**Annual Assessment Report**

**Academic Programs**

**2018 -2020 Cycle**

|  |
| --- |
| **Program : Core Curriculum**  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Program Mission** | **Program Learning Outcomes Tested** |
| 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 personal and social responsibility principles for living in a diverse world, and advance intellectual and practical skills essential for all learning. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Learning Outcome 1:** Students who complete the TAMIU Core Curriculum will be able to think critically and creatively by utilizing skills such as innovation, inquiry, analysis, evaluation, and synthesis of information. (Critical Thinking) |
| **Learning Outcome 2:** Students who complete the TAMIU Core Curriculum 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. (Communication) |
| **Learning Outcome 3:** Students who complete the TAMIU Core Curriculum will be able to develop informed conclusions by engaging in the manipulation and analysis of numerical data or observable facts. (Empirical & Quantitative Skills) |
| **Learning Outcome 4:** Students who complete the TAMIU Core Curriculum will be able to consider different points of view to work effectively with others to support a shared purpose or goal. (Teamwork) |
| **Learning Outcome 5:** Students who complete the TAMIU Core Curriculum will be able to apply intercultural competence and knowledge of civic responsibility to engage effectively in regional, national, and global communities. (Social Responsibility) |
| **Learning Outcome 6:** Students who complete the TAMIU Core Curriculum will be able to connect choices, actions, and consequences to ethical decision-making. (Personal Responsibility) |

 |
| **LO** | **Measure** | **Benchmark** | **Findings** | **Action Plan** **Answer the following questions:** 1. **What did the program faculty learn from the findings of 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?**
 |
| 1 | Student Products (Direct)Instructors and chairs will choose assignments that match the rubrics as instructed numerous times and noted in the University Core Curriculum Committee (UC3) meeting minutes (supporting documentation). Assignments are not “content” driven, but skills driven that match with the domain. Additionally, all students, including those enrolled as early college students taking the courses at the university, are to be included in the testing of the core curriculum. It is also the understanding that all courses approved by THECB will be assessed in the Core Curriculum Process (supporting documentation Fall 2019 schedule). To test this learning outcome, we tested how students demonstrated their ability to think critically about a question or issue, therefore, we chose the overall rubric score. | The overall mean rubric score on the critical thinking rubric for our students will be a 2.0 or higher. The range is 0-4. During the last reporting cycle we barely missed the benchmark, and therefore we have kept it the same. Especially because we were using different rubrics and we had to guess within a ballpark what the instructors meant. They are to use the institutional-created rubrics. \*\*Update\*\* Fall 2019 Rubrics were revised based on faculty concerns, but keeping them as close to the ACU VALUE rubrics, which was THECB's recommendation for rubrics to use for Core Curriculum scoring.  |

|  |
| --- |
| [x] Benchmark Met [ ] Benchmark Not Met |

Overall, the mean score for our students was 2.1. This cycle was higher by .2 points. Critical Thinking was tested only in Fall 2019. The n number is 150 students.  | After the 2018 results, a meeting with the University Core Curriculum Committee (UC3) took place where a previous assessment plan was discussed (supporting documentation “10-30-2019 meeting minutes” “UC3 Minutes 10.21.19”), and it was the decision that the current methodology of doing the assessment was going to continue. There was an idea that the assessment methodology would change to a committee scoring core curriculum artifacts. However, this was decided not to be practical to TAMIU culture as it does not fit the needs and abilities of the university. Course releases would not be readily available to give to these committee members. While we wanted to get the data collection in AEFIS by the 2018 collection, we did not actually get that into AEFIS due to how difficult it was to connect between Blackboard and AEFIS. However, this Fall 2020 it has now been added into the AEFIS system by the Office of Institutional Assessment, Research, and Planning (OIARP), which will begin the data collection process to start providing longitudinal data analysis and eliminate the issues we have been having with our faculty using different rubrics when scoring the assessments. Additionally, they can use Blackboard to link assignments into AEFIS, where we can pull the names of the assignments used across the disciplines if necessary. OIARP and the PROF Center will provide the necessary training to the faculty to ensure they know how to use the AEFIS system to link and score their Core artifacts. Once the data is collected it is still TBD who will interpret that data. Right now, it may be Associate Vice President of OIARP Dr. David Allen or Associate Provost Dr. Stephen Duffy. This upcoming year in AEFIS will be our trial run year to see how the data collection runs. Looking forward, we still reiterate the importance of departments and colleges reviewing the data (notated in supporting documentation meeting minutes). Some topics to consider would be data trends and outliers. We are still trying to get our faculty used to talking about data. To better assess the different areas without overwhelming the disciplines, we will do different domains in different 3-year time periods (included in supporting documentation Minutes 10-19-2020, UC3 Core Assessment Domains AYs2021.2023 10.7.20).The concerns from the department faculty were the following (supporting documentation minutes from departments):* Wanting to see class/section/semester data for department discussions.
* Too many adjuncts teaching the core courses
* Concerns with the rubric and using the rubric appropriately

Right now, our focus this coming cycle will be ensuring the transition to AEFIS will increase our faculty submissions so we can address the first and third concerns shared by faculty. The Provost and Deans will discuss the second concern to see if there is a way to increase our full-time faculty in the core curriculum. If there is an increase, we will see if that also affects the scores. Additionally, there was a discussion amongst our faculty regarding our Math courses. There were/ are several math options in the CoreSome specific programs had/ have specific math requirements (e.g. Business Math I), while others (e.g. history) would accept any math core classSome programs (e.g., English/ Art) did not need a specific math requirement but specified College Algebra in their degree plans. Therefore, students were advised to take College Algebra and many of them found it too challenging and thus a problem for retention/ progress to degree (or took it at LC)The changes made sure the programs needing a specific math class had the correct one and that those that did not need one allowed advisors to place students in more appropriate math classes, such as Math for Liberal Arts |
| 1 | Student Products (Direct)Instructors and chairs will choose assignments that match the rubrics as instructed numerous times and noted in the University Core Curriculum Committee (UC3) meeting minutes (supporting documentation). Assignments are not “content” driven, but skills driven that match with the domain. Additionally, all students, including those enrolled as early college students taking the courses at the university, are to be included in the testing of the core curriculum. It is also the understanding that all courses approved by THECB will be assessed in the Core Curriculum Process (supporting documentation Fall 2019 schedule).We wanted to test how students analyze various components of information to reach a rational conclusion, therefore we chose the analysis domain score. Faculty are to use an institutional rubric that ranges from 0-4These scores were uploaded using Survey Monkey.  | The analysis domain mean score in the critical thinking rubric for our students will be a 2.0 or higher. The range is 0-4.During the last reporting cycle we barely missed the benchmark, and therefore we have kept it the same. Especially because we were using different rubrics and we had to guess within a ballpark what the instructors meant. They are to use the institutional-created rubrics. \*\*Update\*\* Fall 2019 Rubrics were revised based on faculty concerns, but keeping them as close to the ACU VALUE rubrics, which was THECB's recommendation for rubrics to use for Core Curriculum scoring. |

|  |
| --- |
| [x] Benchmark Met [ ] Benchmark Not Met |

Overall, the analysis mean score for our students was 2.0. This cycle was higher by .1 point. Critical Thinking was tested only in Fall 2019. The n number is 150 students. | After the 2018 results, a meeting with the University Core Curriculum Committee (UC3) took place where a previous assessment plan was discussed (supporting documentation “10-30-2019 meeting minutes” “UC3 Minutes 10.21.19”), and it was the decision that the current methodology of doing the assessment was going to continue. There was an idea that the assessment methodology would change to a committee scoring core curriculum artifacts. However, this was decided not to be practical to TAMIU culture as it does not fit the needs and abilities of the university. Course releases would not be readily available to give to these committee members. While we wanted to get the data collection in AEFIS by the 2018 collection, we did not actually get that into AEFIS due to how difficult it was to connect between Blackboard and AEFIS. However, this Fall 2020 it has now been added into the AEFIS system by the Office of Institutional Assessment, Research, and Planning (OIARP), which will begin the data collection process to start providing longitudinal data analysis and eliminate the issues we have been having with our faculty using different rubrics when scoring the assessments. Additionally, they can use Blackboard to link assignments into AEFIS, where we can pull the names of the assignments used across the disciplines if necessary. OIARP and the PROF Center will provide the necessary training to the faculty to ensure they know how to use the AEFIS system to link and score their Core artifacts. Once the data is collected it is still TBD who will interpret that data. Right now, it may be Associate Vice President of OIARP Dr. David Allen or Associate Provost Dr. Stephen Duffy. This upcoming year in AEFIS will be our trial run year to see how the data collection runs. Looking forward, we still reiterate the importance of departments and colleges reviewing the data (notated in supporting documentation meeting minutes). Some topics to consider would be data trends and outliers. We are still trying to get our faculty used to talking about data. To better assess the different areas without overwhelming the disciplines, we will do different domains in different 3-year time periods (included in supporting documentation Minutes 10-19-2020, UC3 Core Assessment Domains AYs2021.2023 10.7.20).The concerns from the department faculty were the following (supporting documentation minutes from departments):* Wanting to see class/section/semester data for department discussions.
* Too many adjuncts teaching the core courses
* Concerns with the rubric and using the rubric appropriately

Right now, our focus this coming cycle will be ensuring the transition to AEFIS will increase our faculty submissions so we can address the first and third concerns shared by faculty. The Provost and Deans will discuss the second concern to see if there is a way to increase our full-time faculty in the core curriculum. If there is an increase, we will see if that also affects the scores.Additionally, there was a discussion amongst our faculty regarding our Math courses. There were/ are several math options in the CoreSome specific programs had/ have specific math requirements (e.g. Business Math I), while others (e.g. history) would accept any math core classSome programs (e.g., English/ Art) did not need a specific math requirement but specified College Algebra in their degree plans. Therefore, students were advised to take College Algebra and many of them found it too challenging and thus a problem for retention/ progress to degree (or took it at LC)The changes made sure the programs needing a specific math class had the correct one and that those that did not need one allowed advisors to place students in more appropriate math classes, such as Math for Liberal Arts |
| 2 | Student Products (Direct)Instructors and chairs will choose assignments that match the rubrics as instructed numerous times and noted in the University Core Curriculum Committee (UC3) meeting minutes (supporting documentation). Assignments are not “content” driven, but skills driven that match with the domain. Additionally, all students, including those enrolled as early college students taking the courses at the university, are to be included in the testing of the core curriculum. It is also the understanding that all courses approved by THECB will be assessed in the Core Curriculum Process (supporting documentation Fall 2019 schedule).We wanted to test how students articulate information clearly and fluently, therefore we chose the overall rubric score. Faculty are to use an institutional rubric that ranges from 0-4These scores were uploaded using Survey Monkey.  | The overall mean rubric score on the communication rubric for our students will be a 2.0 or higher. The range is 0-4.During the last reporting cycle we barely made the benchmark, and therefore we have kept it the same. Especially because we were using different rubrics and we had to guess within a ballpark what the instructors meant. They are to use the institutional-created rubrics. \*\*Update\*\* Fall 2019 Rubrics were revised based on faculty concerns but keeping them as close to the ACU VALUE rubrics, which was THECB's recommendation for rubrics to use for Core Curriculum scoring. |

|  |
| --- |
| [x] Benchmark Met [ ] Benchmark Not Met |

With the change of rubrics, the 2018-2019 AY used the VALUE rubrics, and the overall mean was 3.1. In the 2019-2020 AY with the new institutional rubrics, the mean was 2.3. Combining these rubrics the mean was 2.7. Which is higher than last cycle’s mean of 2.2. However, some people still used the VALUE rubrics in 2019-2020, as well. For the VALUE rubrics the n number of the students tested was:Fall 18 - 45Spring 19 - 129Fall 19 – 119With the institutional developed rubrics, the n number of students tested was:Fall 18 - 4Spring 19 - 0Fall 19 - 375 | After the 2018 results, a meeting with the University Core Curriculum Committee (UC3) took place where a previous assessment plan was discussed (supporting documentation “10-30-2019 meeting minutes” “UC3 Minutes 10.21.19”), and it was the decision that the current methodology of doing the assessment was going to continue. There was an idea that the assessment methodology would change to a committee scoring core curriculum artifacts. However, this was decided not to be practical to TAMIU culture as it does not fit the needs and abilities of the university. Course releases would not be readily available to give to these committee members. While we wanted to get the data collection in AEFIS by the 2018 collection, we did not actually get that into AEFIS due to how difficult it was to connect between Blackboard and AEFIS. However, this Fall 2020 it has now been added into the AEFIS system by the Office of Institutional Assessment, Research, and Planning (OIARP), which will begin the data collection process to start providing longitudinal data analysis and eliminate the issues we have been having with our faculty using different rubrics when scoring the assessments. Additionally, they can use Blackboard to link assignments into AEFIS, where we can pull the names of the assignments used across the disciplines if necessary. OIARP and the PROF Center will provide the necessary training to the faculty to ensure they know how to use the AEFIS system to link and score their Core artifacts. Once the data is collected it is still TBD who will interpret that data. Right now, it may be Associate Vice President of OIARP Dr. David Allen or Associate Provost Dr. Stephen Duffy. This upcoming year in AEFIS will be our trial run year to see how the data collection runs. Looking forward, we still reiterate the importance of departments and colleges reviewing the data (notated in supporting documentation meeting minutes). Some topics to consider would be data trends and outliers. We are still trying to get our faculty used to talking about data. To better assess the different areas without overwhelming the disciplines, we will do different domains in different 3-year time periods (included in supporting documentation Minutes 10-19-2020, UC3 Core Assessment Domains AYs2021.2023 10.7.20).The concerns from the department faculty were the following (supporting documentation minutes from departments):* Wanting to see class/section/semester data for department discussions.
* Too many adjuncts teaching the core courses
* Concerns with the rubric and using the rubric appropriately

Right now, our focus this coming cycle will be ensuring the transition to AEFIS will increase our faculty submissions so we can address the first and third concerns shared by faculty. The Provost and Deans will discuss the second concern to see if there is a way to increase our full-time faculty in the core curriculum. If there is an increase, we will see if that also affects the scores.Additionally, there was a discussion amongst our faculty regarding our Math courses. There were/ are several math options in the CoreSome specific programs had/ have specific math requirements (e.g. Business Math I), while others (e.g. history) would accept any math core classSome programs (e.g., English/ Art) did not need a specific math requirement but specified College Algebra in their degree plans. Therefore, students were advised to take College Algebra and many of them found it too challenging and thus a problem for retention/ progress to degree (or took it at LC)The changes made sure the programs needing a specific math class had the correct one and that those that did not need one allowed advisors to place students in more appropriate math classes, such as Math for Liberal Arts |
| 2 | Student Products (Direct)Instructors and chairs will choose assignments that match the rubrics as instructed numerous times and noted in the University Core Curriculum Committee (UC3) meeting minutes (supporting documentation). Assignments are not “content” driven, but skills driven that match with the domain. Additionally, all students, including those enrolled as early college students taking the courses at the university, are to be included in the testing of the core curriculum. It is also the understanding that all courses approved by THECB will be assessed in the Core Curriculum Process (supporting documentation Fall 2019 schedule).We wanted to test how students demonstrate proficiency in using the tools of language therefore we chose the grammar and mechanics domain score. Faculty are to use an institutional rubric that ranges from 0-4These scores were uploaded using Survey Monkey.  | The grammar and mechanics domain mean score in the communication rubric for our students will be a 2.0 or higher. The range is 0-4.During the last reporting cycle we barely made the benchmark, and therefore we have kept it the same. Especially because we were using different rubrics and we had to guess within a ballpark what the instructors meant. They are to use the institutional-created rubrics. \*\*Update\*\* Fall 2019 Rubrics were revised based on faculty concerns but keeping them as close to the ACU VALUE rubrics, which was THECB's recommendation for rubrics to use for Core Curriculum scoring. |

|  |
| --- |
| [x] Benchmark Met [ ] Benchmark Not Met |

Grammar and Mechanics domain was only available to use with institutional created rubric. The mean score was 2.4, .2 points higher than last cycle. The n number of students tested was:Fall 18 - 4Spring 19 - 0Fall 19 - 375 | After the 2018 results, a meeting with the University Core Curriculum Committee (UC3) took place where a previous assessment plan was discussed (supporting documentation “10-30-2019 meeting minutes” “UC3 Minutes 10.21.19”), and it was the decision that the current methodology of doing the assessment was going to continue. There was an idea that the assessment methodology would change to a committee scoring core curriculum artifacts. However, this was decided not to be practical to TAMIU culture as it does not fit the needs and abilities of the university. Course releases would not be readily available to give to these committee members. While we wanted to get the data collection in AEFIS by the 2018 collection, we did not actually get that into AEFIS due to how difficult it was to connect between Blackboard and AEFIS. However, this Fall 2020 it has now been added into the AEFIS system by the Office of Institutional Assessment, Research, and Planning (OIARP), which will begin the data collection process to start providing longitudinal data analysis and eliminate the issues we have been having with our faculty using different rubrics when scoring the assessments. Additionally, they can use Blackboard to link assignments into AEFIS, where we can pull the names of the assignments used across the disciplines if necessary. OIARP and the PROF Center will provide the necessary training to the faculty to ensure they know how to use the AEFIS system to link and score their Core artifacts. Once the data is collected it is still TBD who will interpret that data. Right now, it may be Associate Vice President of OIARP Dr. David Allen or Associate Provost Dr. Stephen Duffy. This upcoming year in AEFIS will be our trial run year to see how the data collection runs. Looking forward, we still reiterate the importance of departments and colleges reviewing the data (notated in supporting documentation meeting minutes). Some topics to consider would be data trends and outliers. We are still trying to get our faculty used to talking about data. To better assess the different areas without overwhelming the disciplines, we will do different domains in different 3-year time periods (included in supporting documentation Minutes 10-19-2020, UC3 Core Assessment Domains AYs2021.2023 10.7.20).The concerns from the department faculty were the following (supporting documentation minutes from departments):* Wanting to see class/section/semester data for department discussions.
* Too many adjuncts teaching the core courses
* Concerns with the rubric and using the rubric appropriately

Right now, our focus this coming cycle will be ensuring the transition to AEFIS will increase our faculty submissions so we can address the first and third concerns shared by faculty. The Provost and Deans will discuss the second concern to see if there is a way to increase our full-time faculty in the core curriculum. If there is an increase, we will see if that also affects the scores. Additionally, there was a discussion amongst our faculty regarding our Math courses. There were/ are several math options in the CoreSome specific programs had/ have specific math requirements (e.g. Business Math I), while others (e.g. history) would accept any math core classSome programs (e.g., English/ Art) did not need a specific math requirement but specified College Algebra in their degree plans. Therefore, students were advised to take College Algebra and many of them found it too challenging and thus a problem for retention/ progress to degree (or took it at LC)The changes made sure the programs needing a specific math class had the correct one and that those that did not need one allowed advisors to place students in more appropriate math classes, such as Math for Liberal Arts |
| 3 | Student Products (Direct)Instructors and chairs will choose assignments that match the rubrics as instructed numerous times and noted in the University Core Curriculum Committee (UC3) meeting minutes (supporting documentation). Assignments are not “content” driven, but skills driven that match with the domain. Additionally, all students, including those enrolled as early college students taking the courses at the university, are to be included in the testing of the core curriculum. It is also the understanding that all courses approved by THECB will be assessed in the Core Curriculum Process (supporting documentation Fall 2019 schedule).We wanted to test how students interpret results and draw informed conclusions, therefore we chose the overall rubric score. Faculty are to use an institutional rubric that ranges from 0-4These scores were uploaded using Survey Monkey. | The overall mean rubric score on the empirical and quantitative skills rubric for our students will be a 2.0 or higher. The range is 0-4.During the last reporting cycle we made the benchmark, but because we were using different rubrics and we had to guess within a ballpark what the instructors meant we have kept it the same. They (faculty) are to use the institutional-created rubrics. \*\*Update\*\* Fall 2019 Rubrics were revised based on faculty concerns but keeping them as close to the ACU VALUE rubrics, which was THECB's recommendation for rubrics to use for Core Curriculum scoring. |

|  |
| --- |
| [x] Benchmark Met [ ] Benchmark Not Met |

Overall, the mean score for our students was 2.1. This cycle the score went down .3 points. Empirical Quantitative Skills were tested only in Fall 2019. The n number is 152 students. | After the 2018 results, a meeting with the University Core Curriculum Committee (UC3) took place where a previous assessment plan was discussed (supporting documentation “10-30-2019 meeting minutes” “UC3 Minutes 10.21.19”), and it was the decision that the current methodology of doing the assessment was going to continue. There was an idea that the assessment methodology would change to a committee scoring core curriculum artifacts. However, this was decided not to be practical to TAMIU culture as it does not fit the needs and abilities of the university. Course releases would not be readily available to give to these committee members. While we wanted to get the data collection in AEFIS by the 2018 collection, we did not actually get that into AEFIS due to how difficult it was to connect between Blackboard and AEFIS. However, this Fall 2020 it has now been added into the AEFIS system by the Office of Institutional Assessment, Research, and Planning (OIARP), which will begin the data collection process to start providing longitudinal data analysis and eliminate the issues we have been having with our faculty using different rubrics when scoring the assessments. Additionally, they can use Blackboard to link assignments into AEFIS, where we can pull the names of the assignments used across the disciplines if necessary. OIARP and the PROF Center will provide the necessary training to the faculty to ensure they know how to use the AEFIS system to link and score their Core artifacts. Once the data is collected it is still TBD who will interpret that data. Right now, it may be Associate Vice President of OIARP Dr. David Allen or Associate Provost Dr. Stephen Duffy. This upcoming year in AEFIS will be our trial run year to see how the data collection runs. Looking forward, we still reiterate the importance of departments and colleges reviewing the data (notated in supporting documentation meeting minutes). Some topics to consider would be data trends and outliers. We are still trying to get our faculty used to talking about data. To better assess the different areas without overwhelming the disciplines, we will do different domains in different 3-year time periods (included in supporting documentation Minutes 10-19-2020, UC3 Core Assessment Domains AYs2021.2023 10.7.20).The concerns from the department faculty were the following (supporting documentation minutes from departments):* Wanting to see class/section/semester data for department discussions.
* Too many adjuncts teaching the core courses
* Concerns with the rubric and using the rubric appropriately

Right now, our focus this coming cycle will be ensuring the transition to AEFIS will increase our faculty submissions so we can address the first and third concerns shared by faculty. The Provost and Deans will discuss the second concern to see if there is a way to increase our full-time faculty in the core curriculum. If there is an increase, we will see if that also affects the scores.Additionally, there was a discussion amongst our faculty regarding our Math courses. There were/ are several math options in the CoreSome specific programs had/ have specific math requirements (e.g. Business Math I), while others (e.g. history) would accept any math core classSome programs (e.g., English/ Art) did not need a specific math requirement but specified College Algebra in their degree plans. Therefore, students were advised to take College Algebra and many of them found it too challenging and thus a problem for retention/ progress to degree (or took it at LC)The changes made sure the programs needing a specific math class had the correct one and that those that did not need one allowed advisors to place students in more appropriate math classes, such as Math for Liberal Arts |
| 3 | Student Products (Direct)Instructors and chairs will choose assignments that match the rubrics as instructed numerous times and noted in the University Core Curriculum Committee (UC3) meeting minutes (supporting documentation). Assignments are not “content” driven, but skills driven that match with the domain. Additionally, all students, including those enrolled as early college students taking the courses at the university, are to be included in the testing of the core curriculum. It is also the understanding that all courses approved by THECB will be assessed in the Core Curriculum Process (supporting documentation Fall 2019 schedule).We wanted to test how students identify the nature of the problem accurately, therefore, we chose the identification of problem domain score. Faculty are to use an institutional rubric that ranges from 0-4These scores were uploaded using Survey Monkey.   | The identification of problem domain mean score in the empirical and quantitative skills rubric for our students will be a 2.0 or higher. The range is 0-4During the last reporting cycle we made the benchmark, but because we were using different rubrics and we had to guess within a ballpark what the instructors meant we have kept it the same. They (faculty) are to use the institutional-created rubrics. \*\*Update\*\* Fall 2019 Rubrics were revised based on faculty concerns but keeping them as close to the ACU VALUE rubrics, which was THECB's recommendation for rubrics to use for Core Curriculum scoring. |

|  |
| --- |
| [ ] Benchmark Met [ ] Benchmark Not Met |

Overall, the mean score for our students was 2.3. This cycle the score went down .1 point. Empirical Quantitative Skills were tested only in Fall 2019. The n number is 152 students | After the 2018 results, a meeting with the University Core Curriculum Committee (UC3) took place where a previous assessment plan was discussed (supporting documentation “10-30-2019 meeting minutes” “UC3 Minutes 10.21.19”), and it was the decision that the current methodology of doing the assessment was going to continue. There was an idea that the assessment methodology would change to a committee scoring core curriculum artifacts. However, this was decided not to be practical to TAMIU culture as it does not fit the needs and abilities of the university. Course releases would not be readily available to give to these committee members. While we wanted to get the data collection in AEFIS by the 2018 collection, we did not actually get that into AEFIS due to how difficult it was to connect between Blackboard and AEFIS. However, this Fall 2020 it has now been added into the AEFIS system by the Office of Institutional Assessment, Research, and Planning (OIARP), which will begin the data collection process to start providing longitudinal data analysis and eliminate the issues we have been having with our faculty using different rubrics when scoring the assessments. Additionally, they can use Blackboard to link assignments into AEFIS, where we can pull the names of the assignments used across the disciplines if necessary. OIARP and the PROF Center will provide the necessary training to the faculty to ensure they know how to use the AEFIS system to link and score their Core artifacts. Once the data is collected it is still TBD who will interpret that data. Right now, it may be Associate Vice President of OIARP Dr. David Allen or Associate Provost Dr. Stephen Duffy. This upcoming year in AEFIS will be our trial run year to see how the data collection runs. Looking forward, we still reiterate the importance of departments and colleges reviewing the data (notated in supporting documentation meeting minutes). Some topics to consider would be data trends and outliers. We are still trying to get our faculty used to talking about data. To better assess the different areas without overwhelming the disciplines, we will do different domains in different 3-year time periods (included in supporting documentation Minutes 10-19-2020, UC3 Core Assessment Domains AYs2021.2023 10.7.20).The concerns from the department faculty were the following (supporting documentation minutes from departments):* Wanting to see class/section/semester data for department discussions.
* Too many adjuncts teaching the core courses
* Concerns with the rubric and using the rubric appropriately

Right now, our focus this coming cycle will be ensuring the transition to AEFIS will increase our faculty submissions so we can address the first and third concerns shared by faculty. The Provost and Deans will discuss the second concern to see if there is a way to increase our full-time faculty in the core curriculum. If there is an increase, we will see if that also affects the scores. Additionally, there was a discussion amongst our faculty regarding our Math courses. There were/ are several math options in the CoreSome specific programs had/ have specific math requirements (e.g. Business Math I), while others (e.g. history) would accept any math core classSome programs (e.g., English/ Art) did not need a specific math requirement but specified College Algebra in their degree plans. Therefore, students were advised to take College Algebra and many of them found it too challenging and thus a problem for retention/ progress to degree (or took it at LC)The changes made sure the programs needing a specific math class had the correct one and that those that did not need one allowed advisors to place students in more appropriate math classes, such as Math for Liberal Arts |
| 4 | Student Products (Direct)Instructors and chairs will choose assignments that match the rubrics as instructed numerous times and noted in the University Core Curriculum Committee (UC3) meeting minutes (supporting documentation). Assignments are not “content” driven, but skills driven that match with the domain. Additionally, all students, including those enrolled as early college students taking the courses at the university, are to be included in the testing of the core curriculum. It is also the understanding that all courses approved by THECB will be assessed in the Core Curriculum Process (supporting documentation Fall 2019 schedule).We wanted to test how students coordinate efforts effectively to achieve a shared purpose, therefore we chose the overall rubric score. Faculty are to use an institutional rubric that ranges from 0-4These scores were uploaded using Survey Monkey. | The overall mean rubric score on the teamwork rubric for our students will be a 2.0 or higher. The range is 0-4.During the last reporting cycle we made the benchmark, but because we were using different rubrics and we had to guess within a ballpark what the instructors meant we have kept it the same. They (faculty) are to use the institutional-created rubrics. \*\*Update\*\* Fall 2019 Rubrics were revised based on faculty concerns but keeping them as close to the ACU VALUE rubrics, which was THECB's recommendation for rubrics to use for Core Curriculum scoring. |

|  |
| --- |
| [x] Benchmark Met [ ] Benchmark Not Met |

Overall, the mean score for our students was 3.5. This cycle the score went up .6 points. Teamwork was tested only in Spring 2019. The n number is 99 students. | After the 2018 results, a meeting with the University Core Curriculum Committee (UC3) took place where a previous assessment plan was discussed (supporting documentation “10-30-2019 meeting minutes” “UC3 Minutes 10.21.19”), and it was the decision that the current methodology of doing the assessment was going to continue. There was an idea that the assessment methodology would change to a committee scoring core curriculum artifacts. However, this was decided not to be practical to TAMIU culture as it does not fit the needs and abilities of the university. Course releases would not be readily available to give to these committee members. While we wanted to get the data collection in AEFIS by the 2018 collection, we did not actually get that into AEFIS due to how difficult it was to connect between Blackboard and AEFIS. However, this Fall 2020 it has now been added into the AEFIS system by the Office of Institutional Assessment, Research, and Planning (OIARP), which will begin the data collection process to start providing longitudinal data analysis and eliminate the issues we have been having with our faculty using different rubrics when scoring the assessments. Additionally, they can use Blackboard to link assignments into AEFIS, where we can pull the names of the assignments used across the disciplines if necessary. OIARP and the PROF Center will provide the necessary training to the faculty to ensure they know how to use the AEFIS system to link and score their Core artifacts. Once the data is collected it is still TBD who will interpret that data. Right now, it may be Associate Vice President of OIARP Dr. David Allen or Associate Provost Dr. Stephen Duffy. This upcoming year in AEFIS will be our trial run year to see how the data collection runs. Looking forward, we still reiterate the importance of departments and colleges reviewing the data (notated in supporting documentation meeting minutes). Some topics to consider would be data trends and outliers. We are still trying to get our faculty used to talking about data. To better assess the different areas without overwhelming the disciplines, we will do different domains in different 3-year time periods (included in supporting documentation Minutes 10-19-2020, UC3 Core Assessment Domains AYs2021.2023 10.7.20).The concerns from the department faculty were the following (supporting documentation minutes from departments):* Wanting to see class/section/semester data for department discussions.
* Too many adjuncts teaching the core courses
* Concerns with the rubric and using the rubric appropriately

Right now, our focus this coming cycle will be ensuring the transition to AEFIS will increase our faculty submissions so we can address the first and third concerns shared by faculty. The Provost and Deans will discuss the second concern to see if there is a way to increase our full-time faculty in the core curriculum. If there is an increase, we will see if that also affects the scores.  |
| 4 | Student Products (Direct)Instructors and chairs will choose assignments that match the rubrics as instructed numerous times and noted in the University Core Curriculum Committee (UC3) meeting minutes (supporting documentation). Assignments are not “content” driven, but skills driven that match with the domain. Additionally, all students, including those enrolled as early college students taking the courses at the university, are to be included in the testing of the core curriculum. It is also the understanding that all courses approved by THECB will be assessed in the Core Curriculum Process (supporting documentation Fall 2019 schedule).We wanted to test how students contribute meaningfully to team meetings, therefore, we chose the Contributes to team meetings domain score. Faculty are to use an institutional rubric that ranges from 0-4These scores were uploaded using Survey Monkey.  | The Contributes to team meetings mean score in the teamwork rubric for our students will be a 2.0 or higher. The range is 0-4.During the last reporting cycle we made the benchmark, but because we were using different rubrics and we had to guess within a ballpark what the instructors meant we have kept it the same. They (faculty) are to use the institutional-created rubrics. \*\*Update\*\* Fall 2019 Rubrics were revised based on faculty concerns but keeping them as close to the ACU VALUE rubrics, which was THECB's recommendation for rubrics to use for Core Curriculum scoring. |

|  |
| --- |
| [x] Benchmark Met [ ] Benchmark Not Met |

Overall, the mean score for our students was 3.5. This cycle the score went up .5 points. Teamwork was tested only in Spring 2019. The n number is 99 students. | After the 2018 results, a meeting with the University Core Curriculum Committee (UC3) took place where a previous assessment plan was discussed (supporting documentation “10-30-2019 meeting minutes” “UC3 Minutes 10.21.19”), and it was the decision that the current methodology of doing the assessment was going to continue. There was an idea that the assessment methodology would change to a committee scoring core curriculum artifacts. However, this was decided not to be practical to TAMIU culture as it does not fit the needs and abilities of the university. Course releases would not be readily available to give to these committee members. While we wanted to get the data collection in AEFIS by the 2018 collection, we did not actually get that into AEFIS due to how difficult it was to connect between Blackboard and AEFIS. However, this Fall 2020 it has now been added into the AEFIS system by the Office of Institutional Assessment, Research, and Planning (OIARP), which will begin the data collection process to start providing longitudinal data analysis and eliminate the issues we have been having with our faculty using different rubrics when scoring the assessments. Additionally, they can use Blackboard to link assignments into AEFIS, where we can pull the names of the assignments used across the disciplines if necessary. OIARP and the PROF Center will provide the necessary training to the faculty to ensure they know how to use the AEFIS system to link and score their Core artifacts. Once the data is collected it is still TBD who will interpret that data. Right now, it may be Associate Vice President of OIARP Dr. David Allen or Associate Provost Dr. Stephen Duffy. This upcoming year in AEFIS will be our trial run year to see how the data collection runs. Looking forward, we still reiterate the importance of departments and colleges reviewing the data (notated in supporting documentation meeting minutes). Some topics to consider would be data trends and outliers. We are still trying to get our faculty used to talking about data. To better assess the different areas without overwhelming the disciplines, we will do different domains in different 3-year time periods (included in supporting documentation Minutes 10-19-2020, UC3 Core Assessment Domains AYs2021.2023 10.7.20).The concerns from the department faculty were the following (supporting documentation minutes from departments):* Wanting to see class/section/semester data for department discussions.
* Too many adjuncts teaching the core courses
* Concerns with the rubric and using the rubric appropriately

Right now, our focus this coming cycle will be ensuring the transition to AEFIS will increase our faculty submissions so we can address the first and third concerns shared by faculty. The Provost and Deans will discuss the second concern to see if there is a way to increase our full-time faculty in the core curriculum. If there is an increase, we will see if that also affects the scores. |
| 5 | Student Products (Direct)Instructors and chairs will choose assignments that match the rubrics as instructed numerous times and noted in the University Core Curriculum Committee (UC3) meeting minutes (supporting documentation). Assignments are not “content” driven, but skills driven that match with the domain. Additionally, all students, including those enrolled as early college students taking the courses at the university, are to be included in the testing of the core curriculum. It is also the understanding that all courses approved by THECB will be assessed in the Core Curriculum Process (supporting documentation Fall 2019 schedule).We wanted to test how students express ideas in such a way as to address a diverse audience, therefore we chose the overall rubric score. Faculty are to use an institutional rubric that ranges from 0-4These scores were uploaded using Survey Monkey. | The overall mean rubric score on the social responsibility rubric for our students will be a 2.0 or higher. The range is 0-4.During the last reporting cycle we barely made the benchmark, and therefore we have kept it the same. Especially because we were using different rubrics and we had to guess within a ballpark what the instructors meant. They are to use the institutional-created rubrics. \*\*Update\*\* Fall 2019 Rubrics were revised based on faculty concerns but keeping them as close to the ACU VALUE rubrics, which was THECB's recommendation for rubrics to use for Core Curriculum scoring. |

|  |
| --- |
| [x] Benchmark Met [ ] Benchmark Not Met |

With the change of rubrics, the 2018-2019 AY used the VALUE rubrics, and the overall mean was 3.2. In the 2019-2020 AY with the new institutional rubrics, the mean was 2.5. Combining these rubrics the mean was 2.9. Which is higher than last cycle’s mean of 2.4. However, some people still used the VALUE rubrics in 2019-2020, as well. For the VALUE rubrics the n number of the students tested was:Fall 18 - 103Spring 19 - 58Fall 19 – 143With the institutional developed rubrics, the n number of students tested was:Fall 18 - 0Spring 19 - 0Fall 19 - 152 | After the 2018 results, a meeting with the University Core Curriculum Committee (UC3) took place where a previous assessment plan was discussed (supporting documentation “10-30-2019 meeting minutes” “UC3 Minutes 10.21.19”), and it was the decision that the current methodology of doing the assessment was going to continue. There was an idea that the assessment methodology would change to a committee scoring core curriculum artifacts. However, this was decided not to be practical to TAMIU culture as it does not fit the needs and abilities of the university. Course releases would not be readily available to give to these committee members. While we wanted to get the data collection in AEFIS by the 2018 collection, we did not actually get that into AEFIS due to how difficult it was to connect between Blackboard and AEFIS. However, this Fall 2020 it has now been added into the AEFIS system by the Office of Institutional Assessment, Research, and Planning (OIARP), which will begin the data collection process to start providing longitudinal data analysis and eliminate the issues we have been having with our faculty using different rubrics when scoring the assessments. Additionally, they can use Blackboard to link assignments into AEFIS, where we can pull the names of the assignments used across the disciplines if necessary. OIARP and the PROF Center will provide the necessary training to the faculty to ensure they know how to use the AEFIS system to link and score their Core artifacts. Once the data is collected it is still TBD who will interpret that data. Right now, it may be Associate Vice President of OIARP Dr. David Allen or Associate Provost Dr. Stephen Duffy. This upcoming year in AEFIS will be our trial run year to see how the data collection runs. Looking forward, we still reiterate the importance of departments and colleges reviewing the data (notated in supporting documentation meeting minutes). Some topics to consider would be data trends and outliers. We are still trying to get our faculty used to talking about data. To better assess the different areas without overwhelming the disciplines, we will do different domains in different 3-year time periods (included in supporting documentation Minutes 10-19-2020, UC3 Core Assessment Domains AYs2021.2023 10.7.20).The concerns from the department faculty were the following (supporting documentation minutes from departments):* Wanting to see class/section/semester data for department discussions.
* Too many adjuncts teaching the core courses
* Concerns with the rubric and using the rubric appropriately

Right now, our focus this coming cycle will be ensuring the transition to AEFIS will increase our faculty submissions so we can address the first and third concerns shared by faculty. The Provost and Deans will discuss the second concern to see if there is a way to increase our full-time faculty in the core curriculum. If there is an increase, we will see if that also affects the scores. |
| 5 | Student Products (Direct)Instructors and chairs will choose assignments that match the rubrics as instructed numerous times and noted in the University Core Curriculum Committee (UC3) meeting minutes (supporting documentation). Assignments are not “content” driven, but skills driven that match with the domain. Additionally, all students, including those enrolled as early college students taking the courses at the university, are to be included in the testing of the core curriculum. It is also the understanding that all courses approved by THECB will be assessed in the Core Curriculum Process (supporting documentation Fall 2019 schedule).We wanted to test how students demonstrate a clear awareness of civic identity, therefore, we chose the Civic identity and commitment domain score. Faculty are to use an institutional rubric that ranges from 0-4These scores were uploaded using Survey Monkey.  | The Civic identity and commitment mean score in the Social responsibility rubric for our students will be a 2.0 or higher. The range is 0-4.During the last reporting cycle we missed the benchmark, and therefore we have kept it the same. Especially because we were using different rubrics and we had to guess within a ballpark what the instructors meant. They are to use the institutional-created rubrics. \*\*Update\*\* Fall 2019 Rubrics were revised based on faculty concerns, but keeping them as close to the ACU VALUE rubrics, which was THECB's recommendation for rubrics to use for Core Curriculum scoring. |

|  |
| --- |
| [x] Benchmark Met [ ] Benchmark Not Met |

Civic Identity and Committment domain was only available to use with institutional created rubric. The mean score was 2.4, .8 points higher than last cycle. The n number of students tested was:Fall 18 - 0Spring 19 - 0Fall 19 - 152 | After the 2018 results, a meeting with the University Core Curriculum Committee (UC3) took place where a previous assessment plan was discussed (supporting documentation “10-30-2019 meeting minutes” “UC3 Minutes 10.21.19”), and it was the decision that the current methodology of doing the assessment was going to continue. There was an idea that the assessment methodology would change to a committee scoring core curriculum artifacts. However, this was decided not to be practical to TAMIU culture as it does not fit the needs and abilities of the university. Course releases would not be readily available to give to these committee members. While we wanted to get the data collection in AEFIS by the 2018 collection, we did not actually get that into AEFIS due to how difficult it was to connect between Blackboard and AEFIS. However, this Fall 2020 it has now been added into the AEFIS system by the Office of Institutional Assessment, Research, and Planning (OIARP), which will begin the data collection process to start providing longitudinal data analysis and eliminate the issues we have been having with our faculty using different rubrics when scoring the assessments. Additionally, they can use Blackboard to link assignments into AEFIS, where we can pull the names of the assignments used across the disciplines if necessary. OIARP and the PROF Center will provide the necessary training to the faculty to ensure they know how to use the AEFIS system to link and score their Core artifacts. Once the data is collected it is still TBD who will interpret that data. Right now, it may be Associate Vice President of OIARP Dr. David Allen or Associate Provost Dr. Stephen Duffy. This upcoming year in AEFIS will be our trial run year to see how the data collection runs. Looking forward, we still reiterate the importance of departments and colleges reviewing the data (notated in supporting documentation meeting minutes). Some topics to consider would be data trends and outliers. We are still trying to get our faculty used to talking about data. To better assess the different areas without overwhelming the disciplines, we will do different domains in different 3-year time periods (included in supporting documentation Minutes 10-19-2020, UC3 Core Assessment Domains AYs2021.2023 10.7.20).The concerns from the department faculty were the following (supporting documentation minutes from departments):* Wanting to see class/section/semester data for department discussions.
* Too many adjuncts teaching the core courses
* Concerns with the rubric and using the rubric appropriately

Right now, our focus this coming cycle will be ensuring the transition to AEFIS will increase our faculty submissions so we can address the first and third concerns shared by faculty. The Provost and Deans will discuss the second concern to see if there is a way to increase our full-time faculty in the core curriculum. If there is an increase, we will see if that also affects the scores. |
| 6 | Student Products (Direct)Instructors and chairs will choose assignments that match the rubrics as instructed numerous times and noted in the University Core Curriculum Committee (UC3) meeting minutes (supporting documentation). Assignments are not “content” driven, but skills driven that match with the domain. Additionally, all students, including those enrolled as early college students taking the courses at the university, are to be included in the testing of the core curriculum. It is also the understanding that all courses approved by THECB will be assessed in the Core Curriculum Process (supporting documentation Fall 2019 schedule).We wanted to test how students demonstrate an understanding of ethical standards as applied to decision making, therefore we chose the overall rubric score. Faculty are to use an institutional rubric that ranges from 0-4These scores were uploaded using Survey Monkey. | The overall mean rubric score on the personal responsibility rubric for our students will be a 2.0 or higher. The range is 0-4.During the last reporting cycle we missed the benchmark, and therefore we have kept it the same. Especially because we were using different rubrics and we had to guess within a ballpark what the instructors meant. They are to use the institutional-created rubrics. \*\*Update\*\* Fall 2019 Rubrics were revised based on faculty concerns, but keeping them as close to the ACU VALUE rubrics, which was THECB's recommendation for rubrics to use for Core Curriculum scoring. |

|  |
| --- |
| [x] Benchmark Met [ ] Benchmark Not Met |

Overall, the mean score for our students was 3.8. This cycle was astronomically higher by 2.2 points. However, the n number is so small that they cannot be considered so valid. Personal Responsibility was tested only in Fall 2018. The n number is 10 students. | After the 2018 results, a meeting with the University Core Curriculum Committee (UC3) took place where a previous assessment plan was discussed (supporting documentation “10-30-2019 meeting minutes” “UC3 Minutes 10.21.19”), and it was the decision that the current methodology of doing the assessment was going to continue. There was an idea that the assessment methodology would change to a committee scoring core curriculum artifacts. However, this was decided not to be practical to TAMIU culture as it does not fit the needs and abilities of the university. Course releases would not be readily available to give to these committee members. While we wanted to get the data collection in AEFIS by the 2018 collection, we did not actually get that into AEFIS due to how difficult it was to connect between Blackboard and AEFIS. However, this Fall 2020 it has now been added into the AEFIS system by the Office of Institutional Assessment, Research, and Planning (OIARP), which will begin the data collection process to start providing longitudinal data analysis and eliminate the issues we have been having with our faculty using different rubrics when scoring the assessments. Additionally, they can use Blackboard to link assignments into AEFIS, where we can pull the names of the assignments used across the disciplines if necessary. OIARP and the PROF Center will provide the necessary training to the faculty to ensure they know how to use the AEFIS system to link and score their Core artifacts. Once the data is collected it is still TBD who will interpret that data. Right now, it may be Associate Vice President of OIARP Dr. David Allen or Associate Provost Dr. Stephen Duffy. This upcoming year in AEFIS will be our trial run year to see how the data collection runs. Looking forward, we still reiterate the importance of departments and colleges reviewing the data (notated in supporting documentation meeting minutes). Some topics to consider would be data trends and outliers. We are still trying to get our faculty used to talking about data. To better assess the different areas without overwhelming the disciplines, we will do different domains in different 3-year time periods (included in supporting documentation Minutes 10-19-2020, UC3 Core Assessment Domains AYs2021.2023 10.7.20).The concerns from the department faculty were the following (supporting documentation minutes from departments):* Wanting to see class/section/semester data for department discussions.
* Too many adjuncts teaching the core courses
* Concerns with the rubric and using the rubric appropriately

Right now, our focus this coming cycle will be ensuring the transition to AEFIS will increase our faculty submissions so we can address the first and third concerns shared by faculty. The Provost and Deans will discuss the second concern to see if there is a way to increase our full-time faculty in the core curriculum. If there is an increase, we will see if that also affects the scores. |
| 6 | Student Products (Direct)Instructors and chairs will choose assignments that match the rubrics as instructed numerous times and noted in the University Core Curriculum Committee (UC3) meeting minutes (supporting documentation). Assignments are not “content” driven, but skills driven that match with the domain. Additionally, all students, including those enrolled as early college students taking the courses at the university, are to be included in the testing of the core curriculum. It is also the understanding that all courses approved by THECB will be assessed in the Core Curriculum Process (supporting documentation Fall 2019 schedule).We wanted to test how students recognize ethical issues in context; therefore, we chose the Ethical issue recognition domain score. Faculty are to use an institutional rubric that ranges from 0-4These scores were uploaded using Survey Monkey.  | The Ethical issue recognition mean score in the personal responsibility rubric for our students will be a 2.0 or higher. The range is 0-4.During the last reporting cycle we missed the benchmark, and therefore we have kept it the same. Especially because we were using different rubrics and we had to guess within a ballpark what the instructors meant. They are to use the institutional-created rubrics. \*\*Update\*\* Fall 2019 Rubrics were revised based on faculty concerns, but keeping them as close to the ACU VALUE rubrics, which was THECB's recommendation for rubrics to use for Core Curriculum scoring. |

|  |
| --- |
| [x] Benchmark Met [ ] Benchmark Not Met |

Overall, the mean score for our students was 3.8. This cycle was astronomically higher by 2 points. However, the n number is so small that it cannot be considered valid. Personal Responsibility was tested only in Fall 2018. The n number is 10 students. | After the 2018 results, a meeting with the University Core Curriculum Committee (UC3) took place where a previous assessment plan was discussed (supporting documentation “10-30-2019 meeting minutes” “UC3 Minutes 10.21.19”), and it was the decision that the current methodology of doing the assessment was going to continue. There was an idea that the assessment methodology would change to a committee scoring core curriculum artifacts. However, this was decided not to be practical to TAMIU culture as it does not fit the needs and abilities of the university. Course releases would not be readily available to give to these committee members. While we wanted to get the data collection in AEFIS by the 2018 collection, we did not actually get that into AEFIS due to how difficult it was to connect between Blackboard and AEFIS. However, this Fall 2020 it has now been added into the AEFIS system by the Office of Institutional Assessment, Research, and Planning (OIARP), which will begin the data collection process to start providing longitudinal data analysis and eliminate the issues we have been having with our faculty using different rubrics when scoring the assessments. Additionally, they can use Blackboard to link assignments into AEFIS, where we can pull the names of the assignments used across the disciplines if necessary. OIARP and the PROF Center will provide the necessary training to the faculty to ensure they know how to use the AEFIS system to link and score their Core artifacts. Once the data is collected it is still TBD who will interpret that data. Right now, it may be Associate Vice President of OIARP Dr. David Allen or Associate Provost Dr. Stephen Duffy. This upcoming year in AEFIS will be our trial run year to see how the data collection runs. Looking forward, we still reiterate the importance of departments and colleges reviewing the data (notated in supporting documentation meeting minutes). Some topics to consider would be data trends and outliers. We are still trying to get our faculty used to talking about data. To better assess the different areas without overwhelming the disciplines, we will do different domains in different 3-year time periods (included in supporting documentation Minutes 10-19-2020, UC3 Core Assessment Domains AYs2021.2023 10.7.20).The concerns from the department faculty were the following (supporting documentation minutes from departments):* Wanting to see class/section/semester data for department discussions.
* Too many adjuncts teaching the core courses
* Concerns with the rubric and using the rubric appropriately

Right now, our focus this coming cycle will be ensuring the transition to AEFIS will increase our faculty submissions so we can address the first and third concerns shared by faculty. The Provost and Deans will discuss the second concern to see if there is a way to increase our full-time faculty in the core curriculum. If there is an increase, we will see if that also affects the scores. |