Core Curriculum v2.0

📋 Program-401

Annual Assessment

1

Program Mission

Through the Texas A&M International Core Curriculum, students will gain a foundation of knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world, develop principles of personal and social responsibility for living in a diverse world, and advance intellectual and practical skills that are essential for all learning.

*

2

Select one or more Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) to enter Measures and Benchmarks. The checkboxes appear to the left of each PLO. You may also add new PLOs by clicking the + Add Outcome button.

------------------- Added Program Outcomes -------------------

2 **Communication - Communication**
TAMIU students will be able to develop ideas and express them clearly, considering the effect of the message, fostering knowledge, and building the skills needed to communicate persuasively by using their command of oral, aural, written, and visual literacy skills that enable them to exchange messages appropriate to the subject, occasion, and audience.

Measures

1 **Relevant Associations:**

Selected Outcomes:

○ COMM - Communication

2

Measure Type

DIRECT - Student Products

If Selecting Other Measure Type, Please Specify Below

Measure

Just as before instructors and chairs will choose assignments that match the rubrics. The 2020-2021 AY as mentioned in last cycle's assessment report will be the trial run year. The 2021-2022 AY will be our second year collecting the data with core curriculum through AEFIS.

Moving the data to AEFIS will give us the ability to address the two concerns voiced by faculty in the last assessment report of not being able to disaggregate data by courses sections, courses, department, and college easily. We also now have the faculty scoring on the one institutionally created rubric which has been attached as supporting documentation. The rubric ranges in AEFIS as a follows

1 = Deficient
2 = Beginning
3 = Competent
4 = Accomplished
5 = Exemplary

The supporting documentation has the courses that the domains will be tested in for the two academic years. For the purposes of testing this PLO we will test the students ability to articulate information clearly and fluently by looking at the overall communication rubric score.

Benchmark

75% of students will score a competent or higher on the Communication rubric. We are no longer using the mean as the point of benchmark as that may not be the clearest point without all the statistical analysis to know if that's the best statistic for showing success. Therefore, we are looking at each individual students success on the rubric.

Where will it be assessed?

Identified Core Curriculum sections in each long semester.

When will it be assessed?

AY 2020-2021 and AY 2021-2022

Individual(s) Responsible for Data Collection

Findings

Benchmark Met

Findings Description

92.1% of students scored competent or higher. (Not including the outlier semester of Fall 2020, explained in the action plan)

668 (41.13%)= exemplary
524 (32.26%)= accomplished
304 (18.72%)= competent
86 (5.3%)= beginning
42 (2.59%)= deficient

1624 = n

Means
spring 2021 = 3.67
fall 2021 = 4.04
spring 2022 = 3.98

Action Plan Answer the following questions:
1. What did program faculty learn from the findings about how effective the program is in achieving this measure?
2. What are some examples of productive new actions taken by faculty to improve the program that generated these results?
3. What steps should be taken to enhance the effectiveness of this measure to improve the program going forward to the next cycle?
4. What are some general issues that emerged in the reading of these findings that the dean/provost should be aware of?

The 2020-2021 AY was a trial run year, but unfortunately the Fall 2020 semester was accidentally set up in AEFIS incorrectly. While we did get the data from faculty it did not have the appropriate rubrics instead of the 1-5 rubric score it only had the 1-4. This was an error when the AEFIS system was originally set up and could not be corrected during the run. The assessment had to be redone and reset for Spring 2021 onward to the 1-5 rubric scoring. Therefore, while the data from Fall 2020 is available it is considered outlier data.

In Spring 2021, after the rubric was fixed in the AEFIS system. Some of the comments from faculty were
- Core Curriculum needs to be announced in College Faculty Orientation Meetings
- Chairs need to be more involved in the process

- Having to provide scores for an entire lecture course is too many students and they are overwhelmed scoring students for this process

In response to point one, OIARP would be invited to College Faculty Orientation in the Fall to present a reminder on Core Curriculum. In response to point two, the Provost made it clear to the Deans and Chairs their responsibilities in the Core Curriculum process which is to ensure that faculty comply with the requirements of the process. Additionally, the Provost made it very clear that all faculty including adjuncts are to participate in the process. In response to point three, the Provost agreed that after listening to the concerns of faculty and to compromise this concern to create ownership by faculty he agreed to the following: Faculty will score 30% or 25 students whichever is less when scoring their course sections. Instructors will choose the students who they will score.

For the AY 2021-2022 data, after University Core Curriculum Committee (UC3) reviewed the data there was agreement that the scores were incredibly high. To compare last cycle's data to this you do have to add one point when comparing the means. Because the rubric before was 0-4 this rubric in AEFIS is 1-5. So these means are about the same as last cycle which comparatively was 3.7 adjusted. There was a debate between faculty and Associate Provost about scoring. Some faculty believed that scoring on the rubric meant scoring on the range of the student's year in school. For example, "For a freshman, this student scores a 2, etc." However, the Associate Provost clarified that the scoring should be on a more general baseline where the rubric should be followed with scoring as a general student across the board. For reference, these scores are not reported to the students. The artifacts are chosen from class graded projects, but are then scored by the faculty on a separate rubric for the purposes of Core Curriculum and are not a part of the student's grade. Which was emphasized in the meeting when discussing the rubric's use. Some faculty argued that the high scores were appropriate because the faculty spend a lot of time in the core courses working with the students and the upper courses do not. Therefore explaining why the core curriculum would be scoring high on skills that upper curriculum would think students lack in skills. However, few faculty agreed with this sentiment. Another idea to explain the high scores was set forth which was that the sampling choices were having faculty only select those students who performed at a high level, and not a true random sample. However, this was just an idea and there was no statistical analysis on the data to know if this was true or not. To address this issue it was suggested to the faculty to just do an "every other" technique when selecting what students to score.

Last cycle there was conversations about who would analyze the data. This cycle it was analyzed assistant director Karol Batey, but she has asked to hire a statistical analyst to better perform statistical analysis on the data and provide more valid insight into the core curriculum data. The position was approved by Associate Vice President of OIARP and Provost. The job description has been included in the supporting documentation.

The analyst was hired, and she provided the analysis of this cycle's data it is as follows for all core curriculum:

Including data from Fall 2020 (outlier year)

- Through a regression analysis for average vs year for Core Curriculum assessments at TAMIU. In overall, the line is increasing. The significance of p-value, F-values, and probability meaning an improvement of students' performance through the years.

- Through a regression analysis from the number of observations vs average. More observations implies lower mean. The p-value 0.12 and t-value less than 0.0001 show the significance of the data. Two outliers outside the 95% predictions limits:
    - Fall 2020, Department of F&P Arts with 2 observations and mean of 2.406
    - Fall 2020, Department of Humanities with 27 observations and mean of 2.495
    Therefore, the ==increase in students tested in the classes implies a decrease in the overall average==. Also, ==more classes assessed by department will give a lower average==.

Excluding data from Fall 2020 (outlier year)

- The regression analysis for average vs year for Core Curriculum assessments at TAMIU. In overall, the **line is increasing but not significant evidence** proof that the average will follow the increasing pattern the following years.
- The results from the regression analysis from the number of observations vs average. More observations implies lower mean. The p-value 0.0383 and t-value less than alpha 0.05 is the significant evidence that more students assessed will implies a lower average. Therefore, the ==increase in students tested in the classes implies a decrease in the overall average==. Also, ==more classes assessed by department will give a lower average==.

Significant evidence proves the importance of randomization or requirement to increase the number of students graded in each course.

Her analysis did prove that we were not appropriately choosing students to score. If the faculty wanted to continue to do 30% or 25 students whichever is less sampling they needed to do the true randomization of sampling. This will be expressed to them in training from OIARP (supporting documentation) in the next cycle to see if this changes the scores.

Supporting Documentation:

Select a document artifact attached to this form or add a new document

UC3 Core Assessment Domains AYs2021.2023 10.7.20.docx

CC. Communication for Dance Art Theatre Composition.pdf

CC. Communication.pdf

Memo - New Position - Assessment and Data Analyst Specialist I.pdf

Assessment and Data Analyst Specialist I TAMIU- Final 6-15-2022.docx

Randomization for WIN and CORE Assignments.pptx

Statistical Analysis – Core Curriculum Assessments.pptx

Core Assessment Assignments Spring 2021.docx

[UC3 Minutes-10.19.20.doc](#)

[UC3 Minutes 4.7.2021.docx](#)

[UC3 Minutes-09.09.20.doc](#)

[UC3 Minutes-10.19.20.pdf](#)

[UC3 Minutes-11.12.20.pdf](#)

[UC3 Minutes 03.30.2022.pdf](#)

[UC3 Minutes 04.28.2022.pdf](#)

[UC3 Minutes 10.14.2021.pdf](#)

[UC3 Minutes - 11.11.2021.pdf](#)

Measure Type

DIRECT - Student Products

If Selecting Other Measure Type, Please Specify Below

Measure

Just as before instructors and chairs will choose assignments that match the rubrics. The 2020-2021 AY as mentioned in last cycle's assessment report will be the trial run year. The 2021-2022 AY will be our second year collecting the data with core curriculum through AEFIS.

Moving the data to AEFIS will give us the ability to address the two concerns voiced by faculty in the last assessment report of not being able to disaggregate data by courses sections, courses, department, and college easily. We also now have the faculty scoring on the one institutionally created rubric which has been attached as supporting documentation. The rubric ranges in AEFIS as a follows

1 = Deficient
2 = Beginning
3 = Competent
4 = Accomplished

5 = Exemplary

The supporting documentation has the courses that the domains will be tested in for the two academic years. For the purposes of testing this PLO we will test the students ability to demonstrate proficiency in using the tools of language by looking at the grammar and mechanics domain score.

Benchmark

75% of students will score a competent or higher on the Grammar and Mechanics Domain. We are no longer using the mean as the point of benchmark as that may not be the clearest point without all the statistical analysis to know if that's the best statistic for showing success. Therefore, we are looking at each individual students success on the rubric.

Where will it be assessed?

Identified Core Curriculum sections in each long semester.

When will it be assessed?

AY 2020-2021 and AY 2021-2022

Individual(s) Responsible for Data Collection

Office of Institutional Assessment, Research, and Planning will collect fro

Findings

Benchmark Met

Findings Description

94.77% of students scored competent or higher. (Not including the outlier semester of Fall 2020, explained in the action plan)

367 (33.7%) = Exemplary
440 (40.4%)= Accomplished
225 (20.66%)= Competent
31 (2.85%)= Beginning
26 (2.39%)= Deficient

1089 = n

Action Plan Answer the following questions:
1. What did program faculty learn from the findings about how effective the program is in achieving this measure?
2. What are some examples of productive new actions taken by faculty to improve the program that generated these results?
3. What steps should be taken to enhance the effectiveness of this measure to improve the program going forward to the next cycle?
4. What are some general issues that emerged in the reading of these findings that the dean/provost should be aware of?

The 2020-2021 AY was a trial run year, but unfortunately the Fall 2020 semester was accidentally set up in AEFIS incorrectly. While we did get the data from faculty it did not have the appropriate rubrics instead of the 1-5 rubric score it only had the 1-4. This was an error when the AEFIS system was originally set up and could not be corrected during the run. The assessment had to be redone and reset for Spring 2021 onward to the 1-5 rubric scoring. Therefore, while the data from Fall 2020 is available it is considered outlier data.

In Spring 2021, after the rubric was fixed in the AEFIS system. Some of the comments from faculty were

- Core Curriculum needs to be announced in College Faculty Orientation Meetings
- Chairs need to be more involved in the process
- Having to provide scores for an entire lecture course is too many students and they are overwhelmed scoring students for this process

In response to point one, OIARP would be invited to College Faculty Orientation in the Fall to present a reminder on Core Curriculum. In response to point two, the Provost made it clear to the Deans and Chairs their responsibilities in the Core Curriculum process which is to ensure that faculty comply with the requirements of the process. Additionally, the Provost made it very clear that all faculty including adjuncts are to participate in the process. In response to point three, the Provost agreed that after listening to the concerns of faculty and to compromise this concern to create ownership by faculty he agreed to the following: Faculty will score 30% or 25 students whichever is less when scoring their course sections. Instructors will choose the students who they will score.

For the AY 2021-2022 data, after University Core Curriculum Committee (UC3) reviewed the data there was agreement that the scores were incredibly high. There was a debate between faculty and Associate Provost about scoring. Some faculty believed that scoring on the rubric meant scoring on the range of the student's year in school. For example, "For a freshman, this student scores a 2, etc." However, the Associate Provost clarified that the scoring should be on a more general baseline where the rubric should be followed with scoring as a general student across the board. For reference, these scores are not reported to the students. The artifacts are chosen from class graded projects, but are then scored by the faculty on a separate rubric for the purposes of Core Curriculum and are not a part of the student's grade. Which was emphasized in the meeting when discussing the rubric's use. Some faculty argued that the high scores were appropriate because the faculty spend a lot of time in the core courses working with the students and the upper courses do not. Therefore explaining why the core curriculum would be scoring high on skills that upper curriculum would think students lack in skills. However, few faculty agreed with this sentiment. Another idea to explain the high scores was set forth which was that the sampling choices were having faculty only select those students who performed at

a high level, and not a true random sample. However, this was just an idea and there was no statistical analysis on the data to know if this was true or not. To address this issue it was suggested to the faculty to just do an "every other" technique when selecting what students to score.

Last cycle there was conversations about who would analyze the data. This cycle it was analyzed assistant director Karol Batey, but she has asked to hire a statistical analyst to better perform statistical analysis on the data and provide more valid insight into the core curriculum data. The position was approved by Associate Vice President of OIARP and Provost. The job description has been included in the supporting documentation.

The analyst was hired, and she provided the analysis of this cycle's data it is as follows for all core curriculum:

Including data from Fall 2020 (outlier year)

- Through a regression analysis for average vs year for Core Curriculum assessments at TAMIU. In overall, the line is increasing. The significance of p-value, F-values, and probability ==meaning an improvement of students' performance through the years==.
- Through a regression analysis from the number of observations vs average. More observations implies lower mean. The p-value 0.12 and t-value less than 0.0001 show the significance of the data. Two outliers outside the 95% predictions limits:
  - Fall 2020, Department of F&P Arts with 2 observations and mean of 2.406
  - Fall 2020, Department of Humanities with 27 observations and mean of 2.495
  Therefore, the ==increase in students tested in the classes implies a decrease in the overall average==. Also, ==more classes assessed by department will give a lower average==.

Excluding data from Fall 2020 (outlier year)

- The regression analysis for average vs year for Core Curriculum assessments at TAMIU. In overall, the **line is increasing but not significant evidence** proof that the average will follow the increasing pattern the following years.
- The results from the regression analysis from the number of observations vs average. More observations implies lower mean. The p-value 0.0383 and t-value less than alpha 0.05 is the significant evidence that more students assessed will implies a lower average. Therefore, the ==increase in students tested in the classes implies a decrease in the overall average==. Also, ==more classes assessed by department will give a lower average==.

Significant evidence proves the importance of randomization or requirement to increase the number of students graded in each course.

Her analysis did prove that we were not appropriately choosing students to score. If the faculty wanted to continue to do 30% or 25 students whichever is less sampling they needed to do the true randomization of sampling. This will be expressed to them in training from OIARP (supporting documentation) in the next cycle to see if this changes the scores.

Supporting Documentation:

Select a document artifact attached to this form or add a new document

UC3 Core Assessment Domains AYs2021.2023 10.7.20.docx

CC. Communication for Dance Art Theatre Composition.pdf

CC. Communication.pdf

Memo - New Position - Assessment and Data Analyst Specialist I.pdf

Assessment and Data Analyst Specialist I TAMIU- Final 6-15-2022.docx

Randomization for WIN and CORE Assignments.pptx

Statistical Analysis – Core Curriculum Assessments.pptx

Core Assessment Assignments Spring 2021.docx

UC3 Minutes-10.19.20.doc

UC3 Minutes 4.7.2021.docx

UC3 Minutes-09.09.20.doc

UC3 Minutes-10.19.20.pdf

UC3 Minutes-11.12.20.pdf

UC3 Minutes 03.30.2022.pdf

UC3 Minutes 04.28.2022.pdf

UC3 Minutes 10.14.2021.pdf

UC3 Minutes - 11.11.2021.pdf

3 Critical Thinking - Critical Thinking

TAMIU students will be able to think critically and creatively by utilizing skills such as innovation, inquiry, analysis, evaluation and synthesis of information.

Measures

1 Relevant Associations:

Selected Outcomes:

- CT - Critical Thinking

Measure Type

DIRECT - Student Products

If Selecting Other Measure Type, Please Specify Below

Measure

Just as before instructors and chairs will choose assignments that match the rubrics. The 2020-2021 AY as mentioned in last cycle's assessment report will be the trial run year. The 2021-2022 AY will be our second year collecting the data with core curriculum through AEFIS.

Moving the data to AEFIS will give us the ability to address the two concerns voiced by faculty in the last assessment report of not being able to disaggregate data by courses sections, courses, department, and college easily. We also now have the faculty scoring on the one institutionally created rubric which has been attached as supporting documentation. The rubric ranges in AEFIS as a follows

1 = Deficient
2 = Beginning
3 = Competent
4 = Accomplished
5 = Exemplary

The supporting documentation has the courses that the domains will be tested in for the two academic years. For the purposes of testing this PLO we will test the students ability to demonstrate an ability to think critically about a question or issue by looking at the overall critical thinking rubric score.

Benchmark

75% of students will score a competent or higher on the Critical Thinking rubric. We are no longer using the mean as the point of benchmark as that may not be the clearest point without all the statistical analysis to know if that's the best statistic for showing success. Therefore, we are looking at each individual students success on the rubric.

Where will it be assessed?

Identified Core Curriculum sections in each long semester.

When will it be assessed?

AY 2020-2021 and AY 2021-2022

Individual(s) Responsible for Data Collection

Office of Institutional Assessment, Research, and Planning will collect from

Findings

Benchmark Met

Findings Description

81.67% of students scored competent or higher on the critical thinking rubric. (Not including the outlier semester of Fall 2020, explained in the action plan)

742 (37.78%)= Exemplary
554 (28.2%)= Accomplished
308 (15.68%)= Competent
183 (9.32%)= Beginning
177 (9.01%)= Deficient

1964 = n

Means
Spring 2021 = 3.52
Fall 2021 = 4.41
Spring 2022 = 4.4

Action Plan Answer the following questions:
1. What did program faculty learn from the findings about how effective the program is in achieving this measure?
2. What are some examples of productive new actions taken by faculty to improve the program that generated these results?
3. What steps should be taken to enhance the effectiveness of this measure to improve the program going forward to the next cycle?
4. What are some general issues that emerged in the reading of these findings that the dean/provost should be aware of?

The 2020-2021 AY was a trial run year, but unfortunately the Fall 2020 semester was accidentally set up in AEFIS incorrectly. While we did get the data from faculty it did not have the appropriate rubrics instead of the 1-5 rubric score it only had the 1-4. This was an error when the AEFIS system was originally set up and could not be corrected during the run. The assessment had to be redone and reset for Spring 2021 onward to the 1-5 rubric scoring. Therefore, while the data from Fall 2020 is available it is considered outlier data.

In Spring 2021, after the rubric was fixed in the AEFIS system. Some of the comments from faculty were
- Core Curriculum needs to be announced in College Faculty Orientation Meetings
- Chairs need to be more involved in the process
- Having to provide scores for an entire lecture course is too many students and they are overwhelmed scoring students for this process

In response to point one, OIARP would be invited to College Faculty Orientation in the Fall to present a reminder on Core Curriculum. In response to point two, the Provost made it clear to the Deans and Chairs their responsibilities in the Core Curriculum process which is to ensure that faculty comply with the requirements of the process. Additionally, the Provost made it very clear that all faculty including adjuncts are to participate in the process. In response to point three, the Provost agreed that after listening to the concerns of faculty and to compromise this concern to create ownership by faculty he agreed to the following: Faculty will score 30% or 25 students whichever is less when scoring their course sections. Instructors will choose the students who they will score.

For the AY 2021-2022 data, after University Core Curriculum Committee (UC3) reviewed the data there was agreement that the scores were incredibly high. To compare last cycle's data to this you do have to add one point when comparing the means. Because the rubric before was 0-4 this rubric in AEFIS is 1-5. So these means are higher than last cycle which comparatively was 3.1 adjusted. There was a debate between faculty and Associate Provost about scoring. Some faculty believed that scoring on the rubric meant scoring on the range of the student's year in school. For example, "For a freshman, this student scores a 2, etc." However, the Associate Provost clarified that the scoring should be on a more general baseline where the rubric should be followed with scoring as a general student across the board. For reference, these scores are not reported to the students. The artifacts are chosen from class graded projects, but are then scored by the faculty on a separate rubric for the purposes of Core Curriculum and are not a part of the student's grade. Which was emphasized in the meeting when discussing the rubric's use. Some faculty argued that the high scores were appropriate because the faculty spend a lot of time in the core courses working with the students and the upper courses do not. Therefore explaining why the core curriculum would be scoring high on skills that upper curriculum would think students lack in skills. However, few faculty agreed with this sentiment. Another idea to explain the high scores was set forth which was that the sampling choices were having faculty only select those students who performed at a high level, and not a true random sample. However, this was just an idea and there was no statistical analysis on the data to know if this was true or not. To address this issue it was suggested to the faculty to just do an "every other" technique when selecting what students to score.

Last cycle there was conversations about who would analyze the data. This cycle it was analyzed assistant director Karol Batey, but she has asked to hire a statistical analyst to better perform statistical analysis on the data and provide more valid insight into the core curriculum data. The position was approved by Associate Vice President of OIARP and Provost. The job

description has been included in the supporting documentation.

The analyst was hired, and she provided the analysis of this cycle's data it is as follows for all core curriculum:

Including data from Fall 2020 (outlier year)

- Through a regression analysis for average vs year for Core Curriculum assessments at TAMIU. In overall, the line is increasing. The significance of p-value, F-values, and probability ==meaning an improvement of students' performance through the years==.
- Through a regression analysis from the number of observations vs average. More observations implies lower mean. The p-value 0.12 and t-value less than 0.0001 show the significance of the data. Two outliers outside the 95% predictions limits:
    - Fall 2020, Department of F&P Arts with 2 observations and mean of 2.406
    - Fall 2020, Department of Humanities with 27 observations and mean of 2.495
    Therefore, the ==increase in students tested in the classes implies a decrease in the overall average==. Also, ==more classes assessed by department will give a lower average==.

Excluding data from Fall 2020 (outlier year)

- The regression analysis for average vs year for Core Curriculum assessments at TAMIU. In overall, the **line is increasing but not significant evidence** proof that the average will follow the increasing pattern the following years.
- The results from the regression analysis from the number of observations vs average. More observations implies lower mean. The p-value 0.0383 and t-value less than alpha 0.05 is the significant evidence that more students assessed will implies a lower average. Therefore, the ==increase in students tested in the classes implies a decrease in the overall average==. Also, ==more classes assessed by department will give a lower average==.

Significant evidence proves the importance of randomization or requirement to increase the number of students graded in each course.

Her analysis did prove that we were not appropriately choosing students to score. If the faculty wanted to continue to do 30% or 25 students whichever is less sampling they needed to do the true randomization of sampling. This will be expressed to them in training from OIARP (supporting documentation) in the next cycle to see if this changes the scores.

Supporting Documentation:

Select a document artifact attached to this form or add a new document

UC3 Core Assessment Domains AYs2021.2023 10.7.20.docx

CC. Critical Thinking.pdf

Memo - New Position - Assessment and Data Analyst Specialist I.pdf

[Assessment and Data Analyst Specialist I TAMIU- Final 6-15-2022.docx](#)

[Randomization for WIN and CORE Assignments.pptx](#)

[Statistical Analysis – Core Curriculum Assessments.pptx](#)

[UC3 Minutes-10.19.20.doc](#)

[UC3 Minutes 4.7.2021.docx](#)

[UC3 Minutes-09.09.20.doc](#)

[UC3 Minutes-10.19.20.pdf](#)

[UC3 Minutes-11.12.20.pdf](#)

[UC3 Minutes 03.30.2022.pdf](#)

[UC3 Minutes 04.28.2022.pdf](#)

[UC3 Minutes 10.14.2021.pdf](#)

[UC3 Minutes - 11.11.2021.pdf](#)

Measure Type

DIRECT - Student Products

If Selecting Other Measure Type, Please Specify Below

Measure

Just as before instructors and chairs will choose assignments that match the rubrics. The 2020-2021 AY as mentioned in last cycle's assessment report will be the trial run year. The 2021-2022 AY will be our second year collecting the data with core curriculum through AEFIS.

Moving the data to AEFIS will give us the ability to address the two concerns voiced by faculty in the last assessment report of not being able to disaggregate data by courses sections, courses, department, and college easily. We also now have the faculty scoring on the one institutionally created rubric which has been attached as supporting documentation. The rubric ranges in AEFIS as a follows

1 = Deficient

2 = Beginning

3 = Competent

4 = Accomplished

5 = Exemplary

The supporting documentation has the courses that the domains will be tested in for the two academic years. For the purposes of testing this PLO we will test the students ability to Analyze various components of information to reach a rational conclusion by looking at the Analysis domain score.

Benchmark

75% of students will score a competent or higher on the Analysis Domain. We are no longer using the mean as the point of benchmark as that may not be the clearest point without all the statistical analysis to know if that's the best statistic for showing success. Therefore, we are looking at each individual students success on the rubric.

Where will it be assessed?

Identified Core Curriculum sections in each long semester.

When will it be assessed?

AY 2020-2021 and AY 2021-2022

Individual(s) Responsible for Data Collection

Office of Institutional Assessment, Research, and Planning will collect fro

Findings

Benchmark Met

Findings Description

81.92% of students scored competent or higher on the analysis domain. (Not including the outlier semester of Fall 2020, explained in the action plan)

559 (29.37%) = Exemplary

617 (32.42%) = Accomplished

383 (20.13%) = Competent

191 (10.04%) = Beginning

153 (8.04%) = Deficient

1903 = n

Action Plan Answer the following questions:
1. What did program faculty learn from the findings about how effective the program is in achieving this measure?
2. What are some examples of productive new actions taken by faculty to improve the program that generated these results?
3. What steps should be taken to enhance the effectiveness of this measure to improve the program going forward to the next cycle?
4. What are some general issues that emerged in the reading of these findings that the dean/provost should be aware of?

The 2020-2021 AY was a trial run year, but unfortunately the Fall 2020 semester was accidentally set up in AEFIS incorrectly. While we did get the data from faculty it did not have the appropriate rubrics instead of the 1-5 rubric score it only had the 1-4. This was an error when the AEFIS system was originally set up and could not be corrected during the run. The assessment had to be redone and reset for Spring 2021 onward to the 1-5 rubric scoring. Therefore, while the data from Fall 2020 is available it is considered outlier data.

In Spring 2021, after the rubric was fixed in the AEFIS system. Some of the comments from faculty were

- Core Curriculum needs to be announced in College Faculty Orientation Meetings
- Chairs need to be more involved in the process
- Having to provide scores for an entire lecture course is too many students and they are overwhelmed scoring students for this process

In response to point one, OIARP would be invited to College Faculty Orientation in the Fall to present a reminder on Core Curriculum. In response to point two, the Provost made it clear to the Deans and Chairs their responsibilities in the Core Curriculum process which is to ensure that faculty comply with the requirements of the process. Additionally, the Provost made it very clear that all faculty including adjuncts are to participate in the process. In response to point three, the Provost agreed that after listening to the concerns of faculty and to compromise this concern to create ownership by faculty he agreed to the following: Faculty will score 30% or 25 students whichever is less when scoring their course sections. Instructors will choose the students who they will score.

For the AY 2021-2022 data, after University Core Curriculum Committee (UC3) reviewed the data there was agreement that the scores were incredibly high. To compare last cycle's data to this you do have to add one point when comparing the means. Because the rubric before was 0-4 this rubric in AEFIS is 1-5. There was a debate between faculty and Associate Provost about scoring. Some faculty believed that scoring on the rubric meant scoring on the range of the student's year in school. For example, "For a freshman, this student scores a 2, etc." However, the Associate Provost clarified that the scoring should be on a more general baseline where the rubric should be followed with scoring as a general student across the board. For reference, these scores are

not reported to the students. The artifacts are chosen from class graded projects, but are then scored by the faculty on a separate rubric for the purposes of Core Curriculum and are not a part of the student's grade. Which was emphasized in the meeting when discussing the rubric's use. Some faculty argued that the high scores were appropriate because the faculty spend a lot of time in the core courses working with the students and the upper courses do not. Therefore explaining why the core curriculum would be scoring high on skills that upper curriculum would think students lack in skills. However, few faculty agreed with this sentiment. Another idea to explain the high scores was set forth which was that the sampling choices were having faculty only select those students who performed at a high level, and not a true random sample. However, this was just an idea and there was no statistical analysis on the data to know if this was true or not. To address this issue it was suggested to the faculty to just do an "every other" technique when selecting what students to score.

Last cycle there was conversations about who would analyze the data. This cycle it was analyzed assistant director Karol Batey, but she has asked to hire a statistical analyst to better perform statistical analysis on the data and provide more valid insight into the core curriculum data. The position was approved by Associate Vice President of OIARP and Provost. The job description has been included in the supporting documentation.

The analyst was hired, and she provided the analysis of this cycle's data it is as follows for all core curriculum:

Including data from Fall 2020 (outlier year)

- Through a regression analysis for average vs year for Core Curriculum assessments at TAMIU. In overall, the line is increasing. The significance of p-value, F-values, and probability <mark>meaning an improvement of students' performance through the years</mark>.
- Through a regression analysis from the number of observations vs average. More observations implies lower mean. The p-value 0.12 and t-value less than 0.0001 show the significance of the data. Two outliers outside the 95% predictions limits:
    - Fall 2020, Department of F&P Arts with 2 observations and mean of 2.406
    - Fall 2020, Department of Humanities with 27 observations and mean of 2.495
    Therefore, the <mark>increase in students tested in the classes implies a decrease in the overall average</mark>. Also, <mark>more classes assessed by department will give a lower average</mark>.

Excluding data from Fall 2020 (outlier year)

- The regression analysis for average vs year for Core Curriculum assessments at TAMIU. In overall, the **line is increasing but not significant evidence** proof that the average will follow the increasing pattern the following years.
- The results from the regression analysis from the number of observations vs average. More observations implies lower mean. The p-value 0.0383 and t-value less than alpha 0.05 is the significant evidence that more students assessed will implies a lower average. Therefore, the <mark>increase in students tested in the classes implies a decrease in the overall average</mark>. Also, <mark>more classes assessed by department will give a lower average</mark>.

Significant evidence proves the importance of randomization or requirement to increase the number of students graded in each course.

Her analysis did prove that we were not appropriately choosing students to score. If the faculty wanted to continue to do 30% or 25 students whichever is less sampling they needed to do the true randomization of sampling. This will be expressed to them in training from OIARP (supporting documentation) in the next cycle to see if this changes the scores.

Supporting Documentation:

Select a document artifact attached to this form or add a new document

UC3 Core Assessment Domains AYs2021.2023 10.7.20.docx

CC. Critical Thinking.pdf

Memo - New Position - Assessment and Data Analyst Specialist I.pdf

Assessment and Data Analyst Specialist I TAMIU- Final 6-15-2022.docx

Randomization for WIN and CORE Assignments.pptx

Statistical Analysis – Core Curriculum Assessments.pptx

UC3 Minutes-10.19.20.doc

UC3 Minutes 4.7.2021.docx

UC3 Minutes-09.09.20.doc

UC3 Minutes-10.19.20.pdf

UC3 Minutes-11.12.20.pdf

UC3 Minutes 03.30.2022.pdf

UC3 Minutes 04.28.2022.pdf

UC3 Minutes 10.14.2021.pdf

UC3 Minutes - 11.11.2021.pdf

4 Empirical & Quantitative Skills - Empirical & Quantitative Skills

TAMIU students will be able to develop informed conclusions by engaging in manipulation and analysis of numerical data or observable facts.

Measures

① Relevant Associations:

Selected Outcomes:

- EQS - Empirical and Quantitative Skills

②

Measure Type

DIRECT - Student Products

If Selecting Other Measure Type, Please Specify Below

Measure

Just as before instructors and chairs will choose assignments that match the rubrics. The 2020-2021 AY as mentioned in last cycle's assessment report will be the trial run year. The 2021-2022 AY will be our second year collecting the data with core curriculum through AEFIS.

Moving the data to AEFIS will give us the ability to address the two concerns voiced by faculty in the last assessment report of not being able to disaggregate data by courses sections, courses, department, and college easily. We also now have the faculty scoring on the one institutionally created rubric which has been attached as supporting documentation. The rubric ranges in AEFIS as a follows

1 = Deficient
2 = Beginning
3 = Competent
4 = Accomplished
5 = Exemplary

The supporting documentation has the courses that the domains will be tested in for the two academic years. For the purposes of testing this PLO we will test the students ability to interpret results and draw informed conclusions by looking at the overall empirical and quantitative skills rubric score.

Benchmark

75% of students will score a competent or higher on the Empirical and Quantitative Skills rubric. We are no longer using the mean as the point of benchmark as that may not be the clearest point without all the statistical analysis to know if that's the best statistic for showing success. Therefore, we are looking at each individual students success on the rubric.

Where will it be assessed?

Identified Core Curriculum sections in each long semester.

When will it be assessed?

AY 2020-2021 and AY 2021-2022

Individual(s) Responsible for Data Collection

Office of Institutional Assessment, Research, and Planning will collect fror

Findings

Benchmark Met

Findings Description

88.72% of students scored competent or higher on the Empirical and Quantitative Skill Rubric. (Not including the outlier semester of Fall 2020, explained in the action plan)

470 (46.49%) = Exemplary
255 (25.22%) = Accomplished
172 (17.01%) = Competent
74 (7.32%) = Beginning
40 (3.96%) = Deficient

1011 = n

Means
Spring 2021 =3.58
Fall 2021 = 4.17
Spring 2022 = 3.95
Spring Flex Term 2022 = 4.45

Action Plan Answer the following questions:
1. What did program faculty learn from the findings about how effective the program is in achieving this measure?
2. What are some examples of productive new actions taken by faculty to improve the program that generated these results?
3. What steps should be taken to enhance the effectiveness of this measure to improve

the program going forward to the next cycle?

4. What are some general issues that emerged in the reading of these findings that the dean/provost should be aware of?

The 2020-2021 AY was a trial run year, but unfortunately the Fall 2020 semester was accidentally set up in AEFIS incorrectly. While we did get the data from faculty it did not have the appropriate rubrics instead of the 1-5 rubric score it only had the 1-4. This was an error when the AEFIS system was originally set up and could not be corrected during the run. The assessment had to be redone and reset for Spring 2021 onward to the 1-5 rubric scoring. Therefore, while the data from Fall 2020 is available it is considered outlier data.

In Spring 2021, after the rubric was fixed in the AEFIS system. Some of the comments from faculty were

- Core Curriculum needs to be announced in College Faculty Orientation Meetings
- Chairs need to be more involved in the process
- Having to provide scores for an entire lecture course is too many students and they are overwhelmed scoring students for this process

In response to point one, OIARP would be invited to College Faculty Orientation in the Fall to present a reminder on Core Curriculum. In response to point two, the Provost made it clear to the Deans and Chairs their responsibilities in the Core Curriculum process which is to ensure that faculty comply with the requirements of the process. Additionally, the Provost made it very clear that all faculty including adjuncts are to participate in the process. In response to point three, the Provost agreed that after listening to the concerns of faculty and to compromise this concern to create ownership by faculty he agreed to the following: Faculty will score 30% or 25 students whichever is less when scoring their course sections. Instructors will choose the students who they will score.

For the AY 2021-2022 data, after University Core Curriculum Committee (UC3) reviewed the data there was agreement that the scores were incredibly high. To compare last cycle's data to this you do have to add one point when comparing the means. Because the rubric before was 0-4 this rubric in AEFIS is 1-5. So these means are higher than last cycle which comparatively was 3.1 adjusted. There was a debate between faculty and Associate Provost about scoring. Some faculty believed that scoring on the rubric meant scoring on the range of the student's year in school. For example, "For a freshman, this student scores a 2, etc." However, the Associate Provost clarified that the scoring should be on a more general baseline where the rubric should be followed with scoring as a general student across the board. For reference, these scores are not reported to the students. The artifacts are chosen from class graded projects, but are then scored by the faculty on a separate rubric for the purposes of Core Curriculum and are not a part of the student's grade. Which was emphasized in the meeting when discussing the rubric's use. Some faculty argued that the high scores were appropriate because the faculty spend a lot of time in the core courses working with the students and the upper courses do not. Therefore explaining why the core curriculum would be scoring high on skills that upper curriculum would think students lack in skills. However, few faculty agreed with this sentiment. Another idea to explain the high scores was set forth which was that the sampling choices were having faculty only select those students who performed at a high level, and not a true random sample. However, this was just an idea and there was no statistical analysis on the data to know if this was true or not. To address this issue it was suggested to the faculty to just do an "every other" technique when selecting what students to score.

Last cycle there was conversations about who would analyze the data. This cycle it was

analyzed assistant director Karol Batey, but she has asked to hire a statistical analyst to better perform statistical analysis on the data and provide more valid insight into the core curriculum data. The position was approved by Associate Vice President of OIARP and Provost. The job description has been included in the supporting documentation.

The analyst was hired, and she provided the analysis of this cycle's data it is as follows for all core curriculum:

Including data from Fall 2020 (outlier year)

- Through a regression analysis for average vs year for Core Curriculum assessments at TAMIU. In overall, the line is increasing. The significance of p-value, F-values, and probability ==meaning an improvement of students' performance through the years==.
- Through a regression analysis from the number of observations vs average. More observations implies lower mean. The p-value 0.12 and t-value less than 0.0001 show the significance of the data. Two outliers outside the 95% predictions limits:
    - Fall 2020, Department of F&P Arts with 2 observations and mean of 2.406
    - Fall 2020, Department of Humanities with 27 observations and mean of 2.495

    Therefore, the ==increase in students tested in the classes implies a decrease in the overall average==. Also, ==more classes assessed by department will give a lower average==.

Excluding data from Fall 2020 (outlier year)

- The regression analysis for average vs year for Core Curriculum assessments at TAMIU. In overall, the **line is increasing but not significant evidence** proof that the average will follow the increasing pattern the following years.
- The results from the regression analysis from the number of observations vs average. More observations implies lower mean. The p-value 0.0383 and t-value less than alpha 0.05 is the significant evidence that more students assessed will implies a lower average. Therefore, the ==increase in students tested in the classes implies a decrease in the overall average==. Also, ==more classes assessed by department will give a lower average==.

Significant evidence proves the importance of randomization or requirement to increase the number of students graded in each course.

Her analysis did prove that we were not appropriately choosing students to score. If the faculty wanted to continue to do 30% or 25 students whichever is less sampling they needed to do the true randomization of sampling. This will be expressed to them in training from OIARP (supporting documentation) in the next cycle to see if this changes the scores.

Supporting Documentation:

Select a document artifact attached to this form or add a new document

[UC3 Core Assessment Domains AYs2021.2023 10.7.20.docx](#)

[CC. Empirical Quantatative.pdf](#)

[Memo - New Position - Assessment and Data Analyst Specialist I.pdf](#)

[Assessment and Data Analyst Specialist I TAMIU- Final 6-15-2022.docx](#)

[Randomization for WIN and CORE Assignments.pptx](#)

[Statistical Analysis – Core Curriculum Assessments.pptx](#)

[UC3 Minutes-10.19.20.doc](#)

[UC3 Minutes 4.7.2021.docx](#)

[UC3 Minutes-09.09.20.doc](#)

[UC3 Minutes-10.19.20.pdf](#)

[UC3 Minutes-11.12.20.pdf](#)

[UC3 Minutes 03.30.2022.pdf](#)

[UC3 Minutes 04.28.2022.pdf](#)

[UC3 Minutes 10.14.2021.pdf](#)

[UC3 Minutes - 11.11.2021.pdf](#)

Measure Type

DIRECT - Student Products

If Selecting Other Measure Type, Please Specify Below

Measure

Just as before instructors and chairs will choose assignments that match the rubrics. The 2020-2021 AY as mentioned in last cycle's assessment report will be the trial run year. The 2021-2022 AY will be our second year collecting the data with core curriculum through AEFIS.

Moving the data to AEFIS will give us the ability to address the two concerns voiced by faculty in the last assessment report of not being able to disaggregate data by courses sections, courses, department, and college easily. We also now have the faculty scoring on the one institutionally

created rubric which has been attached as supporting documentation. The rubric ranges in AEFIS as a follows

1 = Deficient
2 = Beginning
3 = Competent
4 = Accomplished
5 = Exemplary

The supporting documentation has the courses that the domains will be tested in for the two academic years. For the purposes of testing this PLO we will test the students ability to identify the nature of the problem accurately by looking at the Identification of Problem domain score.

Benchmark

75% of students will score a competent or higher on the Identification of Problem Domain. We are no longer using the mean as the point of benchmark as that may not be the clearest point without all the statistical analysis to know if that's the best statistic for showing success. Therefore, we are looking at each individual students success on the rubric.

Where will it be assessed?

Identified Core Curriculum sections in each long semester.

When will it be assessed?

AY 2020-2021 and AY 2021-2022

Individual(s) Responsible for Data Collection

Office of Institutional Assessment, Research, and Planning will collect fro

Findings

Benchmark Met

Findings Description

89.53% of the students scored competent or higher on the EQS Identification of the Problem Domain. (Not including the outlier semester of Fall 2020, explained in the action plan)

428 (45.24%) = Exemplary
260 (27.48%) = Accomplished
159 (16.81%) = Competent
62 (6.55%) = Beginning
37 (3.91%) = Deficient

946 = n

Action Plan Answer the following questions:
1. What did program faculty learn from the findings about how effective the program is in achieving this measure?
2. What are some examples of productive new actions taken by faculty to improve the program that generated these results?
3. What steps should be taken to enhance the effectiveness of this measure to improve the program going forward to the next cycle?
4. What are some general issues that emerged in the reading of these findings that the dean/provost should be aware of?

The 2020-2021 AY was a trial run year, but unfortunately the Fall 2020 semester was accidentally set up in AEFIS incorrectly. While we did get the data from faculty it did not have the appropriate rubrics instead of the 1-5 rubric score it only had the 1-4. This was an error when the AEFIS system was originally set up and could not be corrected during the run. The assessment had to be redone and reset for Spring 2021 onward to the 1-5 rubric scoring. Therefore, while the data from Fall 2020 is available it is considered outlier data.

In Spring 2021, after the rubric was fixed in the AEFIS system. Some of the comments from faculty were

- Core Curriculum needs to be announced in College Faculty Orientation Meetings
- Chairs need to be more involved in the process
- Having to provide scores for an entire lecture course is too many students and they are overwhelmed scoring students for this process

In response to point one, OIARP would be invited to College Faculty Orientation in the Fall to present a reminder on Core Curriculum. In response to point two, the Provost made it clear to the Deans and Chairs their responsibilities in the Core Curriculum process which is to ensure that faculty comply with the requirements of the process. Additionally, the Provost made it very clear that all faculty including adjuncts are to participate in the process. In response to point three, the Provost agreed that after listening to the concerns of faculty and to compromise this concern to create ownership by faculty he agreed to the following: Faculty will score 30% or 25 students whichever is less when scoring their course sections. Instructors will choose the students who they will score.

For the AY 2021-2022 data, after University Core Curriculum Committee (UC3) reviewed the data there was agreement that the scores were incredibly high. To compare last cycle's data to this you do have to add one point when comparing the means. Because the rubric before was 0-4 this rubric in AEFIS is 1-5. There was a debate between faculty and Associate Provost about scoring. Some faculty believed that scoring on the rubric meant scoring on the range of the student's year

in school. For example, "For a freshman, this student scores a 2, etc." However, the Associate Provost clarified that the scoring should be on a more general baseline where the rubric should be followed with scoring as a general student across the board. For reference, these scores are not reported to the students. The artifacts are chosen from class graded projects, but are then scored by the faculty on a separate rubric for the purposes of Core Curriculum and are not a part of the student's grade. Which was emphasized in the meeting when discussing the rubric's use. Some faculty argued that the high scores were appropriate because the faculty spend a lot of time in the core courses working with the students and the upper courses do not. Therefore explaining why the core curriculum would be scoring high on skills that upper curriculum would think students lack in skills. However, few faculty agreed with this sentiment. Another idea to explain the high scores was set forth which was that the sampling choices were having faculty only select those students who performed at a high level, and not a true random sample. However, this was just an idea and there was no statistical analysis on the data to know if this was true or not. To address this issue it was suggested to the faculty to just do an "every other" technique when selecting what students to score.

Last cycle there was conversations about who would analyze the data. This cycle it was analyzed assistant director Karol Batey, but she has asked to hire a statistical analyst to better perform statistical analysis on the data and provide more valid insight into the core curriculum data. The position was approved by Associate Vice President of OIARP and Provost. The job description has been included in the supporting documentation.

The analyst was hired, and she provided the analysis of this cycle's data it is as follows for all core curriculum:

Including data from Fall 2020 (outlier year)

- Through a regression analysis for average vs year for Core Curriculum assessments at TAMIU. In overall, the line is increasing. The significance of p-value, F-values, and probability ==meaning an improvement of students' performance through the years==.
- Through a regression analysis from the number of observations vs average. More observations implies lower mean. The p-value 0.12 and t-value less than 0.0001 show the significance of the data. Two outliers outside the 95% predictions limits:
  - Fall 2020, Department of F&P Arts with 2 observations and mean of 2.406
  - Fall 2020, Department of Humanities with 27 observations and mean of 2.495
  Therefore, the ==increase in students tested in the classes implies a decrease in the overall average==. Also, ==more classes assessed by department will give a lower average==.

Excluding data from Fall 2020 (outlier year)

- The regression analysis for average vs year for Core Curriculum assessments at TAMIU. In overall, the **line is increasing but not significant evidence** proof that the average will follow the increasing pattern the following years.
- The results from the regression analysis from the number of observations vs average. More observations implies lower mean. The p-value 0.0383 and t-value less than alpha 0.05 is the significant evidence that more students assessed will implies a lower average. Therefore, the ==increase in students tested in the classes implies a decrease in the overall average==. Also, ==more classes assessed by department will give a lower average==.

Significant evidence proves the importance of randomization or requirement to increase the number of students graded in each course.

Her analysis did prove that we were not appropriately choosing students to score. If the faculty wanted to continue to do 30% or 25 students whichever is less sampling they needed to do the true randomization of sampling. This will be expressed to them in training from OIARP (supporting documentation) in the next cycle to see if this changes the scores.

Supporting Documentation:

Select a document artifact attached to this form or add a new document

UC3 Core Assessment Domains AYs2021.2023 10.7.20.docx

CC. Empirical Quantatative.pdf

Memo - New Position - Assessment and Data Analyst Specialist I.pdf

Assessment and Data Analyst Specialist I TAMIU- Final 6-15-2022.docx

Randomization for WIN and CORE Assignments.pptx

Statistical Analysis – Core Curriculum Assessments.pptx

UC3 Minutes-10.19.20.doc

UC3 Minutes 4.7.2021.docx

UC3 Minutes-09.09.20.doc

UC3 Minutes-10.19.20.pdf

UC3 Minutes-11.12.20.pdf

UC3 Minutes 03.30.2022.pdf

UC3 Minutes 04.28.2022.pdf

UC3 Minutes 10.14.2021.pdf

UC3 Minutes - 11.11.2021.pdf

5 **Teamwork - Teamwork**

TAMIU students will be able to consider different points of view to work effectively with others to support a shared purpose or goal.

Measures

1 **Relevant Associations:**

Selected Outcomes:

- TW - Teamwork

2

Measure Type

DIRECT - Student Products

If Selecting Other Measure Type, Please Specify Below

Measure

Just as before instructors and chairs will choose assignments that match the rubrics. The 2020-2021 AY as mentioned in last cycle's assessment report will be the trial run year. The 2021-2022 AY will be our second year collecting the data with core curriculum through AEFIS.

Moving the data to AEFIS will give us the ability to address the two concerns voiced by faculty in the last assessment report of not being able to disaggregate data by courses sections, courses, department, and college easily. We also now have the faculty scoring on the one institutionally created rubric which has been attached as supporting documentation. The rubric ranges in AEFIS as a follows

1 = Deficient
2 = Beginning
3 = Competent
4 = Accomplished
5 = Exemplary

The supporting documentation has the courses that the domains will be tested in for the two academic years. For the purposes of testing this PLO we will test the students ability to coordinate efforts effectively to achieve a shared purpose by looking at the overall teamwork rubric score.

Benchmark

75% of students will score a competent or higher on the Teamwork rubric. We are no longer using the mean as the point of benchmark as that may not be the clearest point without all the statistical analysis to know if that's the best statistic for showing success. Therefore, we are looking at each individual students success on the rubric.

Where will it be assessed?

Identified Core Curriculum sections in each long semester.

When will it be assessed?

AY 2020-2021 and AY 2021-2022

Individual(s) Responsible for Data Collection

Office of Institutional Assessment, Research, and Planning will collect fron

Findings

Benchmark Met

Findings Description

81.12% of students scored competent or higher on the teamwork rubric. (Not including the outlier semester of Fall 2020, explained in the action plan)

170 (29.72%) = Exemplary
163 (28.5%) = Accomplished
131 (22.9%) = Competent
76 (13.29%) = Beginning
32 (5.59%) = Deficient

572 = n

Means
Spring 2021 = 3.57
Spring 2022 = 4.31

Action Plan Answer the following questions:
1. What did program faculty learn from the findings about how effective the program is in achieving this measure?
2. What are some examples of productive new actions taken by faculty to improve the

program that generated these results?

3. What steps should be taken to enhance the effectiveness of this measure to improve the program going forward to the next cycle?

4. What are some general issues that emerged in the reading of these findings that the dean/provost should be aware of?

The 2020-2021 AY was a trial run year, but unfortunately the Fall 2020 semester was accidentally set up in AEFIS incorrectly. While we did get the data from faculty it did not have the appropriate rubrics instead of the 1-5 rubric score it only had the 1-4. This was an error when the AEFIS system was originally set up and could not be corrected during the run. The assessment had to be redone and reset for Spring 2021 onward to the 1-5 rubric scoring. Therefore, while the data from Fall 2020 is available it is considered outlier data.

In Spring 2021, after the rubric was fixed in the AEFIS system. Some of the comments from faculty were

- Core Curriculum needs to be announced in College Faculty Orientation Meetings
- Chairs need to be more involved in the process
- Having to provide scores for an entire lecture course is too many students and they are overwhelmed scoring students for this process

In response to point one, OIARP would be invited to College Faculty Orientation in the Fall to present a reminder on Core Curriculum. In response to point two, the Provost made it clear to the Deans and Chairs their responsibilities in the Core Curriculum process which is to ensure that faculty comply with the requirements of the process. Additionally, the Provost made it very clear that all faculty including adjuncts are to participate in the process. In response to point three, the Provost agreed that after listening to the concerns of faculty and to compromise this concern to create ownership by faculty he agreed to the following: Faculty will score 30% or 25 students whichever is less when scoring their course sections. Instructors will choose the students who they will score.

For the AY 2021-2022 data, after University Core Curriculum Committee (UC3) reviewed the data there was agreement that the scores were incredibly high. To compare last cycle's data to this you do have to add one point when comparing the means. Because the rubric before was 0-4 this rubric in AEFIS is 1-5. So these means are low and the same as last cycle which comparatively was 4.5 adjusted. There was a debate between faculty and Associate Provost about scoring. Some faculty believed that scoring on the rubric meant scoring on the range of the student's year in school. For example, "For a freshman, this student scores a 2, etc." However, the Associate Provost clarified that the scoring should be on a more general baseline where the rubric should be followed with scoring as a general student across the board. For reference, these scores are not reported to the students. The artifacts are chosen from class graded projects, but are then scored by the faculty on a separate rubric for the purposes of Core Curriculum and are not a part of the student's grade. Which was emphasized in the meeting when discussing the rubric's use. Some faculty argued that the high scores were appropriate because the faculty spend a lot of time in the core courses working with the students and the upper courses do not. Therefore explaining why the core curriculum would be scoring high on skills that upper curriculum would think students lack in skills. However, few faculty agreed with this sentiment. Another idea to explain the high scores was set forth which was that the sampling choices were having faculty only select those students who performed at a high level, and not a true random sample. However, this was just an idea and there was no statistical analysis on the data to know if this was true or not. To address this issue it was suggested to the faculty to just do an "every other"

technique when selecting what students to score.

Last cycle there was conversations about who would analyze the data. This cycle it was analyzed assistant director Karol Batey, but she has asked to hire a statistical analyst to better perform statistical analysis on the data and provide more valid insight into the core curriculum data. The position was approved by Associate Vice President of OIARP and Provost. The job description has been included in the supporting documentation.

The analyst was hired, and she provided the analysis of this cycle's data it is as follows for all core curriculum:

Including data from Fall 2020 (outlier year)

- Through a regression analysis for average vs year for Core Curriculum assessments at TAMIU. In overall, the line is increasing. The significance of p-value, F-values, and probability ==meaning an improvement of students' performance through the years==.
- Through a regression analysis from the number of observations vs average. More observations implies lower mean. The p-value 0.12 and t-value less than 0.0001 show the significance of the data. Two outliers outside the 95% predictions limits:
  - Fall 2020, Department of F&P Arts with 2 observations and mean of 2.406
  - Fall 2020, Department of Humanities with 27 observations and mean of 2.495

  Therefore, the ==increase in students tested in the classes implies a decrease in the overall average==. Also, ==more classes assessed by department will give a lower average==.

Excluding data from Fall 2020 (outlier year)

- The regression analysis for average vs year for Core Curriculum assessments at TAMIU. In overall, the **line is increasing but not significant evidence** proof that the average will follow the increasing pattern the following years.
- The results from the regression analysis from the number of observations vs average. More observations implies lower mean. The p-value 0.0383 and t-value less than alpha 0.05 is the significant evidence that more students assessed will implies a lower average. Therefore, the ==increase in students tested in the classes implies a decrease in the overall average==. Also, ==more classes assessed by department will give a lower average==.

Significant evidence proves the importance of randomization or requirement to increase the number of students graded in each course.

Her analysis did prove that we were not appropriately choosing students to score. If the faculty wanted to continue to do 30% or 25 students whichever is less sampling they needed to do the true randomization of sampling. This will be expressed to them in training from OIARP (supporting documentation) in the next cycle to see if this changes the scores.

Supporting Documentation:

Select a document artifact attached to this form or add a new document

UC3 Core Assessment Domains AYs2021.2023 10.7.20.docx

[CC. Teamwork.pdf](#)

[Memo - New Position - Assessment and Data Analyst Specialist I.pdf](#)

[Assessment and Data Analyst Specialist I TAMIU- Final 6-15-2022.docx](#)

[Randomization for WIN and CORE Assignments.pptx](#)

[Statistical Analysis – Core Curriculum Assessments.pptx](#)

[UC3 Minutes-10.19.20.doc](#)

[UC3 Minutes 4.7.2021.docx](#)

[UC3 Minutes-09.09.20.doc](#)

[UC3 Minutes-10.19.20.pdf](#)

[UC3 Minutes-11.12.20.pdf](#)

[UC3 Minutes 03.30.2022.pdf](#)

[UC3 Minutes 04.28.2022.pdf](#)

[UC3 Minutes 10.14.2021.pdf](#)

[UC3 Minutes - 11.11.2021.pdf](#)

Measure Type

DIRECT - Student Products

If Selecting Other Measure Type, Please Specify Below

Measure

Just as before instructors and chairs will choose assignments that match the rubrics. The 2020-2021 AY as mentioned in last cycle's assessment report will be the trial run year. The 2021-2022 AY will be our second year collecting the data with core curriculum through AEFIS.

Moving the data to AEFIS will give us the ability to address the two concerns voiced by faculty in the last assessment report of not being able to disaggregate data by courses sections, courses, department, and college easily. We also now have the faculty scoring on the one institutionally created rubric which has been attached as supporting documentation. The rubric ranges in AEFIS as a follows

1 = Deficient
2 = Beginning
3 = Competent
4 = Accomplished
5 = Exemplary

The supporting documentation has the courses that the domains will be tested in for the two academic years. For the purposes of testing this PLO we will test the students ability to contribute meaningfully to team meetings by looking at the Contributes to Team Meetings domain score.

Benchmark

75% of students will score a competent or higher on the Contributes to Team Meetings Domain. We are no longer using the mean as the point of benchmark as that may not be the clearest point without all the statistical analysis to know if that's the best statistic for showing success. Therefore, we are looking at each individual students success on the rubric.

Where will it be assessed?

Identified Core Curriculum sections in each long semester.

When will it be assessed?

AY 2020-2021 and AY 2021-2022

Individual(s) Responsible for Data Collection

Office of Institutional Assessment, Research, and Planning will collect from

Findings

Benchmark Met

Findings Description

82.37% students scored competent or higher on the Contributes to Team Meetings Domain on the Teamwork Rubric. (Not including the outlier semester of Fall 2020, explained in the action plan)

153 (27.52%) = Exemplary
160 (28.78%) = Accomplished
145 (26.08%) = Competent
69 (12.41%) = Beginning
29 (5.22%) = Deficient

556 = n

Action Plan Answer the following questions:
1. What did program faculty learn from the findings about how effective the program is in achieving this measure?
2. What are some examples of productive new actions taken by faculty to improve the program that generated these results?
3. What steps should be taken to enhance the effectiveness of this measure to improve the program going forward to the next cycle?
4. What are some general issues that emerged in the reading of these findings that the dean/provost should be aware of?

The 2020-2021 AY was a trial run year, but unfortunately the Fall 2020 semester was accidentally set up in AEFIS incorrectly. While we did get the data from faculty it did not have the appropriate rubrics instead of the 1-5 rubric score it only had the 1-4. This was an error when the AEFIS system was originally set up and could not be corrected during the run. The assessment had to be redone and reset for Spring 2021 onward to the 1-5 rubric scoring. Therefore, while the data from Fall 2020 is available it is considered outlier data.

In Spring 2021, after the rubric was fixed in the AEFIS system. Some of the comments from faculty were
- Core Curriculum needs to be announced in College Faculty Orientation Meetings
- Chairs need to be more involved in the process
- Having to provide scores for an entire lecture course is too many students and they are overwhelmed scoring students for this process

In response to point one, OIARP would be invited to College Faculty Orientation in the Fall to present a reminder on Core Curriculum. In response to point two, the Provost made it clear to the Deans and Chairs their responsibilities in the Core Curriculum process which is to ensure that faculty comply with the requirements of the process. Additionally, the Provost made it very clear that all faculty including adjuncts are to participate in the process. In response to point three, the Provost agreed that after listening to the concerns of faculty and to compromise this concern to create ownership by faculty he agreed to the following: Faculty will score 30% or 25 students whichever is less when scoring their course sections. Instructors will choose the students who they will score.

For the AY 2021-2022 data, after University Core Curriculum Committee (UC3) reviewed the data there was agreement that the scores were incredibly high. To compare last cycle's data to this you do have to add one point when comparing the means. Because the rubric before was 0-4 this rubric in AEFIS is 1-5. There was a debate between faculty and Associate Provost about scoring.

Some faculty believed that scoring on the rubric meant scoring on the range of the student's year in school. For example, "For a freshman, this student scores a 2, etc." However, the Associate Provost clarified that the scoring should be on a more general baseline where the rubric should be followed with scoring as a general student across the board. For reference, these scores are not reported to the students. The artifacts are chosen from class graded projects, but are then scored by the faculty on a separate rubric for the purposes of Core Curriculum and are not a part of the student's grade. Which was emphasized in the meeting when discussing the rubric's use. Some faculty argued that the high scores were appropriate because the faculty spend a lot of time in the core courses working with the students and the upper courses do not. Therefore explaining why the core curriculum would be scoring high on skills that upper curriculum would think students lack in skills. However, few faculty agreed with this sentiment. Another idea to explain the high scores was set forth which was that the sampling choices were having faculty only select those students who performed at a high level, and not a true random sample. However, this was just an idea and there was no statistical analysis on the data to know if this was true or not. To address this issue it was suggested to the faculty to just do an "every other" technique when selecting what students to score.

Last cycle there was conversations about who would analyze the data. This cycle it was analyzed assistant director Karol Batey, but she has asked to hire a statistical analyst to better perform statistical analysis on the data and provide more valid insight into the core curriculum data. The position was approved by Associate Vice President of OIARP and Provost. The job description has been included in the supporting documentation.

The analyst was hired, and she provided the analysis of this cycle's data it is as follows for all core curriculum:

Including data from Fall 2020 (outlier year)

- Through a regression analysis for average vs year for Core Curriculum assessments at TAMIU. In overall, the line is increasing. The significance of p-value, F-values, and probability ==meaning an improvement of students' performance through the years==.
- Through a regression analysis from the number of observations vs average. More observations implies lower mean. The p-value 0.12 and t-value less than 0.0001 show the significance of the data. Two outliers outside the 95% predictions limits:
  - Fall 2020, Department of F&P Arts with 2 observations and mean of 2.406
  - Fall 2020, Department of Humanities with 27 observations and mean of 2.495
  Therefore, the ==increase in students tested in the classes implies a decrease in the overall average==. Also, ==more classes assessed by department will give a lower average==.

Excluding data from Fall 2020 (outlier year)

- The regression analysis for average vs year for Core Curriculum assessments at TAMIU. In overall, the **line is increasing but not significant evidence** proof that the average will follow the increasing pattern the following years.
- The results from the regression analysis from the number of observations vs average. More observations implies lower mean. The p-value 0.0383 and t-value less than alpha 0.05 is the significant evidence that more students assessed will implies a lower average. Therefore,

the ==increase in students tested in the classes implies a decrease in the overall average==. Also, ==more classes assessed by department will give a lower average==.

Significant evidence proves the importance of randomization or requirement to increase the number of students graded in each course.

Her analysis did prove that we were not appropriately choosing students to score. If the faculty wanted to continue to do 30% or 25 students whichever is less sampling they needed to do the true randomization of sampling. This will be expressed to them in training from OIARP (supporting documentation) in the next cycle to see if this changes the scores.

Supporting Documentation:

Select a document artifact attached to this form or add a new document

UC3 Core Assessment Domains AYs2021.2023 10.7.20.docx

CC. Teamwork.pdf

Memo - New Position - Assessment and Data Analyst Specialist I.pdf

Assessment and Data Analyst Specialist I TAMIU- Final 6-15-2022.docx

Randomization for WIN and CORE Assignments.pptx

Statistical Analysis – Core Curriculum Assessments.pptx

UC3 Minutes-10.19.20.doc

UC3 Minutes 4.7.2021.docx

UC3 Minutes-09.09.20.doc

UC3 Minutes-10.19.20.pdf

UC3 Minutes-11.12.20.pdf

UC3 Minutes 03.30.2022.pdf

UC3 Minutes 04.28.2022.pdf

UC3 Minutes 10.14.2021.pdf

UC3 Minutes - 11.11.2021.pdf

6 **Personal Responsibility - Personal Responsibility**

TAMIU students will be able to connect choices, actions, and consequences to ethical decision-making.

Measures

1 **Relevant Associations:**

Selected Outcomes:

- PR - Personal Responsibility

2

Measure Type

DIRECT - Student Products

If Selecting Other Measure Type, Please Specify Below

Measure

Just as before instructors and chairs will choose assignments that match the rubrics. The 2020-2021 AY as mentioned in last cycle's assessment report will be the trial run year. The 2021-2022 AY will be our second year collecting the data with core curriculum through AEFIS.

Moving the data to AEFIS will give us the ability to address the two concerns voiced by faculty in the last assessment report of not being able to disaggregate data by courses sections, courses, department, and college easily. We also now have the faculty scoring on the one institutionally created rubric which has been attached as supporting documentation. The rubric ranges in AEFIS as a follows

1 = Deficient
2 = Beginning
3 = Competent
4 = Accomplished
5 = Exemplary

The supporting documentation has the courses that the domains will be tested in for the two academic years. For the purposes of testing this PLO we will test the students ability to demonstrate an understanding of ethical standards as applied to decision making by looking at the overall personal responsibility rubric score.

Benchmark

75% of students will score a competent or higher on the Personal Responsibility rubric. We are no longer using the mean as the point of benchmark as that may not be the clearest point without all the statistical analysis to know if that's the best statistic for showing success. Therefore, we are looking at each individual students success on the rubric.

Where will it be assessed?

Identified Core Curriculum sections in each long semester.

When will it be assessed?

AY 2020-2021 and AY 2021-2022

Individual(s) Responsible for Data Collection

Office of Institutional Assessment, Research, and Planning will collect fro

Findings

Benchmark Met

Findings Description

82.85% of students scored Competent or higher on the Personal Responsibility rubric. (Personal Responsibility was not tested in AY 2020-2021)

608 (45.92%) = Exemplary
289 (21.83%) = Accomplished
200 (15.11%) = Competent
135 (10.2%) = Beginning
92 (6.95%) = Deficient

1324 = n

Means
Fall 2021 = 3.74
Fall Sub-Term 1 2021 = 3.17
Spring 2022 = 3.80
Spring Sub-term 1 2022 = 4.20

Action Plan Answer the following questions:
1. What did program faculty learn from the findings about how effective the program is in achieving this measure?
2. What are some examples of productive new actions taken by faculty to improve the program that generated these results?
3. What steps should be taken to enhance the effectiveness of this measure to improve the program going forward to the next cycle?
4. What are some general issues that emerged in the reading of these findings that the dean/provost should be aware of?

The 2020-2021 AY was a trial run year, but unfortunately the Fall 2020 semester was accidentally set up in AEFIS incorrectly. While we did get the data from faculty it did not have the appropriate rubrics instead of the 1-5 rubric score it only had the 1-4. This was an error when the AEFIS system was originally set up and could not be corrected during the run. The assessment had to be redone and reset for Spring 2021 onward to the 1-5 rubric scoring. Therefore, while the data from Fall 2020 is available it is considered outlier data.

In Spring 2021, after the rubric was fixed in the AEFIS system. Some of the comments from faculty were
- Core Curriculum needs to be announced in College Faculty Orientation Meetings
- Chairs need to be more involved in the process
- Having to provide scores for an entire lecture course is too many students and they are overwhelmed scoring students for this process

In response to point one, OIARP would be invited to College Faculty Orientation in the Fall to present a reminder on Core Curriculum. In response to point two, the Provost made it clear to the Deans and Chairs their responsibilities in the Core Curriculum process which is to ensure that faculty comply with the requirements of the process. Additionally, the Provost made it very clear that all faculty including adjuncts are to participate in the process. In response to point three, the Provost agreed that after listening to the concerns of faculty and to compromise this concern to create ownership by faculty he agreed to the following: Faculty will score 30% or 25 students whichever is less when scoring their course sections. Instructors will choose the students who they will score.

For the AY 2021-2022 data, after University Core Curriculum Committee (UC3) reviewed the data there was agreement that the scores were incredibly high. To compare last cycle's data to this you do have to add one point when comparing the means. Because the rubric before was 0-4 this rubric in AEFIS is 1-5. So these means lower than last cycle which comparatively was 4.8 adjusted. However, as you remember last cycle only had 10 students tested. This cycle had 1,324 giving us a clearer picture. There was a debate between faculty and Associate Provost about scoring. Some faculty believed that scoring on the rubric meant scoring on the range of the student's year in school. For example, "For a freshman, this student scores a 2, etc." However, the Associate Provost clarified that the scoring should be on a more general baseline where the rubric should be followed with scoring as a general student across the board. For reference, these scores are not reported to the students. The artifacts are chosen from class graded projects, but are then scored by the faculty on a separate rubric for the purposes of Core Curriculum and are not a part of the student's grade. Which was emphasized in the meeting when discussing the rubric's use. Some faculty argued that the high scores were appropriate because the faculty spend a lot of time in the core courses working with the students and the

upper courses do not. Therefore explaining why the core curriculum would be scoring high on skills that upper curriculum would think students lack in skills. However, few faculty agreed with this sentiment. Another idea to explain the high scores was set forth which was that the sampling choices were having faculty only select those students who performed at a high level, and not a true random sample. However, this was just an idea and there was no statistical analysis on the data to know if this was true or not. To address this issue it was suggested to the faculty to just do an "every other" technique when selecting what students to score.

Last cycle there was conversations about who would analyze the data. This cycle it was analyzed assistant director Karol Batey, but she has asked to hire a statistical analyst to better perform statistical analysis on the data and provide more valid insight into the core curriculum data. The position was approved by Associate Vice President of OIARP and Provost. The job description has been included in the supporting documentation.

The analyst was hired, and she provided the analysis of this cycle's data it is as follows for all core curriculum:

Including data from Fall 2020 (outlier year)

- Through a regression analysis for average vs year for Core Curriculum assessments at TAMIU. In overall, the line is increasing. The significance of p-value, F-values, and probability ==meaning an improvement of students' performance through the years==.
- Through a regression analysis from the number of observations vs average. More observations implies lower mean. The p-value 0.12 and t-value less than 0.0001 show the significance of the data. Two outliers outside the 95% predictions limits:
    - Fall 2020, Department of F&P Arts with 2 observations and mean of 2.406
    - Fall 2020, Department of Humanities with 27 observations and mean of 2.495
    Therefore, the ==increase in students tested in the classes implies a decrease in the overall average==. Also, ==more classes assessed by department will give a lower average==.

Excluding data from Fall 2020 (outlier year)

- The regression analysis for average vs year for Core Curriculum assessments at TAMIU. In overall, the **line is increasing but not significant evidence** proof that the average will follow the increasing pattern the following years.
- The results from the regression analysis from the number of observations vs average. More observations implies lower mean. The p-value 0.0383 and t-value less than alpha 0.05 is the significant evidence that more students assessed will implies a lower average. Therefore, the ==increase in students tested in the classes implies a decrease in the overall average==. Also, ==more classes assessed by department will give a lower average==.

Significant evidence proves the importance of randomization or requirement to increase the number of students graded in each course.

Her analysis did prove that we were not appropriately choosing students to score. If the faculty wanted to continue to do 30% or 25 students whichever is less sampling they needed to do the true randomization of sampling. This will be expressed to them in training from OIARP (supporting documentation) in the next cycle to see if this changes the scores.

Supporting Documentation:

Select a document artifact attached to this form or add a new document

UC3 Core Assessment Domains AYs2021.2023 10.7.20.docx

CC. Personal Responsibility.pdf

Memo - New Position - Assessment and Data Analyst Specialist I.pdf

Assessment and Data Analyst Specialist I TAMIU- Final 6-15-2022.docx

Randomization for WIN and CORE Assignments.pptx

Statistical Analysis – Core Curriculum Assessments.pptx

UC3 Minutes-10.19.20.doc

UC3 Meeting Agenda 11.12.20.docx

UC3 Minutes 4.7.2021.docx

UC3 Minutes-09.09.20.doc

UC3 Minutes-10.19.20.pdf

UC3 Minutes-11.12.20.pdf

UC3 Minutes 03.30.2022.pdf

UC3 Minutes 04.28.2022.pdf

UC3 Minutes 10.14.2021.pdf

UC3 Minutes - 11.11.2021.pdf

Measure Type

DIRECT - Student Products

If Selecting Other Measure Type, Please Specify Below

Measure

Just as before instructors and chairs will choose assignments that match the rubrics. The 2020-2021 AY as mentioned in last cycle's assessment report will be the trial run year. The 2021-2022 AY will be our second year collecting the data with core curriculum through AEFIS.

Moving the data to AEFIS will give us the ability to address the two concerns voiced by faculty in the last assessment report of not being able to disaggregate data by courses sections, courses, department, and college easily. We also now have the faculty scoring on the one institutionally created rubric which has been attached as supporting documentation. The rubric ranges in AEFIS as a follows

1 = Deficient
2 = Beginning
3 = Competent
4 = Accomplished
5 = Exemplary

The supporting documentation has the courses that the domains will be tested in for the two academic years. For the purposes of testing this PLO we will test the students ability to recognize ethical issues in context by looking at the Ethical Issue Recognition domain score.

Benchmark

75% of students will score a competent or higher on the Ethical Issue Recognition Domain. We are no longer using the mean as the point of benchmark as that may not be the clearest point without all the statistical analysis to know if that's the best statistic for showing success. Therefore, we are looking at each individual students success on the rubric. .

Where will it be assessed?

Identified Core Curriculum sections in each long semester.

When will it be assessed?

AY 2020-2021 and AY 2021-2022

Individual(s) Responsible for Data Collection

Office of Institutional Assessment, Research, and Planning will collect from

Findings

Benchmark Met

Findings Description

82.59% of the students scored Ethical Issue Recognition Domain on the Personal Responsibility Rubric. (Personal Responsibility was not tested in AY 2020-2021)

500 (34.67%) = Exemplary
339 (23.51%) = Accomplished
352 (24.41%) = Competent
126 (8.74%) = Beginning
65 (4.51%) = Deficient

1442 = n

Action Plan Answer the following questions:
1. What did program faculty learn from the findings about how effective the program is in achieving this measure?
2. What are some examples of productive new actions taken by faculty to improve the program that generated these results?
3. What steps should be taken to enhance the effectiveness of this measure to improve the program going forward to the next cycle?
4. What are some general issues that emerged in the reading of these findings that the dean/provost should be aware of?

The 2020-2021 AY was a trial run year, but unfortunately the Fall 2020 semester was accidentally set up in AEFIS incorrectly. While we did get the data from faculty it did not have the appropriate rubrics instead of the 1-5 rubric score it only had the 1-4. This was an error when the AEFIS system was originally set up and could not be corrected during the run. The assessment had to be redone and reset for Spring 2021 onward to the 1-5 rubric scoring. Therefore, while the data from Fall 2020 is available it is considered outlier data.

In Spring 2021, after the rubric was fixed in the AEFIS system. Some of the comments from faculty were
- Core Curriculum needs to be announced in College Faculty Orientation Meetings
- Chairs need to be more involved in the process
- Having to provide scores for an entire lecture course is too many students and they are overwhelmed scoring students for this process

In response to point one, OIARP would be invited to College Faculty Orientation in the Fall to present a reminder on Core Curriculum. In response to point two, the Provost made it clear to the Deans and Chairs their responsibilities in the Core Curriculum process which is to ensure that faculty comply with the requirements of the process. Additionally, the Provost made it very clear that all faculty including adjuncts are to participate in the process. In response to point three, the Provost agreed that after listening to the concerns of faculty and to compromise this concern to create ownership by faculty he agreed to the following: Faculty will score 30% or 25 students whichever is less when scoring their course sections. Instructors will choose the students who

they will score.

For the AY 2021-2022 data, after University Core Curriculum Committee (UC3) reviewed the data there was agreement that the scores were incredibly high. To compare last cycle's data to this you do have to add one point when comparing the means. Because the rubric before was 0-4 this rubric in AEFIS is 1-5. There was a debate between faculty and Associate Provost about scoring. Some faculty believed that scoring on the rubric meant scoring on the range of the student's year in school. For example, "For a freshman, this student scores a 2, etc." However, the Associate Provost clarified that the scoring should be on a more general baseline where the rubric should be followed with scoring as a general student across the board. For reference, these scores are not reported to the students. The artifacts are chosen from class graded projects, but are then scored by the faculty on a separate rubric for the purposes of Core Curriculum and are not a part of the student's grade. Which was emphasized in the meeting when discussing the rubric's use. Some faculty argued that the high scores were appropriate because the faculty spend a lot of time in the core courses working with the students and the upper courses do not. Therefore explaining why the core curriculum would be scoring high on skills that upper curriculum would think students lack in skills. However, few faculty agreed with this sentiment. Another idea to explain the high scores was set forth which was that the sampling choices were having faculty only select those students who performed at a high level, and not a true random sample. However, this was just an idea and there was no statistical analysis on the data to know if this was true or not. To address this issue it was suggested to the faculty to just do an "every other" technique when selecting what students to score.

Last cycle there was conversations about who would analyze the data. This cycle it was analyzed assistant director Karol Batey, but she has asked to hire a statistical analyst to better perform statistical analysis on the data and provide more valid insight into the core curriculum data. The position was approved by Associate Vice President of OIARP and Provost. The job description has been included in the supporting documentation.

The analyst was hired, and she provided the analysis of this cycle's data it is as follows for all core curriculum:

Including data from Fall 2020 (outlier year)

- Through a regression analysis for average vs year for Core Curriculum assessments at TAMIU. In overall, the line is increasing. The significance of p-value, F-values, and probability meaning an improvement of students' performance through the years.
- Through a regression analysis from the number of observations vs average. More observations implies lower mean. The p-value 0.12 and t-value less than 0.0001 show the significance of the data. Two outliers outside the 95% predictions limits:
    - Fall 2020, Department of F&P Arts with 2 observations and mean of 2.406
    - Fall 2020, Department of Humanities with 27 observations and mean of 2.495
    Therefore, the increase in students tested in the classes implies a decrease in the overall average. Also, more classes assessed by department will give a lower average.

Excluding data from Fall 2020 (outlier year)

- The regression analysis for average vs year for Core Curriculum assessments at TAMIU. In overall, the **line is increasing but not significant evidence** proof that the average will follow the increasing pattern the following years.
- The results from the regression analysis from the number of observations vs average. More observations implies lower mean. The p-value 0.0383 and t-value less than alpha 0.05 is the significant evidence that more students assessed will implies a lower average. Therefore, the <mark>increase in students tested in the classes implies a decrease in the overall average</mark>. Also, <mark>more classes assessed by department will give a lower average</mark>.

Significant evidence proves the importance of randomization or requirement to increase the number of students graded in each course.

Her analysis did prove that we were not appropriately choosing students to score. If the faculty wanted to continue to do 30% or 25 students whichever is less sampling they needed to do the true randomization of sampling. This will be expressed to them in training from OIARP (supporting documentation) in the next cycle to see if this changes the scores.

Supporting Documentation:

Select a document artifact attached to this form or add a new document

UC3 Core Assessment Domains AYs2021.2023 10.7.20.docx

CC. Personal Responsibility.pdf

Memo - New Position - Assessment and Data Analyst Specialist I.pdf

Assessment and Data Analyst Specialist I TAMIU- Final 6-15-2022.docx

Randomization for WIN and CORE Assignments.pptx

Statistical Analysis – Core Curriculum Assessments.pptx

UC3 Minutes-10.19.20.doc

UC3 Minutes 4.7.2021.docx

UC3 Minutes-09.09.20.doc

UC3 Minutes-11.12.20.pdf

UC3 Minutes 03.30.2022.pdf

UC3 Minutes 04.28.2022.pdf

UC3 Minutes 10.14.2021.pdf

UC3 Minutes - 11.11.2021.pdf

7 **Social Responsibility - Social Responsibility**

TAMIU students will be able to apply intercultural competence and knowledge of civic responsibility to engage effectively in regional, national, and global communities.

Measures

1 Relevant Associations:

Selected Outcomes:

- SR - Social Responsibility

2

Measure Type

DIRECT - Student Products

If Selecting Other Measure Type, Please Specify Below

Measure

Just as before instructors and chairs will choose assignments that match the rubrics. The 2020-2021 AY as mentioned in last cycle's assessment report will be the trial run year. The 2021-2022 AY will be our second year collecting the data with core curriculum through AEFIS.

Moving the data to AEFIS will give us the ability to address the two concerns voiced by faculty in the last assessment report of not being able to disaggregate data by courses sections, courses, department, and college easily. We also now have the faculty scoring on the one institutionally created rubric which has been attached as supporting documentation. The rubric ranges in AEFIS as a follows

1 = Deficient
2 = Beginning
3 = Competent
4 = Accomplished
5 = Exemplary

The supporting documentation has the courses that the domains will be tested in for the two academic years. For the purposes of testing this PLO we will test the students ability to express ideas in such a way as to address a diverse audience by looking at the overall social responsibility rubric score.

Benchmark

75% of students will score a competent or higher on the Social Responsibility rubric. We are no longer using the mean as the point of benchmark as that may not be the clearest point without all the statistical analysis to know if that's the best statistic for showing success. Therefore, we are looking at each individual students success on the rubric.

Where will it be assessed?

Identified Core Curriculum sections in each long semester.

When will it be assessed?

AY 2020-2021 and AY 2021-2022

Individual(s) Responsible for Data Collection

Office of Institutional Assessment, Research, and Planning will collect fro

Findings

Benchmark Met

Findings Description

87.13% of students scored Competent or higher on the Social Responsibility Rubric. (Not including the outlier semester of Fall 2020, explained in the action plan)

265 (43.16%) = Exemplary
187 (30.46%) = Accomplished
83 (13.52%) = Competent
57 (9.28%) = Beginning
22 (3.58%) = Deficient

614 = n

Means
Spring 2021 = 3.84
Fall 2022 = 3.77

Action Plan Answer the following questions:
1. What did program faculty learn from the findings about how effective the program is in achieving this measure?
2. What are some examples of productive new actions taken by faculty to improve the program that generated these results?
3. What steps should be taken to enhance the effectiveness of this measure to improve the program going forward to the next cycle?
4. What are some general issues that emerged in the reading of these findings that the dean/provost should be aware of?

The 2020-2021 AY was a trial run year, but unfortunately the Fall 2020 semester was accidentally set up in AEFIS incorrectly. While we did get the data from faculty it did not have the appropriate rubrics instead of the 1-5 rubric score it only had the 1-4. This was an error when the AEFIS system was originally set up and could not be corrected during the run. The assessment had to be redone and reset for Spring 2021 onward to the 1-5 rubric scoring. Therefore, while the data from Fall 2020 is available it is considered outlier data.

In Spring 2021, after the rubric was fixed in the AEFIS system. Some of the comments from faculty were

- Core Curriculum needs to be announced in College Faculty Orientation Meetings
- Chairs need to be more involved in the process
- Having to provide scores for an entire lecture course is too many students and they are overwhelmed scoring students for this process

In response to point one, OIARP would be invited to College Faculty Orientation in the Fall to present a reminder on Core Curriculum. In response to point two, the Provost made it clear to the Deans and Chairs their responsibilities in the Core Curriculum process which is to ensure that faculty comply with the requirements of the process. Additionally, the Provost made it very clear that all faculty including adjuncts are to participate in the process. In response to point three, the Provost agreed that after listening to the concerns of faculty and to compromise this concern to create ownership by faculty he agreed to the following: Faculty will score 30% or 25 students whichever is less when scoring their course sections. Instructors will choose the students who they will score.

For the AY 2021-2022 data, after University Core Curriculum Committee (UC3) reviewed the data there was agreement that the scores were incredibly high. To compare last cycle's data to this you do have to add one point when comparing the means. Because the rubric before was 0-4 this rubric in AEFIS is 1-5. So these means are about the same as last cycle which comparatively was 3.9 adjusted. There was a debate between faculty and Associate Provost about scoring. Some faculty believed that scoring on the rubric meant scoring on the range of the student's year in school. For example, "For a freshman, this student scores a 2, etc." However, the Associate Provost clarified that the scoring should be on a more general baseline where the rubric should be followed with scoring as a general student across the board. For reference, these scores are not reported to the students. The artifacts are chosen from class graded projects, but are then scored by the faculty on a separate rubric for the purposes of Core Curriculum and are not a part of the student's grade. Which was emphasized in the meeting when discussing the rubric's use. Some faculty argued that the high scores were appropriate because the faculty spend a lot of time in the core courses working with the students and the upper courses do not. Therefore explaining why the core curriculum would be scoring high on skills that upper curriculum would

think students lack in skills. However, few faculty agreed with this sentiment. Another idea to explain the high scores was set forth which was that the sampling choices were having faculty only select those students who performed at a high level, and not a true random sample. However, this was just an idea and there was no statistical analysis on the data to know if this was true or not. To address this issue it was suggested to the faculty to just do an "every other" technique when selecting what students to score.

Last cycle there was conversations about who would analyze the data. This cycle it was analyzed assistant director Karol Batey, but she has asked to hire a statistical analyst to better perform statistical analysis on the data and provide more valid insight into the core curriculum data. The position was approved by Associate Vice President of OIARP and Provost. The job description has been included in the supporting documentation.

The analyst was hired, and she provided the analysis of this cycle's data it is as follows for all core curriculum:

Including data from Fall 2020 (outlier year)

- Through a regression analysis for average vs year for Core Curriculum assessments at TAMIU. In overall, the line is increasing. The significance of p-value, F-values, and probability ==meaning an improvement of students' performance through the years==.
- Through a regression analysis from the number of observations vs average. More observations implies lower mean. The p-value 0.12 and t-value less than 0.0001 show the significance of the data. Two outliers outside the 95% predictions limits:
  - Fall 2020, Department of F&P Arts with 2 observations and mean of 2.406
  - Fall 2020, Department of Humanities with 27 observations and mean of 2.495

  Therefore, the ==increase in students tested in the classes implies a decrease in the overall average==. Also, ==more classes assessed by department will give a lower average==.

Excluding data from Fall 2020 (outlier year)

- The regression analysis for average vs year for Core Curriculum assessments at TAMIU. In overall, the <u>line is increasing but not significant evidence</u> proof that the average will follow the increasing pattern the following years.
- The results from the regression analysis from the number of observations vs average. More observations implies lower mean. The p-value 0.0383 and t-value less than alpha 0.05 is the significant evidence that more students assessed will implies a lower average. Therefore, the ==increase in students tested in the classes implies a decrease in the overall average==. Also, ==more classes assessed by department will give a lower average==.

Significant evidence proves the importance of randomization or requirement to increase the number of students graded in each course.

Her analysis did prove that we were not appropriately choosing students to score. If the faculty wanted to continue to do 30% or 25 students whichever is less sampling they needed to do the true randomization of sampling. This will be expressed to them in training from OIARP (supporting documentation) in the next cycle to see if this changes the scores.

Supporting Documentation:

Select a document artifact attached to this form or add a new document

[UC3 Core Assessment Domains AYs2021.2023 10.7.20.docx](#)

[CC. Social Responsibility.pdf](#)

[Memo - New Position - Assessment and Data Analyst Specialist I.pdf](#)

[Assessment and Data Analyst Specialist I TAMIU- Final 6-15-2022.docx](#)

[Randomization for WIN and CORE Assignments.pptx](#)

[Statistical Analysis – Core Curriculum Assessments.pptx](#)

[UC3 Minutes-10.19.20.doc](#)

[UC3 Minutes 4.7.2021.docx](#)

[UC3 Minutes-09.09.20.doc](#)

[UC3 Minutes-10.19.20.pdf](#)

[UC3 Minutes-11.12.20.pdf](#)

[UC3 Minutes 03.30.2022.pdf](#)

[UC3 Minutes 04.28.2022.pdf](#)

[UC3 Minutes 10.14.2021.pdf](#)

[UC3 Minutes - 11.11.2021.pdf](#)

Measure Type

DIRECT - Student Products

If Selecting Other Measure Type, Please Specify Below

Measure

Just as before instructors and chairs will choose assignments that match the rubrics. The 2020-2021 AY as mentioned in last cycle's assessment report will be the trial run year. The 2021-2022 AY will be our second year collecting the data with core curriculum through AEFIS.

Moving the data to AEFIS will give us the ability to address the two concerns voiced by faculty in the last assessment report of not being able to disaggregate data by courses sections, courses, department, and college easily. We also now have the faculty scoring on the one institutionally created rubric which has been attached as supporting documentation. The rubric ranges in AEFIS as a follows

1 = Deficient
2 = Beginning
3 = Competent
4 = Accomplished
5 = Exemplary

The supporting documentation has the courses that the domains will be tested in for the two academic years. For the purposes of testing this PLO we will test the students ability to demonstrate a clear awareness of civic identity by looking at the Civic Identity and Commitment domain score.

Benchmark

75% of students will score a competent or higher on the Civic Identity and Commitment Domain. We are no longer using the mean as the point of benchmark as that may not be the clearest point without all the statistical analysis to know if that's the best statistic for showing success. Therefore, we are looking at each individual students success on the rubric.

Where will it be assessed?

Identified Core Curriculum sections in each long semester.

When will it be assessed?

AY 2020-2021 and AY 2021-2022

Individual(s) Responsible for Data Collection

Office of Institutional Assessment, Research, and Planning will collect fro|

Findings

Benchmark Met

Findings Description

91% of the students scored Competent or higher on the Civic Identity and Commitment Domain on the Social Responsibility Rubric. (Not including the outlier semester of Fall 2020, explained in the action plan)

239 (38.93%) = Exemplary
199 (32.41%) = Accomplished
121 (19.71%) = Competent
33 (5.37%) = Beginning
22 (3.58%) = Deficient

614 = n

Action Plan Answer the following questions:
1. What did program faculty learn from the findings about how effective the program is in achieving this measure?
2. What are some examples of productive new actions taken by faculty to improve the program that generated these results?
3. What steps should be taken to enhance the effectiveness of this measure to improve the program going forward to the next cycle?
4. What are some general issues that emerged in the reading of these findings that the dean/provost should be aware of?

The 2020-2021 AY was a trial run year, but unfortunately the Fall 2020 semester was accidentally set up in AEFIS incorrectly. While we did get the data from faculty it did not have the appropriate rubrics instead of the 1-5 rubric score it only had the 1-4. This was an error when the AEFIS system was originally set up and could not be corrected during the run. The assessment had to be redone and reset for Spring 2021 onward to the 1-5 rubric scoring. Therefore, while the data from Fall 2020 is available it is considered outlier data.

In Spring 2021, after the rubric was fixed in the AEFIS system. Some of the comments from faculty were
- Core Curriculum needs to be announced in College Faculty Orientation Meetings
- Chairs need to be more involved in the process
- Having to provide scores for an entire lecture course is too many students and they are overwhelmed scoring students for this process

In response to point one, OIARP would be invited to College Faculty Orientation in the Fall to present a reminder on Core Curriculum. In response to point two, the Provost made it clear to the Deans and Chairs their responsibilities in the Core Curriculum process which is to ensure that faculty comply with the requirements of the process. Additionally, the Provost made it very clear that all faculty including adjuncts are to participate in the process. In response to point three, the Provost agreed that after listening to the concerns of faculty and to compromise this concern to create ownership by faculty he agreed to the following: Faculty will score 30% or 25 students whichever is less when scoring their course sections. Instructors will choose the students who they will score.

For the AY 2021-2022 data, after University Core Curriculum Committee (UC3) reviewed the data there was agreement that the <mark>scores were incredibly high.</mark> To compare last cycle's data to this you do have to add one point when comparing the means. Because the rubric before was 0-4 this rubric in AEFIS is 1-5. There was a debate between faculty and Associate Provost about scoring. Some faculty believed that scoring on the rubric meant scoring on the range of the student's year in school. For example, "For a freshman, this student scores a 2, etc." However, the Associate Provost clarified that the scoring should be on a more general baseline where the rubric should be followed with scoring as a general student across the board. For reference, these scores are not reported to the students. The artifacts are chosen from class graded projects, but are then scored by the faculty on a separate rubric for the purposes of Core Curriculum and are not a part of the student's grade. Which was emphasized in the meeting when discussing the rubric's use. Some faculty argued that the high scores were appropriate because the faculty spend a lot of time in the core courses working with the students and the upper courses do not. Therefore explaining why the core curriculum would be scoring high on skills that upper curriculum would think students lack in skills. However, few faculty agreed with this sentiment. Another idea to explain the high scores was set forth which was that the sampling choices were having faculty only select those students who performed at a high level, and not a true random sample. However, this was just an idea and there was no statistical analysis on the data to know if this was true or not. To address this issue it was suggested to the faculty to just do an "every other" technique when selecting what students to score.

Last cycle there was conversations about who would analyze the data. This cycle it was analyzed assistant director Karol Batey, but she has asked to hire a statistical analyst to better perform statistical analysis on the data and provide more valid insight into the core curriculum data. The position was approved by Associate Vice President of OIARP and Provost. The job description has been included in the supporting documentation.

The analyst was hired, and she provided the analysis of this cycle's data it is as follows for all core curriculum:

Including data from Fall 2020 (outlier year)

- Through a regression analysis for average vs year for Core Curriculum assessments at TAMIU. In overall, the line is increasing. The significance of p-value, F-values, and probability <mark>meaning an improvement of students' performance through the years</mark>.
- Through a regression analysis from the number of observations vs average. More observations implies lower mean. The p-value 0.12 and t-value less than 0.0001 show the significance of the data. Two outliers outside the 95% predictions limits:
    - Fall 2020, Department of F&P Arts with 2 observations and mean of 2.406
    - Fall 2020, Department of Humanities with 27 observations and mean of 2.495
    Therefore, the <mark>increase in students tested in the classes implies a decrease in the overall average</mark>. Also, <mark>more classes assessed by department will give a lower average</mark>.

Excluding data from Fall 2020 (outlier year)

- The regression analysis for average vs year for Core Curriculum assessments at TAMIU. In overall, the **line is increasing but not significant evidence** proof that the average will follow

the increasing pattern the following years.

- The results from the regression analysis from the number of observations vs average. More observations implies lower mean. The p-value 0.0383 and t-value less than alpha 0.05 is the significant evidence that more students assessed will implies a lower average. Therefore, the ==increase in students tested in the classes implies a decrease in the overall average==. Also, ==more classes assessed by department will give a lower average==.

Significant evidence proves the importance of randomization or requirement to increase the number of students graded in each course.

Her analysis did prove that we were not appropriately choosing students to score. If the faculty wanted to continue to do 30% or 25 students whichever is less sampling they needed to do the true randomization of sampling. This will be expressed to them in training from OIARP (supporting documentation) in the next cycle to see if this changes the scores.

Supporting Documentation:

Select a document artifact attached to this form or add a new document

UC3 Core Assessment Domains AYs2021.2023 10.7.20.docx

CC. Social Responsibility.pdf

Memo - New Position - Assessment and Data Analyst Specialist I.pdf

Assessment and Data Analyst Specialist I TAMIU- Final 6-15-2022.docx

Randomization for WIN and CORE Assignments.pptx

Statistical Analysis – Core Curriculum Assessments.pptx

UC3 Minutes-10.19.20.doc

UC3 Minutes 4.7.2021.docx

UC3 Minutes-09.09.20.doc

UC3 Minutes-10.19.20.pdf

UC3 Minutes-11.12.20.pdf

UC3 Minutes 03.30.2022.pdf

UC3 Minutes 04.28.2022.pdf

UC3 Minutes 10.14.2021.pdf

UC3 Minutes - 11.11.2021.pdf