2.63	0.63
Style	2.78		2.50	0.59
Organization	2.66		2.59	0.59
Conventions	2.65		2.38	0.58
Overall Average	2.72		2.52	0.52

Descriptive Statistics for College of Health Sciences (2016-2017)

Writing Skills Domain	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Ideas/Critical Thinking/Synthesis	2.38	0.65
Style	2.27	0.62
Organization	2.36	0.63
Conventions	2.02	0.62
Overall Average	2.26	0.55

Note. The number of student artifacts was 261. No comparison scores from 2013 were available for the College of Health Sciences.

Comparison of 2013 and 2017-2018 Scores for the College of Fine Arts and Mass Communication

	2013 Baseline (<i>n</i> = 40)		2017-2018 (<i>n</i> = 237)	
Writing Skills Domain	<i>M</i>		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Ideas/Critical Thinking/Synthesis	2.53		2.95	0.68
Style	2.44		3.01	0.66
Organization	2.40		2.84	0.70
Conventions	2.23		2.94	0.63
Overall Average	2.40		2.93	0.57

Comparison of 2013 and 2014-2018 University-wide Writing Scores

	2013 Baseline (<i>n</i> = 395)		2014-2018 (<i>n</i> = 1,775)	
Writing Skills Domain	<i>M</i>		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Ideas/Critical Thinking/Synthesis	2.68		2.51	0.71
Style	2.67		2.45	0.66
Organization	2.63		2.58	0.68
Conventions	2.57		2.31	0.73
Overall Average	2.64		2.46	0.60

Appendix F

CAT Results for Questions Related to Communication, by College, 2015-2018

CAT Results for Questions Related to Communication, by College, 2015-2018

	COSET		CHSS		COBA		COE		COCJ		COFAMC		COHS		
	National Mean	Mean	Effect Size	Mean	Effect Size	Mean	Effect Size	Mean	Effect Size	Mean	Effect Size	Mean	Effect Size	Mean	Effect Size
Q2	1.21	1.22		1.11		0.78***	-0.42	0.86***	-0.33	0.86***	-0.35	0.70***	-0.51	0.92***	-0.28
Q3	1.35	1.01***	-0.35	0.84***	-0.50	0.66***	-0.69	0.47***	-0.97	0.67***	-0.70	0.78***	-0.60	0.78***	-0.56
Q4	1.41	1.21		0.85***	-0.48	0.48***	-0.90	0.41***	-0.98	0.73***	-0.61	0.83***	-0.52	0.89***	-0.45
Q6	1.56	1.68		1.39*	-0.20	1.13***	-0.52	1.13***	-0.53	1.19***	-0.43	1.28**	-0.33	1.31***	-0.31
Q7	0.82	0.45***	-0.57	0.34***	-0.77	0.30***	-0.87	0.21***	-1.01	0.21***	-1.06	0.35***	-0.78	0.31***	-0.84
Q9	0.93	0.61***	-0.45	0.58***	-0.49	0.52***	-0.59	0.59***	-0.48	0.54***	-0.57	0.68***	-0.37	0.70***	-0.31
Q11	1.11	0.81***	-0.44	0.68***	-0.66	0.53***	-0.92	0.39***	-1.21	0.80***	-0.48	0.79***	-0.51	0.85***	-0.40
Q14	2.29	2.38		1.78**	-0.28	1.77***	-0.30	1.45***	-0.49	1.85**	-0.24	1.89*	-0.22	2.16	
Q15	1.15	0.57***	-0.62	0.56***	-0.61	0.43***	-0.79	0.25***	-1.04	0.52***	-0.66	0.56***	-0.62	0.67***	-0.47

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$ (2-tailed)

Appendix G

Results from Course-Embedded English Assessment

Descriptive Statistics for Student Writing in Course-Embedded English Assessment

Course Level	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
2014-2015			
1000-level (Total)	229	5.07	1.49
ENGL 1301	55	4.89	1.49
ENGL 1302	174	5.12	1.50
2000-level	60	5.42	1.28
4000-level	34	5.26	1.58
2015-2016			
1000-level (Total)	242	5.05	1.41
ENGL 1301	67	5.28	1.25
ENGL 1302	175	4.95	1.46
2000-level	42	5.26	1.36
4000-level	9	5.44	1.42

Student Writing Scores by Course Type

Student Score	ENGL 1301		ENGL 1302		2000-level		4000-level	
	2014-2015	2015-2016	2014-2015	2015-2016	2014-2015	2015-2016	2014-2015	2015-2016
2	3	0	6	10	1	1	1	0
3	10	3	19	20	2	3	5	1
4	7	22	36	31	11	8	3	1
5	13	9	44	54	18	12	11	3
6	14	19	36	33	16	9	6	1
7	8	14	22	21	9	8	5	3
8	0	0	11	6	3	1	3	0

Percentage of Student Writing Scores by Course Type

Student Score	ENGL 1301		ENGL 1302		2000-level		4000-level	
	2014-2015	2015-2016	2014-2015	2015-2016	2014-2015	2015-2016	2014-2015	2015-2016
2	5.45%	0.0%	3.45%	5.7%	1.67%	2.4%	2.94%	0.0%
3	18.18%	4.5%	10.92%	11.4%	3.33%	7.1%	14.70%	11.1%
4	12.73%	32.8%	20.69%	17.7%	18.33%	19.0%	8.82%	11.1%
5	23.64%	13.4%	25.29%	30.9%	30.00%	28.6%	32.35%	33.3%
6	25.45%	28.4%	20.69%	18.9%	26.67%	21.4%	17.65%	11.1%
7	14.54%	20.9%	12.64%	12.0%	15.00%	19.0%	14.70%	33.3%
8	0.00%	0.0%	6.32%	3.4%	5.00%	2.4%	8.82%	0.0%

Appendix H
TSRI Results

Differences in Student TSRI Results by Number of Teamwork Experiences

Number of Teamwork Experiences	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	SD
0 Experiences	19	48.84	8.98
1-3 Experiences	216	49.16	8.68
4-6 Experiences	256	50.32	7.72
7-9 Experiences	113	50.36	7.49
10 or more Experiences	285	53.55	7.84

Differences in Student TSRI Results by Student Level

Student Level	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	SD
Beginning of Experience	300	49.54	7.72
End of Experience	589	51.81	8.31

Appendix I

Results from the Course Embedded Contemporary Moral Issues Assessment, 2015-2018

Results from the Course Embedded Contemporary Moral Issues Assessment, 2015-2018

Year		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M%</i>	<i>SD%</i>
2015-2016						
	Pre-test	413	11.82	N/A	47.26	10.89
	Post-test	413	15.96	N/A	63.84	14.33
2016-2017						
	Pre-test					
	Face-to-Face	435	14.18	N/A	56.71	12.37
	Online	99	14.16	N/A	56.65	13.18
	Overall	534	14.18	N/A	56.70	12.51
	Post-test					
	Face-to-Face	435	17.23	N/A	68.91	13.23
	Online	99	17.43	N/A	69.70	14.29
	Overall	534	17.27	N/A	69.06	13.42
2017-2018						
	Pre-test					
	Face-to-Face	245	15.03	3.10	60.13	12.40
	Online	67	14.60	3.44	58.39	13.77
	Overall	312	14.94	3.18	59.76	12.70
	Post-test					
	Face-to-Face	245	17.68	2.92	70.73	11.67
	Online	67	17.76	3.87	71.04	15.48
	Overall	312	17.70	3.14	70.79	12.55

Appendix J

Results from the Course Embedded American Government Assessment, 2015-2017

*Descriptive Statistics for Student Pre- and Post-Scores on Course-Embedded Assessments in
POLS 2305: American Government*

	<i>n</i>	<i>M %</i>	<i>SD %</i>
Fall 2015			
Pre-test Scores	361	77.45	14.52
Post-test Scores	361	82.87	12.84
Fall 2016			
Pre-test Scores	528	75.84	14.50
Post-test Scores	528	82.54	14.10
Fall 2017			
Pre-test Scores	750	74.80	14.73
Post-test Scores	750	81.42	12.90

Appendix K

Results from the Course Embedded Texas Government Assessment, 2016-2018

*Descriptive Statistics for Student Pre- and Post-Scores on Course-Embedded Assessments in
POLs 2306: Texas Government*

	<i>n</i>	<i>M %</i>	<i>SD %</i>
Spring 2016			
Pre-test Scores	564	43.48	14.74
Post-test Scores	564	55.85	17.05
Spring 2017			
Pre-test Scores	483	41.45	14.40
Post-test Scores	483	52.61	15.53
Spring 2018			
Pre-test Scores	124	44.03	12.29
Post-test Scores	124	55.56	14.89

Appendix L

Results from the NSSE Civic Engagement Topical Module for First-Year and Senior Students

2016 NSSE Civic Engagement Topical Module Results for First-Year Students

NSSE Items	SHSU Mean	IPEDS Comparison Group	Effect Size
Select the response that best represents your ability to do the following			
1a. Help people resolve their disagreements with each other	5.0	5.0	
1b. Resolve conflicts that involve bias, discrimination, and prejudice	4.7	4.7	
1c. Lead a group where people from different backgrounds feel welcomed and included	4.9	4.8	
1d. Contribute to the well-being of your community	5.0	5.0	
During the current school year, whether course-related or not, about how often have you done the following?			
2a. Informed yourself about local or campus issues	2.3	2.4*	-0.11
2b. Informed yourself about state, national, or global issues	2.5	2.6**	-0.14
2c. Discussed local or campus issues with others	2.3	2.3	
2d. Discussed state, national or global issues with others	2.5	2.5	
2e. Raised awareness about local or campus issues	1.8	1.7	
2f. Raised awareness about state, national or global issues	1.8	1.8	
2g. Asked others to address local or campus issues	1.7	1.6*	0.11
2h. Asked others to address state, national, or global issues	1.7	1.7	
2i. Organized others to work on local or campus issues	1.6	1.4**	0.15
2j. Organized others to work on state, national, or global issues	1.5	1.4*	0.12

Note: Items with mean differences that are larger than would be expected by chance are noted with asterisk referring to three significance levels (* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$). Where statistically significant differences were observed, effect sizes are provided to help judge the practical meaning of the differences. Effect sizes of less than 0.20 are considered trivial, 0.20 - 0.49 are considered small, 0.50 - 0.80 are considered large.

2016 NSSE Civic Engagement Topical Module Results for Senior-Year Students

NSSE Items	SHSU Mean	IPEDS Comparison Group	Effect Size
Select the response that best represents your ability to do the following			
1a. Help people resolve their disagreements with each other	5.3	5.3	
1b. Resolve conflicts that involve bias, discrimination, and prejudice	5.0	4.9	
1c. Lead a group where people from different backgrounds feel welcomed and included	5.4	5.4	
1d. Contribute to the well-being of your community	5.4	5.4	
During the current school year, whether course-related or not, about how often have you done the following?			
2a. Informed yourself about local or campus issues	2.4	2.5***	
2b. Informed yourself about state, national, or global issues	2.9	2.9	
2c. Discussed local or campus issues with others	2.3	2.4***	
2d. Discussed state, national or global issues with others	2.7	2.7	
2e. Raised awareness about local or campus issues	1.8	1.8*	
2f. Raised awareness about state, national or global issues	2.0	2.0	
2g. Asked others to address local or campus issues	1.6	1.7	
2h. Asked others to address state, national, or global issues	1.8	1.7	
2i. Organized others to work on local or campus issues	1.5	1.5	
2j. Organized others to work on state, national, or global issues	1.4	1.4	

Note: Items with mean differences that are larger than would be expected by chance are noted with asterisk referring to three significance levels (* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$). Where statistically significant differences were observed, effect sizes are provided to help judge the practical meaning of the differences. Effect sizes of less than 0.20 are considered trivial, 0.20 - 0.49 are considered small, 0.50 - 0.80 are considered large.

Appendix M

Results from the NSSE Global Learning Topical Module for First-Year and Senior Students

2016 NSSE Global Learning Topical Module Results for First-Year Students

NSSE Items	SHSU Mean	Global Learning Comparison Group	Effect Size
How much does your institution emphasize the following?			
1a. Providing courses that focus on global and international topics	2.2	2.6***	-0.47
1b. Providing activities and experiences (speakers, events) that focus on global and international topics	2.4	2.7***	-0.34
Which of the following have you done or do you plan to do before you graduate?			
2a. Complete a course that focuses on global trends or issues (human rights, international relations, world health, climate, etc.)	12%	20%***	-0.23
2b. Complete a course that focuses on perspectives, issues, or events from countries or regions outside the United States	10%	18%***	-0.23
2.c Complete a course that focuses on religions or cultural groups other than your own	13%	17%*	-0.12
During the current school year, how much has your coursework encouraged you to do the following?			
3a. Understand the viewpoints, values, or customs of different world cultures, nationalities, and religions	2.6	2.6	
3b. Develop skills for interacting effectively and appropriately with those from different world cultures, nationalities, and religions	2.5	2.5	
During the current school year, about how often have you done the following?			
4a. Discussed international or global topics and issues with others	2.3	2.4***	-0.19
4b. Talked about international opportunities (study abroad, international internship, Model UN, field study or research abroad, etc.) with a faculty member or advisor	1.8	2.0***	-0.22
4c. Attended events or activities that promoted the understanding of different world cultures, nationalities, and religions	1.8	1.9	
4d. Worked on out-of-class activities (campus events, committees, student groups, etc.) with an international or global focus	1.7	1.7	
4e. Participated in a program that pairs U.S. and international students (language partners, buddy program, etc.)	1.4	1.4	
During the current school year, have you looked for information about global education programs and opportunities (study abroad, international internships, international field studies or research, volunteering abroad, etc.)?			
5a. Percentage of students who responded "Yes"	29%	42%***	-0.29
How much has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas?			
6a. Being informed about current international and global issues	2.1	2.3***	-0.19
6b. Speaking a second language	1.7	1.6	

6c. Seeking international or global opportunities out of your comfort zone	1.8	1.9**	-0.14
6d. Understanding how your actions affect global communities	2.0	2.1*	-0.10
6e. Preparing for life and work in an increasingly globalized era	2.1	2.3***	-0.19
6f. Encouraging your sense of global responsibility	2.1	2.3***	-0.17
Since enrolling at your current institution, have you lived with students from a country other than your own (exclude study abroad and other programs outside of the US)?			
7a. Percentage of students who responded "Yes"	9%	17%***	-0.26

Note: Items with mean differences that are larger than would be expected by chance are noted with asterisk referring to three significance levels (* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$). Where statistically significant differences were observed, effect sizes are provided to help judge the practical meaning of the differences. Effect sizes of less than 0.20 are considered trivial, 0.20 - 0.49 are considered small, 0.50 - 0.80 are considered large.

2016 NSSE Global Learning Topical Module Results for Senior Students

NSSE Items	SHSU Mean	Global Learning Comparison Group	Effect Size
How much does your institution emphasize the following?			
1a. Providing courses that focus on global and international topics	2.3	2.5***	-0.23
1b. Providing activities and experiences (speakers, events) that focus on global and international topics	2.4	2.5***	-0.12
Which of the following have you done or do you plan to do before you graduate?			
2a. Complete a course that focuses on global trends or issues (human rights, international relations, world health, climate, etc.)	35%	50%***	-0.30
2b. Complete a course that focuses on perspectives, issues, or events from countries or regions outside the United States	36%	46%***	-0.20
2.c Complete a course that focuses on religions or cultural groups other than your own	35%	43%***	-0.17
During the current school year, how much has your coursework encouraged you to do the following?			
3a. Understand the viewpoints, values, or customs of different world cultures, nationalities, and religions	2.6	2.6	
3b. Develop skills for interacting effectively and appropriately with those from different world cultures, nationalities, and religions	2.6	2.6	
During the current school year, about how often have you done the following?			
4a. Discussed international or global topics and issues with others	2.3	2.6***	-0.23
4b. Talked about international opportunities (study abroad, international internship, Model UN, field study or research abroad, etc.) with a faculty member or advisor	1.8	1.9**	-0.09
4c. Attended events or activities that promoted the understanding of different world cultures, nationalities, and religions	1.7	1.8**	-0.11
4d. Worked on out-of-class activities (campus events, committees, student groups, etc.) with an international or global focus	1.6	1.7	
4e. Participated in a program that pairs U.S. and international students (language partners, buddy program, etc.)	1.4	1.4	
During the current school year, have you looked for information about global education programs and opportunities (study abroad, international internships, international field studies or research, volunteering abroad, etc.)?			
5a. Percentage of students who responded "Yes"	27%	25%	
How much has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas?			
6a. Being informed about current international and global issues	2.2	2.3*	-0.09
6b. Speaking a second language	1.6	1.6	

6c. Seeking international or global opportunities out of your comfort zone	1.8	1.9**	-0.10
6d. Understanding how your actions affect global communities	2.1	2.2*	-0.08
6e. Preparing for life and work in an increasingly globalized era	2.3	2.3	
6f. Encouraging your sense of global responsibility	2.2	2.3***	-0.12
Since enrolling at your current institution, have you lived with students from a country other than your own (exclude study abroad and other programs outside of the US)?			
7a. Percentage of students who responded "Yes"	11%	18%***	-0.19

Note: Items with mean differences that are larger than would be expected by chance are noted with asterisk referring to three significance levels (* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$). Where statistically significant differences were observed, effect sizes are provided to help judge the practical meaning of the differences. Effect sizes of less than 0.20 are considered trivial, 0.20 - 0.49 are considered small, 0.50 - 0.80 are considered large.