

Point Loma Nazarene University (PLNU), San Diego, California

FINAL REPORT FOR CIC/DQP CONSORTIUM, October 2013

PLNU is very grateful for the opportunity to participate in the CIC DQP pilot project supported by the Lumina Foundation. The two-year pilot has provided opportunities for faculty and academic leadership to think constructively about the assessment of student learning at the program and institutional level as well as the meaning and quality of the PLNU liberal arts undergraduate degree. The conversations that were begun during the pilot will continue as the University engages in ways to improve the student academic experience leading to greater student learning and success.

During the initial phase of the pilot PLNU concluded that using the DQP to assess student learning at the end of their degree program (summative assessment), would provide us the most meaningful data. Therefore, academic units with culminating experience (capstone course or other senior project) were encouraged to participate in the PLNU DQP pilot. There were initially seven program directors who volunteered their capstone courses to participate in the DQP pilot: Art & Design, Business, Mathematical, Information and Computer Sciences, Philosophy, Spanish, Literature, and Liberal Studies. This team of program leaders identified specialized knowledge and intellectual skills as the DQP domains to use for the pilot. Departments were given the option to add domains if they so desired. The team also agreed to use the relevant AAC&U Value Rubrics to assess their culminating DQP assignments.

In the following report we will describe some of the benefits and challenges we experienced. While the university made great strides in assessment, we did not accomplish all of our initial objectives, experienced some surprises, and had to overcome a few challenges. PLNU has a portal page in the public website that displays all of the [university's DQP artifacts](#) including: learning outcomes, assignments, rubrics, syllabi, and results.

1. Action Plan Goals

The university has just completed a review of the assessment data from the spring 2013 pilot of the DQP framework. This information will be presented by the DQP Task Force to the faculty and administration in the fall semester. This will be followed by a curricular discussion by the faculty and academic leadership about an institutional movement to a culminating/capstone experience for all programs with common elements including a campus-wide use of the AAC&U Value Rubrics to assess outcomes for the five WASC core competencies (written and oral communication, information literacy, quantitative reasoning, and critical thinking) which are in the DQP area of Intellectual Skills. We will also consider how the other four DQP domains can assist in building a more robust assessment of the meaning of the degree across programs.

2. Scope of the Project

The PLNU DQP Task Force began the pilot by surveying all academic programs to identify those with a significant culminating experience. Following this initial screening, the Task Force selected programs to invite to participate in the DQP pilot in the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Social Sciences and Professional Studies, the School of Business; and the School of Education. A diverse collection of programs agreed to participate and the Provost met with the program chair or dean and presented an outline of the DQP pilot. The DQP Task Force was expanded to include these program leaders. Attached is a list of the Task Force membership, academic units and the program and faculty participants.

Accomplishments and Data Analysis

Because PLNU is a university with a large general education requirement, students take GE classes throughout their four years at the university. This has led to some interesting institutional conversations about how to best assess GE and how the learning in GE connects with the learning in the degree. For example, students take a freshman writing course but then are asked to do many additional writing tasks in GE and in their discipline. For this reason the notion of assessing competencies at the end of the degree rather than simply assessing GE resonates with PLNU's approach to education.

The DQP pilot looked at three types of data: National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) data, ETS Proficiency Profile data and rubric data from the culminating experiences in the DQP pilot program. The university learned different things from each type of data.

NSSE Data: NSSE is an instrument given to freshmen and seniors and the organization has mapped a variety of the survey questions to the DQP domains. While this is self-reported and affective data, it does provide some external benchmarking and some general insights about our programs. In many areas PLNU was at or above the level of its comparators. The one area that was of note is that PLNU has significantly fewer students engaging in culminating experiences than would be expected in a university of its type. This issue is already under discussion and will be considered further in the coming academic year. The NSSE data is attached.

ETS Proficiency Profile: The ETS exam has now been used at PLNU for testing incoming freshmen and graduating seniors for three years to assess learning outcomes in the area of writing, critical thinking and mathematics. PLNU is clearly above the comparison group in the scores of both freshmen and seniors. The university needs to engage in further conversations about the data and its implications for curricular reform. For example, 49% of the PLNU seniors are not proficient at critical thinking (vs. 73% not proficient for comparators). While this is better than our comparators, should we be satisfied with this outcome? The ETS data is attached.

Departmental Rubric Data: The participating program faculty were asked to assess Specialized Knowledge and Intellectual Skills (specifically critical thinking, information literacy, written communication and oral communication). They were also given the option of assessing Applied Learning or Civic Learning if they desired. Not all departments assessed all of the required elements at the senior level (underclassmen data was discarded in our summary). Not all programs used the AAC&U Value Rubrics, some used discipline specific rubrics, this is indicated in the summary data table which is attached.

Reviewing the rubric data, it is clear that different departments were using somewhat different scoring systems. Therefore, there are very few statistically sound conclusions that can be drawn from this data, however trends can be observed. If it is assumed that a score of 3 (scale of 1-4 with 4 high) is considered “high satisfactory” and thus a score of 2 is “low satisfactory”, then the significant majority of the students are above low satisfactory in all skills and in most cases a majority is above high satisfactory.

The aggregation of the data makes it clear that the university has many important discussions ahead in order to calibrate the use of the Value Rubrics and to make the data across departments better suited for use in the aggregate.

3. Project Challenges

The initial optimism of the DQP Task Force was met with several challenges involving the DQP Framework and the PLNU context.

- First, many faculty found the complex language of the DQP Outcomes difficult to interpret in the context of their major. Discipline differences emerged quickly and required several conversations, including a glossary of terms, to arrive at a shared understanding. This is not surprising since the DQP seeks to define learning outcomes that are not discipline specific. The fact that different academic departments within a relatively small, highly relational university had trouble agreeing on how to define and thus measure the outcomes using the DQP language highlights a concern that should be part of the national conversation about the future of the DQP. If the struggles are present within a single institution, how much greater will they be when trying to get a national collection of institutions to agree on the definitions across disciplines *and* between institutions? One of the key things that we have learned from this experience is that the language of the DQP needs to be simplified in order for it to be useful across all the disciplines.
- Second, the DQP Task Force agreed to use five of the AAC&U Value Rubrics (WASC Core Competencies: Critical Thinking, Information Literacy, Quantitative Literacy, Oral Communication, and Written Communication) with only minor adaptations for the academic discipline context. It was agreed the pilot participants would map assignments and assessments that they were currently using to the Value Rubrics and DQP Outcomes. This exercise was interpreted by the faculty in varied ways and resulted in

some difficulty in making cross disciplinary comparisons. When individual departments within a single university are allowed to define how they will measure a DQP outcome, it is difficult to make valid cross disciplinary comparisons. What will happen when multiple universities with many departments individually define how they will measure each DQP outcome? The DQP seeks to provide a common meaning for a degree across all universities. Ultimately the “meaning” that comes from the DQP is a function of how the outcomes are interpreted and, how the achievement of those interpreted outcomes, are measured. If both of these are left to the discretion of each university and discipline, there will be a variety of meanings of a degree rather than a common meaning.

- Third, while the DQP Spider Web is a useful tool once the DQP Framework is well established and embedded in the university culture, it was confusing to many of the PLNU faculty. The Task Force moved away from mapping the assessment results onto the spider web and using it for any interpretation of the pilot results.
- Fourth, the ability of the faculty to engage the DQP framework varied significantly. The Art faculty found the approach too difficult to align with their capstone assignments and finally abandoned the pilot. On the other hand the School of Business faculty indicated that they would be able to embed the DQP outcome assignments in the capstone course but only part of the data that they sent came from the capstone, the balance came from a sophomore level course. Thus we were not able to use much of their data in making cross-discipline comparisons or aggregating the data with the other participating academic programs.
- Fifth, many faculty interpreted the DQP framework as an “additional” requirement rather than an enhancement of their current assessment work. The faculty expressed concern about being overwhelmed with having to work with gild standards, institutional outcomes, program outcomes, WASC core competencies, general education outcomes, and professional accreditation in addition to the DQP Framework. Faculty expressed confusion about how these multiple student learning outcome standards fit together and complement each other. We were able to resolve some of this confusion, but the complexity of the language in the DQP learning outcomes was not helpful.
- Sixth, as in most academic endeavors, the success of a new initiative is greatly dependent on the academic leadership of the program. The chair or dean’s commitment to adopting the DQP was the single most important factor in determining the success of the pilot program. A strong assessment culture in the academic unit, lead by a chair committed to continuous improvement, was a key predictor in both understanding the goals of the DQP framework and leading the DQP Pilot in their academic unit.

4. Next Steps

This academic year (2013-2014) the university will be taking several steps in building assessment leadership, assessment capacity, and standards that will facilitate the university in thinking about how to communicate the meaning of the degree and how to best engage in the national conversation about best practices and benchmarking (including DQP).

- The DQP Pilot raised the issue of the importance of having a culminating experience in each academic program (the NSSE data made this need very clear). In recent years more academic units have realized the value of the capstone and added these important culminating experiences to the programs. This year the focus will be on encouraging the remaining academic programs to add a culminating experience (e.g. capstone, senior seminar, senior exhibition, ePortfolio, etc.) This change will be a challenge because, like many universities, PLNU operates under a number of constraints that require departments to not add additional units to their majors. Thus in order to add a culminating experience to a degree program, a department will need to transform an existing course or eliminate something from their curriculum in order to add a capstone course. PLNU academic leadership will also continue to define the commonalities of a culminating experience and what that means for the major and summative assessment.
- The university will conclude the curricular committee work on rewriting General Education Learning Outcomes to align them more closely with the AAC&U LEAP Outcomes. This will allow the university to make better use of the AAC&U Value Rubrics for assessing GE and the WASC core competencies for graduating seniors. This will provide the necessary foundation to adopt national learning outcomes/core competencies similar to DQP for all undergraduate program
- The university will continue to build the assessment infrastructure to support the WASC Core Competencies embedded in the Institutional Learning Outcomes and the General Education Learning Outcomes. These will be assessed using the AAC&U Value Rubrics in both the lower division GE courses and the senior capstone experience.
- During the DQP pilot program PLNU engaged important curricular conversations and work to reframe the PLNU vision around the meaning and value of the degree in the context of student success. These conversations will continue as the university commits to curricular and co-curricular continuous improvement in the midst of disruptive changes in the higher education environment.

Submitted by:

Dr. Kerry Fulcher, Provost

Dr. Margaret Bailey, Vice Provost

Dr. Maria Zack, Chair Department of Mathematical, Information and Computer Sciences

Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP) Learning Areas for Capstone/Culminating Experience

DQP Learning Areas: (1) Specialized Knowledge, (2) Broad Integrative Knowledge, (3) Intellectual Skills, (4) Applied Learning, (5) Civic Learning, (6) Institution-Specific Areas

Specialized Knowledge (Required):

1. Defines and properly uses the principal terms in the field, both historical and contemporaneous.
2. Demonstrates fluency in the use of tools, technologies and methods in the field.
3. One of the following:
 - Evaluates, clarifies, and frames a complex question or challenge using perspectives and scholarship from the student's major field and at least one other.
 - Constructs a project related to a familiar but complex problem in the field of study by assembling, arranging and reformulating ideas, concepts, designs or techniques.
 - Constructs a summative project, paper, case study or practice-based performance that draws on current research, scholarship and/or techniques in the field.

Intellectual Skills (Required): *Interfaced with the Five **WASC Graduation Proficiencies****

1. **Critical Thinking:** Differentiates and evaluates theories and approaches to complex standard and non-standard problems within his or her major field. *Note the ETS exam will also measure critical thinking.*
2. **Information Literacy:** Incorporates multiple information resources in different modes or languages in projects, papers or performances, with appropriate citations; and evaluates the relative merits of competing resources with respect to clearly articulated standards.
3. **Written Communication and Oral Communication:** Constructs sustained, coherent argument or presentation on technical issues or processes in more than one medium for general and specific audiences. *Note the ETS exam will also measure written communication.*

***WASC Required Graduation Proficiencies**

1. **Written Communication**
2. **Oral Communication**
3. **Informational Literacy**
4. **Critical Thinking**
5. **Quantitative Reasoning**

Quantitative Reasoning is the fifth graduation proficiency required by WASC. Note that the ETS exam will measure quantitative reasoning.

Note that DQP has two other categories that might be used to further describe the capstone or culminating work:

Applied Learning: (One or more)

1. Presents a project, paper, performance or other appropriate task linking knowledge and skills from work, community or research activities with knowledge acquired in academic disciplines; explains how elements were combined to shape meaning or findings; and shows to relationship to relevant scholarship.
2. Formulates a question on a topic that addresses **more than one academic discipline** or practical setting, locates appropriate evidence that addresses the question, evaluates the evidence in relation to the problems contexts, and articulates conclusions that follow logically from analysis.
3. Completes a field-based argument in the course of study that employs insights from others; evaluates a significant question in relation to concepts, methods or assumptions **in at least one academic field** and explains the implications of learning outside the classroom.

Civic Learning: (One or more)

1. Explains diverse perspectives on a contested issue and evaluates insights gained from different kinds of evidence reflecting scholarly and community perspectives.
2. Describes historical and contemporary positions on democratic values and practices, and presents his or her position on a related problem.
3. Collaborates in developing and implementing an approach to a civic issue, evaluates the process and, where applicable, weighs the result.

PLNU DQP Data from NSSE

The National Survey of Social Engagement (NSSE) published a mapping between DQP Learning Outcomes and NSSE questions. This document provides the information from PLNU's administration of NSSE in 2005 and 2011 in each of the DQP domains. The details of the data are on the pages that follow.

Here are some observations from the data:

- In many ways, PLNU is similar to its comparator institutions in most of the NSSE domains connected with the DQP.
- There is some difference between 2005 and 2011. Because of the changes in the comparator groups used in those two years, it is difficult to tell how much of the change is due to improvement and how much is connected with the change in the groups.

Some key derived from looking at comparators:

- Compared to its comparators, PLNU has significantly fewer students involved in “culminating senior experience (capstone course, senior project or thesis, comprehensive exam, etc.)”
- Fewer PLNU students than at our comparators say that they “included diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.) in class discussions or writing assignments.”
- PLNU students report taking a greater amount of “foreign language coursework” than students at PLNU's comparator institutions.
- PLNU students rate themselves more highly than students in our comparator schools in their ability to “analyze quantitative problems.”
- A higher percentage of PLNU students “Participated in a community-based project (e.g. service learning) as part of a regular course” than students at comparator institutions.
- A higher percentage of PLNU students “discussed ideas from your readings or classes with faculty members outside of class” than students at comparator institutions.
- PLNU students rate the life goal “contributing to the welfare of your community” more highly than students at comparator institutions.

Note that * next to a numbers indicates a significant difference; the greater the number of stars, the more significant the difference.

Specialized Knowledge

1. Defines and explains the boundaries, divisions, styles and practices of a field.

NSSE Measure		FY		SR	
		2005	2011	2005	2011
Acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills	PLNU	2.83	2.89	3.10	3.11
	Masters	2.73	2.82	3.10	3.09
	Peers	2.79	2.93	3.09	3.16

2. Defines and properly uses the principal terms in the field, both historical and contemporaneous.

NSSE Measure		FY		SR	
		2005	2011	2005	2011
Acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills	PLNU	2.83	2.89	3.10	3.11
	Masters	2.73	2.82	3.10	3.09
	Peers	2.79	2.93	3.09	3.16
Writing clearly and effectively	PLNU	3.01	3.01	3.07	3.13
	Masters	3.00	3.07	3.12	3.14
	Peers	2.98	3.03	**3.23	3.22
Speaking clearly and effectively	PLNU	2.94	2.96	3.02	3.17
	Masters	*2.81	2.93	3.05	*3.05
	Peers	**2.73	2.86	3.08	3.11

3. Demonstrates fluency in the use of tools, technologies and methods in the field.

NSSE Measure		FY		SR	
		2005	2011	2005	2011
Acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills	PLNU	2.83	2.89	3.10	3.11
	Masters	2.73	2.82	3.10	3.09
	Peers	2.79	2.93	3.09	3.16
Thinking critically and analytically	PLNU	3.26	3.25	3.33	3.43
	Masters	*3.14	3.24	3.34	3.36
	Peers	3.25	3.29	***3.49	3.45
Analyzing quantitative problems	PLNU	2.77	2.89	2.91	3.11
	Masters	2.81	2.98	3.01	3.10
	Peers	2.82	2.89	3.02	*2.97

4. Evaluates, clarifies and frames a complex question or challenge using perspectives and scholarship from the student's major field and at least one other.

NSSE Measure		FY		SR	
		2005	2011	2005	2011
Worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources	PLNU	3.06	3.20	3.43	3.35
	Masters	3.08	3.15	3.36	3.38
	Peers	3.12	3.13	3.39	3.44
Put together ideas or concepts from different courses when completing assignments or during class discussions	PLNU	2.70	2.62	2.75	2.98
	Masters	**2.54	2.64	**2.91	2.96
	Peers	2.63	2.66	***2.95	3.00
Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and considering its components	PLNU	3.08	3.17	3.18	3.30
	Masters	3.03	3.15	3.22	3.30
	Peers	3.13	3.22	**3.32	3.34
Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships	PLNU	2.86	2.99	2.98	3.15
	Masters	2.81	2.94	3.03	3.10
	Peers	2.86	2.97	**3.14	3.18
Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions	PLNU	2.83	2.83	2.88	3.10
	Masters	2.82	*2.96	2.97	3.06
	Peers	2.80	2.93	*3.02	3.09
Acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills	PLNU	2.83	2.89	3.10	3.11
	Masters	2.73	2.82	3.10	3.09
	Peers	2.79	2.93	3.09	3.16
Thinking critically and analytically	PLNU	3.26	3.25	3.33	3.43
	Masters	*3.14	3.24	3.34	3.36
	Peers	3.25	3.29	***3.49	3.45

5. Constructs a project related to a familiar but complex problem in the field of study by assembling, arranging and reformulating ideas, concepts, designs or techniques.

NSSE Measure		FY		SR	
		2005	2011	2005	2011
Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships	PLNU	2.86	2.99	2.98	3.15
	Masters	2.81	2.94	3.03	3.10
	Peers	2.86	2.97	**3.14	3.18
Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions	PLNU	2.83	2.83	2.88	3.10
	Masters	2.82	*2.96	2.97	3.06
	Peers	2.80	2.93	*3.02	3.09
Culminating senior experience (capstone course, senior project or thesis, comprehensive exam, etc.)	PLNU	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.29
	Masters	***0.01	***0.02	**0.34	0.30
	Peers	**0.01	0.01	***0.52	***0.54
Acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills	PLNU	2.83	2.89	3.10	3.11
	Masters	2.73	2.82	3.10	3.09
	Peers	2.79	2.93	3.09	3.16
Thinking critically and analytically	PLNU	3.26	3.25	3.33	3.43
	Masters	*3.14	3.24	3.34	3.36
	Peers	3.25	3.29	***3.49	3.45

6. Constructs a summative project, paper or practice-based performance that draws on current research, scholarship and/or techniques in the field.

NSSE Measure		FY		SR	
		2005	2011	2005	2011
Made a class presentation	PLNU	2.40	2.58	2.89	2.90
	Masters	2.30	***2.33	2.93	2.86
	Peers	***2.23	***2.41	2.85	2.93
Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and considering its components	PLNU	3.08	3.17	3.18	3.30
	Masters	3.03	3.15	3.22	3.30
	Peers	3.13	3.22	**3.32	3.34
Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships	PLNU	2.86	2.99	2.98	3.15
	Masters	2.81	2.94	3.03	3.10
	Peers	2.86	2.97	**3.14	3.18
Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions	PLNU	2.83	2.83	2.88	3.10
	Masters	2.82	*2.96	2.97	3.06
	Peers	2.80	2.93	*3.02	3.09
Culminating senior experience (capstone course, senior project or thesis, comprehensive exam, etc.)	PLNU	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.29
	Masters	***0.01	***0.02	**0.34	0.30
	Peers	**0.01	0.01	***0.52	***0.54
Acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills	PLNU	2.83	2.89	3.10	3.11
	Masters	2.73	2.82	3.10	3.09
	Peers	2.79	2.93	3.09	3.16

Broad, Integrative Knowledge

1. Frames a complex scientific, social, technological, economic or aesthetic challenge or problem from the perspectives and literature of at least two academic fields and proposes a “best approach” to the question or challenge using evidence from those fields.

NSSE Measure		FY		SR	
		2005	2011	2005	2011
Worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources	PLNU	3.06	3.20	3.43	3.35
	Masters	3.08	3.15	3.36	3.38
	Peers	3.12	3.13	3.39	3.44
Put together ideas or concepts from different courses when completing assignments or during class discussions	PLNU	2.70	2.62	2.75	2.98
	Masters	**2.54	2.64	**2.91	2.96
	Peers	2.63	2.66	***2.95	3.00
Acquiring a broad general education	PLNU	3.36	3.28	3.42	3.41
	Masters	***3.15	3.18	**3.31	**3.24
	Peers	3.31	3.28	3.50	3.41
Thinking critically and analytically	PLNU	3.26	3.25	3.33	3.43
	Masters	*3.14	3.24	3.34	3.36
	Peers	3.25	3.29	***3.49	3.45
Solving complex real-world problems	PLNU	2.56	2.66	2.54	2.88
	Masters	2.56	2.72	**2.73	2.83
	Peers	2.60	2.71	***2.78	2.86

2. Produces, independently or collaboratively, an investigative, creative or practical work that draws on specific theories, tools and methods from at least two academic fields.

NSSE Measure		FY		SR	
		2005	2011	2005	2011
Worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources	PLNU	3.06	3.20	3.43	3.35
	Masters	3.08	3.15	3.36	3.38
	Peers	3.12	3.13	3.39	3.44
Put together ideas or concepts from different courses when completing assignments or during class discussions	PLNU	2.70	2.62	2.75	2.98
	Masters	**2.54	2.64	**2.91	2.96
	Peers	2.63	2.66	***2.95	3.00
Work on a research project with a faculty member outside of course or program requirements	PLNU	0.02	0.01	0.20	0.22
	Masters	*0.05	***0.05	0.18	*0.16
	Peers	0.04	*0.03	0.25	0.23
Independent study or self-designed major	PLNU	0.01	0.01	0.20	0.13
	Masters	***0.03	***0.04	0.20	0.15
	Peers	0.02	0.02	**0.27	***0.23
Acquiring a broad general education	PLNU	3.36	3.28	3.42	3.41
	Masters	***3.15	3.18	**3.31	**3.24
	Peers	3.31	3.28	3.50	3.41
Thinking critically and analytically	PLNU	3.26	3.25	3.33	3.43
	Masters	*3.14	3.24	3.34	3.36
	Peers	3.25	3.29	***3.49	3.45

3. Explains a problem in science, the arts, society, human services, economic life or technology from the perspective of at least two academic fields, explains how the methods of inquiry and research in those disciplines can be brought to bear, judges the likelihood that the combination of disciplinary perspectives and methods would contribute to the resolution of the challenge, and justifies the importance of the challenge in a social or global context.

NSSE Measure		FY		SR	
		2005	2011	2005	2011
Worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources	PLNU	3.06	3.20	3.43	3.35
	Masters	3.08	3.15	3.36	3.38
	Peers	3.12	3.13	3.39	3.44
Included diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.) in class discussions or writing assignments	PLNU	2.68	2.78	2.81	2.79
	Masters	2.76	2.81	2.83	2.89
	Peers	2.87	2.84	*2.93	*2.94
Put together ideas or concepts from different courses when completing assignments or during class discussions	PLNU	2.70	2.62	2.75	2.98
	Masters	**2.54	2.64	**2.91	2.96
	Peers	2.63	2.66	***2.95	3.00
Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective	PLNU	2.91	3.03	2.99	3.05
	Masters	**2.73	***2.81	**2.84	**2.88
	Peers	2.90	*2.91	3.01	3.02
Acquiring a broad general education	PLNU	3.36	3.28	3.42	3.41
	Masters	***3.15	3.18	**3.31	**3.24
	Peers	3.31	3.28	3.50	3.41
Writing clearly and effectively	PLNU	3.01	3.01	3.07	3.13
	Masters	3.00	3.07	3.12	3.14
	Peers	2.98	3.03	**3.23	3.22
Speaking clearly and effectively	PLNU	2.94	2.96	3.02	3.17
	Masters	*2.81	2.93	3.05	*3.05
	Peers	**2.73	2.86	3.08	3.11
Thinking critically and analytically	PLNU	3.26	3.25	3.33	3.43
	Masters	*3.14	3.24	3.34	3.36
	Peers	3.25	3.29	***3.49	3.45

Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds	PLNU	2.44	2.49	2.32	2.57
	Masters	*2.58	**2.71	***2.61	2.70
	Peers	**2.66	**2.71	***2.69	2.69
Solving complex real-world problems	PLNU	2.56	2.66	2.54	2.88
	Masters	2.56	2.72	**2.73	2.83
	Peers	2.60	2.71	***2.78	2.86

Intellectual Skills

1. Differentiates and evaluates theories and approaches to complex standard and nonstandard problems within his or her major field. (Analytic inquiry)

NSSE Measure		FY		SR	
		2005	2011	2005	2011
Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and considering its components	PLNU	3.08	3.17	3.18	3.30
	Masters	3.03	3.15	3.22	3.30
	Peers	3.13	3.22	**3.32	3.34
Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships	PLNU	2.86	2.99	2.98	3.15
	Masters	2.81	2.94	3.03	3.10
	Peers	2.86	2.97	**3.14	3.18
Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions	PLNU	2.83	2.83	2.88	3.10
	Masters	2.82	*2.96	2.97	3.06
	Peers	2.80	2.93	*3.02	3.09
Acquiring a broad general education	PLNU	3.36	3.28	3.42	3.41
	Masters	***3.15	3.18	**3.31	**3.24
	Peers	3.31	3.28	3.50	3.41
Thinking critically and analytically	PLNU	3.26	3.25	3.33	3.43
	Masters	*3.14	3.24	3.34	3.36
	Peers	3.25	3.29	***3.49	3.45

2. Incorporates multiple information resources in different media or languages in projects, papers or performances, with appropriate citations; and evaluates the relative merits of competing resources with respect to clearly articulated standards. (Use of information resources)

NSSE Measure		FY		SR	
		2005	2011	2005	2011
Made a class presentation	PLNU	2.40	2.58	2.89	2.90
	Masters	2.30	***2.33	2.93	2.86
	Peers	***2.23	***2.41	2.85	2.93
Used an electronic medium (Listserv, chat group, Internet, instant messaging etc.) to discuss or complete an assignment	PLNU	2.63	2.82	2.78	2.94
	Masters	2.57	2.72	2.81	2.92
	Peers	2.57	*2.66	2.69	2.89
Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and considering its components	PLNU	3.08	3.17	3.18	3.30
	Masters	3.03	3.15	3.22	3.30
	Peers	3.13	3.22	**3.32	3.34
Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships	PLNU	2.86	2.99	2.98	3.15
	Masters	2.81	2.94	3.03	3.10
	Peers	2.86	2.97	**3.14	3.18
Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions	PLNU	2.83	2.83	2.88	3.10
	Masters	2.82	*2.96	2.97	3.06
	Peers	2.80	2.93	*3.02	3.09
Foreign language coursework	PLNU	0.17	0.20	0.74	0.72
	Masters	0.21	0.16	***0.41	***0.34
	Peers	***0.33	*0.27	***0.64	***0.59
Acquiring a broad general education	PLNU	3.36	3.28	3.42	3.41
	Masters	***3.15	3.18	**3.31	**3.24
	Peers	3.31	3.28	3.50	3.41
Thinking critically and analytically	PLNU	3.26	3.25	3.33	3.43
	Masters	*3.14	3.24	3.34	3.36
	Peers	3.25	3.29	***3.49	3.45

	PLNU	2.77	2.89	2.91	3.11
Analyzing quantitative problems	Masters	2.81	2.98	3.01	3.10
	Peers	2.82	2.89	3.02	*2.97

3. Constructs a cultural, political or technological alternate vision of either the natural or human world through a written project, laboratory report, exhibit, performance, or community service design; defines the distinct patterns in this alternate vision; and explains how these patterns differ from current realities. (Engaging diverse perspectives)

NSSE Measure		FY		SR	
		2005	2011	2005	2011
Included diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.) in class discussions or writing assignments	PLNU	2.68	2.78	2.81	2.79
	Masters	2.76	2.81	2.83	2.89
	Peers	2.87	2.84	*2.93	*2.94
Had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity than your own	PLNU	2.71	2.81	2.56	2.66
	Masters	**2.52	***2.57	2.60	2.67
	Peers	2.70	*2.66	*2.71	2.68
Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and considering its components	PLNU	3.08	3.17	3.18	3.30
	Masters	3.03	3.15	3.22	3.30
	Peers	3.13	3.22	**3.32	3.34
Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships	PLNU	2.86	2.99	2.98	3.15
	Masters	2.81	2.94	3.03	3.10
	Peers	2.86	2.97	**3.14	3.18
Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions	PLNU	2.83	2.83	2.88	3.10
	Masters	2.82	*2.96	2.97	3.06
	Peers	2.80	2.93	*3.02	3.09
Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective	PLNU	2.91	3.03	2.99	3.05
	Masters	**2.73	***2.81	**2.84	**2.88
	Peers	2.90	*2.91	3.01	3.02

Practicum, internship, field experience, co-op experience, or clinical assignment	PLNU	0.05	0.06	0.71	0.70
	Masters	*0.08	0.06	***0.56	***0.47
	Peers	0.06	0.07	0.69	0.66
Acquiring a broad general education	PLNU	3.36	3.28	3.42	3.41
	Masters	***3.15	3.18	**3.31	**3.24
	Peers	3.31	3.28	3.50	3.41
Thinking critically and analytically	PLNU	3.26	3.25	3.33	3.43
	Masters	*3.14	3.24	3.34	3.36
	Peers	3.25	3.29	***3.49	3.45
Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds	PLNU	2.44	2.49	2.32	2.57
	Masters	*2.58	**2.71	***2.61	2.70
	Peers	**2.66	**2.71	***2.69	2.69
Solving complex real-world problems	PLNU	2.56	2.66	2.54	2.88
	Masters	2.56	2.72	**2.73	2.83
	Peers	2.60	2.71	***2.78	2.86

4. Translates verbal problems into mathematical algorithms, constructs valid arguments using the accepted symbolic system of mathematical reasoning, and constructs accurate calculations.

NSSE Measure		FY		SR	
		2005	2011	2005	2011
Made a class presentation	PLNU	2.40	2.58	2.89	2.90
	Masters	2.30	***2.33	2.93	2.86
	Peers	***2.23	***2.41	2.85	2.93
Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions	PLNU	2.83	2.83	2.88	3.10
	Masters	2.82	*2.96	2.97	3.06
	Peers	2.80	2.93	*3.02	3.09
Acquiring a broad general education	PLNU	3.36	3.28	3.42	3.41
	Masters	***3.15	3.18	**3.31	**3.24
	Peers	3.31	3.28	3.50	3.41
Thinking critically and analytically	PLNU	3.26	3.25	3.33	3.43
	Masters	*3.14	3.24	3.34	3.36
	Peers	3.25	3.29	***3.49	3.45
Analyzing quantitative problems	PLNU	2.77	2.89	2.91	3.11
	Masters	2.81	2.98	3.01	3.10
	Peers	2.82	2.89	3.02	*2.97

5. Estimates, risk analyses or quantitative evaluations of public information through presentations, papers or projects. (Quantitative fluency)

NSSE Measure		FY		SR	
		2005	2011	2005	2011
Made a class presentation	PLNU	2.40	2.58	2.89	2.90
	Masters	2.30	***2.33	2.93	2.86
	Peers	***2.23	***2.41	2.85	2.93
Included diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.) in class discussions or writing assignments	PLNU	2.68	2.78	2.81	2.79
	Masters	2.76	2.81	2.83	2.89
	Peers	2.87	2.84	*2.93	*2.94
Had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity than your own	PLNU	2.71	2.81	2.56	2.66
	Masters	**2.52	***2.57	2.60	2.67
	Peers	2.70	*2.66	*2.71	2.68
Had serious conversations with students who are very different from you in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values	PLNU	2.66	2.76	2.60	2.71
	Masters	2.70	*2.61	2.71	2.69
	Peers	2.78	2.66	*2.76	2.74
Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and considering its components	PLNU	3.08	3.17	3.18	3.30
	Masters	3.03	3.15	3.22	3.30
	Peers	3.13	3.22	**3.32	3.34
Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions	PLNU	2.83	2.83	2.88	3.10
	Masters	2.82	*2.96	2.97	3.06
	Peers	2.80	2.93	*3.02	3.09
Foreign language coursework	PLNU	0.17	0.20	0.74	0.72
	Masters	0.21	0.16	***0.41	***0.34
	Peers	***0.33	*0.27	***0.64	***0.59
Acquiring a broad general education	PLNU	3.36	3.28	3.42	3.41
	Masters	***3.15	3.18	**3.31	**3.24
	Peers	3.31	3.28	3.50	3.41

Writing clearly and effectively	PLNU	3.01	3.01	3.07	3.13
	Masters	3.00	3.07	3.12	3.14
	Peers	2.98	3.03	**3.23	3.22
Speaking clearly and effectively	PLNU	2.94	2.96	3.02	3.17
	Masters	*2.81	2.93	3.05	*3.05
	Peers	**2.73	2.86	3.08	3.11
Thinking critically and analytically	PLNU	3.26	3.25	3.33	3.43
	Masters	*3.14	3.24	3.34	3.36
	Peers	3.25	3.29	***3.49	3.45
Solving complex real-world problems	PLNU	2.56	2.66	2.54	2.88
	Masters	2.56	2.72	**2.73	2.83
	Peers	2.60	2.71	***2.78	2.86

6. Constructs sustained, coherent argument or presentation on technical issues or processes in more than one language and in more than one medium for general and specific audiences; and works through collaboration to address a social, personal or ethical dilemma. (Communication fluency)

No NSSE data items.

Applied Learning

1. Presents a project, paper, performance or other appropriate task linking knowledge and skills from work, community or research activities with knowledge acquired in academic disciplines; explains how elements were combined to shape meaning or findings; and shows the relationship to relevant scholarship.

NSSE Measure		FY		SR	
		2005	2011	2005	2011
Made a class presentation	PLNU	2.40	2.58	2.89	2.90
	Masters	2.30	***2.33	2.93	2.86
	Peers	***2.23	***2.41	2.85	2.93
Worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources	PLNU	3.06	3.20	3.43	3.35
	Masters	3.08	3.15	3.36	3.38
	Peers	3.12	3.13	3.39	3.44
Participated in a community-based project (e.g. service learning) as part of a regular course	PLNU	1.51	1.58	1.91	2.17
	Masters	1.56	1.55	1.80	***1.75
	Peers	***1.81	***1.81	1.96	***1.86
Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and considering its components	PLNU	3.08	3.17	3.18	3.30
	Masters	3.03	3.15	3.22	3.30
	Peers	3.13	3.22	**3.32	3.34
Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships	PLNU	2.86	2.99	2.98	3.15
	Masters	2.81	2.94	3.03	3.10
	Peers	2.86	2.97	**3.14	3.18
Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions	PLNU	2.83	2.83	2.88	3.10
	Masters	2.82	*2.96	2.97	3.06
	Peers	2.80	2.93	*3.02	3.09
Practicum, internship, field experience, co-op experience, or clinical assignment	PLNU	0.05	0.06	0.71	0.70
	Masters	*0.08	0.06	***0.56	***0.47
	Peers	0.06	0.07	0.69	0.66

Community service or volunteer work	PLNU	0.45	0.51	0.75	0.77
	Masters	0.40	***0.36	***0.62	***0.56
	Peers	*0.53	0.54	0.77	0.75
Work on a research project with a faculty member outside of course or program requirements	PLNU	0.02	0.01	0.20	0.22
	Masters	*0.05	***0.05	0.18	*0.16
	Peers	0.04	*0.03	0.25	0.23
Culminating senior experience (capstone course, senior project or thesis, comprehensive exam, etc.)	PLNU	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.29
	Masters	***0.01	***0.02	**0.34	0.30
	Peers	**0.01	0.01	***0.52	***0.54
Acquiring a broad general education	PLNU	3.36	3.28	3.42	3.41
	Masters	***3.15	3.18	**3.31	**3.24
	Peers	3.31	3.28	3.50	3.41
Writing clearly and effectively	PLNU	3.01	3.01	3.07	3.13
	Masters	3.00	3.07	3.12	3.14
	Peers	2.98	3.03	**3.23	3.22
Speaking clearly and effectively	PLNU	2.94	2.96	3.02	3.17
	Masters	*2.81	2.93	3.05	*3.05
	Peers	**2.73	2.86	3.08	3.11
Thinking critically and analytically	PLNU	3.26	3.25	3.33	3.43
	Masters	*3.14	3.24	3.34	3.36
	Peers	3.25	3.29	***3.49	3.45
Solving complex real-world problems	PLNU	2.56	2.66	2.54	2.88
	Masters	2.56	2.72	**2.73	2.83
	Peers	2.60	2.71	***2.78	2.86

2. Formulates a question on a topic that addresses more than one academic discipline or practical setting, locates appropriate evidence that addresses the question, evaluates the evidence in relation to the problem's contexts, and articulates conclusions that follow logically from analysis.

NSSE Measure		FY		SR	
		2005	2011	2005	2011
Worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources	PLNU	3.06	3.20	3.43	3.35
	Masters	3.08	3.15	3.36	3.38
	Peers	3.12	3.13	3.39	3.44
Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and considering its components	PLNU	3.08	3.17	3.18	3.30
	Masters	3.03	3.15	3.22	3.30
	Peers	3.13	3.22	**3.32	3.34
Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships	PLNU	2.86	2.99	2.98	3.15
	Masters	2.81	2.94	3.03	3.10
	Peers	2.86	2.97	**3.14	3.18
Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions	PLNU	2.83	2.83	2.88	3.10
	Masters	2.82	*2.96	2.97	3.06
	Peers	2.80	2.93	*3.02	3.09
Acquiring a broad general education	PLNU	3.36	3.28	3.42	3.41
	Masters	***3.15	3.18	**3.31	**3.24
	Peers	3.31	3.28	3.50	3.41
Writing clearly and effectively	PLNU	3.01	3.01	3.07	3.13
	Masters	3.00	3.07	3.12	3.14
	Peers	2.98	3.03	**3.23	3.22
Speaking clearly and effectively	PLNU	2.94	2.96	3.02	3.17
	Masters	*2.81	2.93	3.05	*3.05
	Peers	**2.73	2.86	3.08	3.11
Thinking critically and analytically	PLNU	3.26	3.25	3.33	3.43
	Masters	*3.14	3.24	3.34	3.36
	Peers	3.25	3.29	***3.49	3.45

3. Completes a field-based assignment in the course of study that employs insights from others; evaluates a significant question in relation to concepts, methods or assumptions in at least one academic field; and explains the implications of learning outside the classroom.

NSSE Measure		FY		SR	
		2005	2011	2005	2011
Participated in a community-based project (e.g. service learning) as part of a regular course	PLNU	1.51	1.58	1.91	2.17
	Masters	1.56	1.55	1.80	***1.75
	Peers	***1.81	***1.81	1.96	***1.86
Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with faculty members outside of class	PLNU	1.76	1.96	2.22	2.50
	Masters	1.82	1.84	2.13	***2.08
	Peers	*1.90	1.85	2.28	***2.21
Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and considering its components	PLNU	3.08	3.17	3.18	3.30
	Masters	3.03	3.15	3.22	3.30
	Peers	3.13	3.22	**3.32	3.34
Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships	PLNU	2.86	2.99	2.98	3.15
	Masters	2.81	2.94	3.03	3.10
	Peers	2.86	2.97	**3.14	3.18
Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions	PLNU	2.83	2.83	2.88	3.10
	Masters	2.82	*2.96	2.97	3.06
	Peers	2.80	2.93	*3.02	3.09
Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective	PLNU	2.91	3.03	2.99	3.05
	Masters	**2.73	***2.81	**2.84	**2.88
	Peers	2.90	*2.91	3.01	3.02
Practicum, internship, field experience, co-op experience, or clinical assignment	PLNU	0.05	0.06	0.71	0.70
	Masters	*0.08	0.06	***0.56	***0.47
	Peers	0.06	0.07	0.69	0.66
Community service or volunteer work	PLNU	0.45	0.51	0.75	0.77
	Masters	0.40	***0.36	***0.62	***0.56
	Peers	*0.53	0.54	0.77	0.75

Work on a research project with a faculty member outside of course or program requirements	PLNU	0.02	0.01	0.20	0.22
	Masters	*0.05	***0.05	0.18	*0.16
	Peers	0.04	*0.03	0.25	0.23
Study abroad	PLNU	0.01	0.00	0.33	0.35
	Masters	***0.02	***0.03	***0.13	***0.11
	Peers	0.01	***0.03	0.36	0.35
Acquiring a broad general education	PLNU	3.36	3.28	3.42	3.41
	Masters	***3.15	3.18	**3.31	**3.24
	Peers	3.31	3.28	3.50	3.41
Writing clearly and effectively	PLNU	3.01	3.01	3.07	3.13
	Masters	3.00	3.07	3.12	3.14
	Peers	2.98	3.03	**3.23	3.22
Speaking clearly and effectively	PLNU	2.94	2.96	3.02	3.17
	Masters	*2.81	2.93	3.05	*3.05
	Peers	**2.73	2.86	3.08	3.11
Thinking critically and analytically	PLNU	3.26	3.25	3.33	3.43
	Masters	*3.14	3.24	3.34	3.36
	Peers	3.25	3.29	***3.49	3.45
Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds	PLNU	2.44	2.49	2.32	2.57
	Masters	*2.58	**2.71	***2.61	2.70
	Peers	**2.66	**2.71	***2.69	2.69

Civic Learning

1. Explains diverse perspectives on a contested issue and evaluates insights gained from different kinds of evidence reflecting scholarly and community perspectives.

NSSE Measure		FY		SR	
		2005	2011	2005	2011
Included diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.) in class discussions or writing assignments	PLNU	2.68	2.78	2.81	2.79
	Masters	2.76	2.81	2.83	2.89
	Peers	2.87	2.84	*2.93	*2.94
Participated in a community-based project (e.g. service learning) as part of a regular course	PLNU	1.51	1.58	1.91	2.17
	Masters	1.56	1.55	1.80	***1.75
	Peers	***1.81	***1.81	1.96	***1.86
Had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity than your own	PLNU	2.71	2.81	2.56	2.66
	Masters	**2.52	***2.57	2.60	2.67
	Peers	2.70	*2.66	*2.71	2.68
Had serious conversations with students who are very different from you in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values	PLNU	2.66	2.76	2.60	2.71
	Masters	2.70	*2.61	2.71	2.69
	Peers	2.78	2.66	*2.76	2.74
Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions	PLNU	2.83	2.83	2.88	3.10
	Masters	2.82	*2.96	2.97	3.06
	Peers	2.80	2.93	*3.02	3.09
Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue	PLNU	3.01	2.94	3.02	2.94
	Masters	***2.56	***2.6	***2.70	***2.70
	Peers	2.88	*2.83	2.95	2.96
Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective	PLNU	2.91	3.03	2.99	3.05
	Masters	**2.73	***2.81	**2.84	**2.88
	Peers	2.90	*2.91	3.01	3.02
Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept	PLNU	3.05	3.08	3.07	3.16
	Masters	***2.76	***2.88	***2.85	***2.93
	Peers	2.97	2.97	3.02	3.05

Acquiring a broad general education	PLNU	3.36	3.28	3.42	3.41
	Masters	***3.15	3.18	**3.31	**3.24
	Peers	3.31	3.28	3.50	3.41
Writing clearly and effectively	PLNU	3.01	3.01	3.07	3.13
	Masters	3.00	3.07	3.12	3.14
	Peers	2.98	3.03	**3.23	3.22
Thinking critically and analytically	PLNU	3.26	3.25	3.33	3.43
	Masters	*3.14	3.24	3.34	3.36
	Peers	3.25	3.29	***3.49	3.45
Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds	PLNU	2.44	2.49	2.32	2.57
	Masters	*2.58	**2.71	***2.61	2.70
	Peers	**2.66	**2.71	***2.69	2.69
Solving complex real-world problems	PLNU	2.56	2.66	2.54	2.88
	Masters	2.56	2.72	**2.73	2.83
	Peers	2.60	2.71	***2.78	2.86
Developing a personal code of values and ethics	PLNU	3.22	3.04	3.16	3.13
	Masters	***2.62	***2.75	***2.73	***2.77
	Peers	***2.94	2.97	3.07	3.09
Contributing to the welfare of your community	PLNU	3.01	2.97	2.78	3.05
	Masters	***2.40	***2.45	***2.49	***2.49
	Peers	***2.74	*2.82	2.81	**2.86

2. Develops and justifies a position on a public issue and relates this position to alternative views within the community or policy environment.

NSSE Measure		FY		SR	
		2005	2011	2005	2011
Included diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.) in class discussions or writing assignments	PLNU	2.68	2.78	2.81	2.79
	Masters	2.76	2.81	2.83	2.89
	Peers	2.87	2.84	*2.93	*2.94
Participated in a community-based project (e.g. service learning) as part of a regular course	PLNU	1.51	1.58	1.91	2.17
	Masters	1.56	1.55	1.80	***1.75
	Peers	***1.81	***1.81	1.96	***1.86
Had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity than your own	PLNU	2.71	2.81	2.56	2.66
	Masters	**2.52	***2.57	2.60	2.67
	Peers	2.70	*2.66	*2.71	2.68
Had serious conversations with students who are very different from you in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values	PLNU	2.66	2.76	2.60	2.71
	Masters	2.70	*2.61	2.71	2.69
	Peers	2.78	2.66	*2.76	2.74
Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions	PLNU	2.83	2.83	2.88	3.10
	Masters	2.82	*2.96	2.97	3.06
	Peers	2.80	2.93	*3.02	3.09
Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue	PLNU	3.01	2.94	3.02	2.94
	Masters	***2.56	***2.6	***2.70	***2.70
	Peers	2.88	*2.83	2.95	2.96
Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective	PLNU	2.91	3.03	2.99	3.05
	Masters	**2.73	***2.81	**2.84	**2.88
	Peers	2.90	*2.91	3.01	3.02
Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept	PLNU	3.05	3.08	3.07	3.16
	Masters	***2.76	***2.88	***2.85	***2.93
	Peers	2.97	2.97	3.02	3.05
Acquiring a broad general education	PLNU	3.36	3.28	3.42	3.41

	Masters	***3.15	3.18	**3.31	**3.24
	Peers	3.31	3.28	3.50	3.41
	PLNU	3.26	3.25	3.33	3.43
Thinking critically and analytically	Masters	*3.14	3.24	3.34	3.36
	Peers	3.25	3.29	***3.49	3.45
	PLNU	2.33	1.87	2.22	1.96
Voting in local, state, or national elections	Masters	2.45	2.00	2.29	2.08
	Peers	2.39	1.77	2.35	1.93
	PLNU	2.44	2.49	2.32	2.57
Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds	Masters	*2.58	**2.71	***2.61	2.70
	Peers	**2.66	**2.71	***2.69	2.69
	PLNU	3.22	3.04	3.16	3.13
Developing a personal code of values and ethics	Masters	***2.62	***2.75	***2.73	***2.77
	Peers	***2.94	2.97	3.07	3.09
	PLNU	3.01	2.97	2.78	3.05
Contributing to the welfare of your community	Masters	***2.40	***2.45	***2.49	***2.49
	Peers	***2.74	*2.82	2.81	**2.86

3. Collaborates in developing and implementing an approach to a civic issue, evaluates the process and, where applicable, weighs the results.

NSSE Measure		FY		SR	
		2005	2011	2005	2011
Included diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.) in class discussions or writing assignments	PLNU	2.68	2.78	2.81	2.79
	Masters	2.76	2.81	2.83	2.89
	Peers	2.87	2.84	*2.93	*2.94
Participated in a community-based project (e.g. service learning) as part of a regular course	PLNU	1.51	1.58	1.91	2.17
	Masters	1.56	1.55	1.80	***1.75
	Peers	***1.81	***1.81	1.96	***1.86
Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions	PLNU	2.83	2.83	2.88	3.10
	Masters	2.82	*2.96	2.97	3.06
	Peers	2.80	2.93	*3.02	3.09
Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue	PLNU	3.01	2.94	3.02	2.94
	Masters	***2.56	***2.6	***2.70	***2.70
	Peers	2.88	*2.83	2.95	2.96
Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective	PLNU	2.91	3.03	2.99	3.05
	Masters	**2.73	***2.81	**2.84	**2.88
	Peers	2.90	*2.91	3.01	3.02
Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept	PLNU	3.05	3.08	3.07	3.16
	Masters	***2.76	***2.88	***2.85	***2.93
	Peers	2.97	2.97	3.02	3.05
Practicum, internship, field experience, co-op experience, or clinical assignment	PLNU	0.05	0.06	0.71	0.70
	Masters	*0.08	0.06	***0.56	***0.47
	Peers	0.06	0.07	0.69	0.66
Community service or volunteer work	PLNU	0.45	0.51	0.75	0.77
	Masters	0.40	***0.36	***0.62	***0.56
	Peers	*0.53	0.54	0.77	0.75

Acquiring a broad general education	PLNU	3.36	3.28	3.42	3.41
	Masters	***3.15	3.18	**3.31	**3.24
	Peers	3.31	3.28	3.50	3.41
Thinking critically and analytically	PLNU	3.26	3.25	3.33	3.43
	Masters	*3.14	3.24	3.34	3.36
	Peers	3.25	3.29	***3.49	3.45
Working effectively with others	PLNU	3.02	3.10	3.23	3.29
	Masters	2.96	3.04	3.20	3.20
	Peers	3.01	3.13	3.29	3.32
Voting in local, state, or national elections	PLNU	2.33	1.87	2.22	1.96
	Masters	2.45	2.00	2.29	2.08
	Peers	2.39	1.77	2.35	1.93
Solving complex real-world problems	PLNU	2.56	2.66	2.54	2.88
	Masters	2.56	2.72	**2.73	2.83
	Peers	2.60	2.71	***2.78	2.86
Contributing to the welfare of your community	PLNU	3.01	2.97	2.78	3.05
	Masters	***2.40	***2.45	***2.49	***2.49
	Peers	***2.74	*2.82	2.81	**2.86

Peer Institutions Used for NSSE:

2005 Peer Group (these are the members of PLNU's Peer and Aspirant list that participated in 2005):

Abilene Christian University	Abilene	TX
Bethel University	St. Paul	MN
California Lutheran University	Thousand Oaks	CA
Chapman University	Orange	CA
Gordon College	Wenham	MA
Santa Clara University	Santa Clara	CA
Taylor University-Upland	Upland	IN
University of San Diego	San Diego	CA
Wheaton College (MA)	Norton	MA (should have been Wheaton (IL))
Whittier College	Whittier	CA
Whitworth College	Spokane	WA

2011 Peer Group (these are the members of PLNU's Peer and Aspirant list that participated in 2011):

Abilene Christian University	Abilene	TX
Anderson University	Anderson	SC
Bethel University	McKenzie	TN (should have been Bethel (MN))
California Lutheran University	Thousand Oaks	CA
Chapman University	Orange	CA
Gordon College	Wenham	MA
Messiah College	Grantham	PA
Seattle Pacific University	Seattle	WA
Taylor University	Upland	IN
Union University	Jackson	TN
Whitworth University	Spokane	WA

PLNU ETS Scores Analysis

		Entering Freshmen			Graduating Seniors		
		Fall 2011	Fall 2012	*Benchmark	Spring 2012	Spring 2013	*Benchmark
Number of Students		71	102	34,303	84	140	44,978
Total Score	mean	450.03	455.47	434.10	459.71	460.50	446.30
	std. dev.	17.70	16.62	17.30	18.58	18.13	19.70
	75 th pctl	464	464	444	474	473	460
	median	447	454	432	460	460	444
	25 th pctl	435	442	422	449	449	432
Critical Thinking Skills Subscore	mean	113.37	114.42	109.10	117.08	115.61	112.60
	std. dev.	5.75	5.90	5.60	5.73	6.21	6.40
	75 th pctl	117	118	112	120	121	117
	median	112	115	108	117	116	112
	25 th pctl	108	110	105	114	112	108
Reading Skills Subscore	mean	118.86	120.19	114.60	121.89	122.32	118.70
	std. dev.	6.06	6.14	6.70	6.09	6.21	6.70
	75 th pctl	124	125	120	127	127	124
	median	119	121	115	124	125	119
	25 th pctl	115	116	109	118	120	114
Writing Skills Subscore	mean	115.20	116.85	112.20	116.92	117.72	114.60
	std. dev.	4.24	3.99	4.90	4.56	4.00	4.90
	75 th pctl	117	119	115	121	121	117
	median	114	118	112	117	119	114
	25 th pctl	113	115	109	114	115	112
Mathematics Skills Subscore	mean	115.83	116.21	111.10	116.15	116.71	113.70
	std. dev.	6.33	4.96	5.50	6.33	5.53	6.10
	75 th pctl	122	119	115	121	121	118
	median	114	116	110	115	116	113
	25 th pctl	110	113	107	111	113	109
Humanities Context-Based Subscore	mean	115.44	117.40	112.20	118.39	119.49	115.50
	std. dev.	6.00	6.58	5.90	6.58	5.68	6.50
	75 th pctl	120	123	116	124	123	120
	median	115	119	111	119	119	115
	25 th pctl	110	112	107	113	115	111
Social Sciences Context-Based Subscore	mean	115.03	114.59	110.90	117.89	115.81	114.20
	std. dev.	5.98	6.11	5.70	5.58	6.46	6.20
	75 th pctl	120	120	114	120	122	119
	median	116	114	110	119	118	114

	25 th pctl	110	110	106	114	110	109
Natural Sciences Context-Based Subscore	mean	116.30	117.00	112.60	119.25	118.30	115.80
	std. dev.	4.81	4.84	5.60	4.60	5.02	5.80
	75 th pctl	120	120	117	121	123	120
	median	117	118	112	121	119	117
	25 th pctl	113	114	109	117	116	111

* Benchmark data is based on comparable results from all participating Master's (Comprehensive) Colleges and Universities I and II from July 2007 through June 2012

PLNU ETS Proficiency Analysis

		Entering Freshmen			Graduating Seniors		
		Fall 2011	Fall 2012	*Benchmark	Spring 2012	Spring 2013	*Benchmark
Number of Students		71	102	34,303	84	140	44,978
Reading, Level 1	Proficient	73%	76%	45%	86%	84%	69%
	Marginal	17%	15%	25%	7%	9%	17%
	Not Proficient	10%	9%	30%	7%	6%	13%
Reading, Level 2	Proficient	39%	43%	19%	63%	65%	40%
	Marginal	21%	29%	16%	15%	18%	20%
	Not Proficient	39%	27%	65%	21%	17%	40%
Critical Thinking (Reading, Level 3)	Proficient	3%	7%	2%	23%	11%	7%
	Marginal	23%	24%	8%	31%	40%	20%
	Not Proficient	75%	70%	90%	46%	49%	73%
Writing, Level 1	Proficient	73%	81%	45%	81%	90%	66%
	Marginal	23%	17%	34%	15%	9%	25%
	Not Proficient	4%	2%	20%	4%	1%	9%
Writing, Level 2	Proficient	20%	26%	10%	43%	39%	21%
	Marginal	38%	49%	28%	37%	46%	37%
	Not Proficient	42%	25%	62%	20%	16%	41%
Writing, Level 3	Proficient	7%	12%	4%	21%	18%	9%
	Marginal	27%	37%	16%	40%	39%	27%
	Not Proficient	66%	51%	81%	38%	43%	64%
Mathematics, Level 1	Proficient	69%	77%	38%	75%	81%	57%
	Marginal	23%	20%	28%	18%	12%	24%
	Not Proficient	8%	3%	33%	7%	7%	19%
Mathematics, Level 2	Proficient	41%	43%	16%	44%	48%	31%
	Marginal	28%	35%	22%	30%	30%	26%

	Not Proficient	31%	22%	62%	26%	22%	43%
Mathematics, Level 3	Proficient	14%	5%	4%	18%	11%	8%
	Marginal	23%	30%	9%	24%	31%	17%
	Not Proficient	63%	65%	87%	58%	57%	74%

* Benchmark data is based on comparable results from all participating Master's (Comprehensive) Colleges and Universities I and II from July 2007 through June 2012

PLNU ETS Proficiency Analysis

Percentage of "Proficient" Students

● 0% - 33% ● 34% - 66% ● 67% or Higher

	Entering Freshmen			Graduating Seniors		
	Fall 2011 (n=71)	Fall 2012 (n=102)	*Benchmark (n=34,303)	Spring 2012 (n=84)	Spring 2013 (n=140)	*Benchmark (n=44,978)
Reading, Level 1	● 73%	● 76%	● 45%	● 86%	● 84%	● 69%
Reading, Level 2	● 39%	● 43%	● 19%	● 63%	● 65%	● 40%
Critical Thinking <small>(Reading, Level 3)</small>	● 3%	● 7%	● 2%	● 23%	● 11%	● 7%
Writing, Level 1	● 73%	● 81%	● 45%	● 81%	● 90%	● 66%
Writing, Level 2	● 20%	● 26%	● 10%	● 43%	● 39%	● 21%
Writing, Level 3	● 7%	● 12%	● 4%	● 21%	● 18%	● 9%
Math, Level 1	● 69%	● 77%	● 38%	● 75%	● 81%	● 57%
Math, Level 2	● 41%	● 43%	● 16%	● 44%	● 48%	● 31%
Math, Level 3	● 14%	● 5%	● 4%	● 18%	● 11%	● 8%

DQP Rubric Data Summary

Scale Used:

Benchmark/Unsatisfactory	1
Milestone/Low Satisfactory	2
Milestone/High Satisfactory	3
Capstone/Outstanding	4

Most data gathered using multiple readers for each assignment.

Specialized Knowledge (Department Measure)	Percent of students at or above 3	Percent of students at or above 2.5	Percent of students at or above 2
Business*	46.9%	46.9%	79.6%
Crossdisciplinary Studies	50.0%	55.6%	100.0%
Literature			
Spanish	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mathematics/Computer Science	81.8%	90.9%	100.0%
Philosophy			

Critical Thinking (Department Measure)	Percent of students at or above 3	Percent of students at or above 2.5	Percent of students at or above 2
Business*			
Crossdisciplinary Studies^	66.7%	77.8%	88.9%
Literature^	66.7%	100.0%	100.0%
Spanish*			
Mathematics/Computer Science^	81.8%	100.0%	100.0%
Philosophy^	88.9%	88.9%	100.0%

Information Literacy (Department Measure)	Percent of students at or above 3	Percent of students at or above 2.5	Percent of students at or above 2
Business*			
Crossdisciplinary Studies^	44.4%	77.8%	94.4%
Literature^	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Spanish*			
Mathematics/Computer Science^	81.8%	90.9%	90.9%
Philosophy^	88.9%	88.9%	100.0%

Written Communication (Department Measure)	Percent of students at or above 3	Percent of students at or above 2.5	Percent of students at or above 2
Business*			
Crossdisciplinary Studies^	66.7%	77.8%	88.9%
Literature^	83.3%	100.0%	100.0%
Spanish*	75.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mathematics/Computer Science^	81.8%	100.0%	100.0%
Philosophy^	77.8%	77.8%	77.8%

Oral Communication (Department Measure)	Percent of students at or above 3	Percent of students at or above 2.5	Percent of students at or above 2
Business*			
Crossdisciplinary Studies^	55.6%	88.9%	100.0%
Literature^			
Spanish*	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mathematics/Computer Science^	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Philosophy^			

Applied Learning (Department Measure)	Percent of students at or above 3	Percent of students at or above 2.5	Percent of students at or above 2
Business			
Crossdisciplinary Studies	38.9%	66.7%	94.4%
Literature			
Spanish			
Mathematics/Computer Science			
Philosophy	88.9%	88.9%	100.0%

* Used disciplinary rubric

^ Used AAC&U rubric in part or full