Texas A&M University

CORE CURRICULUM ASSESSMENT REPORT

2020-2021

OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS & EVALUATION

Contact: assessment@tamu.edu

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As a public institution of higher education, Texas A&M University's general education program is required to meet specific standards laid out by the Texas state legislature and its regional accreditor, the Southern Association of Colleges and School – Commission on Colleges.

All current Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board certified core curriculum courses are approved and recertified by the Texas A&M University Faculty Senate – Core Curriculum Council on a scheduled recertification and assessment rotation. The core curriculum courses are organized into Foundational Component Areas in which a student should acquire and advance defined student learning outcomes. The Foundational Component Areas include American History, Communication, Creative Arts, Government/Political Science, Language, Philosophy, & Culture, Life & Physical Sciences, Mathematics, and Social & Behavioral Sciences.

The Texas Core Curriculum refers to the expected learning outcomes as Core Objectives. These include Communication Skills, Critical Thinking Skills, Empirical and Quantitative Skills, Personal Responsibility, Social Responsibility, and Teamwork.

The core learning objectives assessed for all Foundational Component Areas during the 2020-2021 academic year were *Critical Thinking* and *Social Responsibility*. On average, students demonstrated the expected knowledge and skills at the pre-developing achievement level for each objective. This report provides results at the Foundational Component Area and Campus levels.

TEXAS CORE CURRICULUM

DESCRIPTION AND OUTCOMES

As a public institution of higher education, Texas A&M University's general education program is required to meet specific standards laid out by the Texas state legislature and its regional accreditor, the Southern Association of Colleges and School – Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC). The faculty and administrators of Texas A&M University are invested and focused in assessing the overall effectiveness of the general education program.

The Texas A&M University Core Curriculum and related core objectives are required by statute (see Texas Administrative Code (TAC Title 19 § 4.28). This code stipulates that through the mandated 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 living." The state code further stipulates that through the core curriculum, students will be prepared for contemporary challenges by developing and demonstrating the following **Core Objectives**:

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

As a state institution governed by requirements set forth in Texas Education Code, Texas A&M University has adopted these core objectives as its collegiate-level general education competencies to be achieved through students' successful completion of the core curriculum.

The core curriculum courses are organized into Foundational Component Areas (FCA) in which a student should acquire and advance defined student learning outcomes the Texas Core Curriculum refers to as Core Objectives.

> *"Although the courses included in the TCC may vary by institution, every Texas higher education institution's core curriculum must include the following Foundational Component Areas (*TAC Title 19 § 4.28*):"*

- **American History (AH)**
  - Courses in this category focus on the consideration of past events and ideas relative to the United States, with the option of including Texas History for a portion of this component area. Courses involve the interaction among individuals, communities, states, the nation, and the world, considering how these interactions have contributed to the development of the United States and its global role.

- **Communication (C)**
  - Courses in this category focus on developing ideas and expressing them clearly, considering the effect of the message, fostering understanding, and building the skills needed to communicate persuasively. Courses involve the command of oral, aural, written, and visual literacy skills that enable people to exchange messages appropriate to the subject, occasion, and audience.

- **Creative Arts (CA)**
  - Courses in this category focus on the appreciation and analysis of creative artifacts and works of the human imagination. Courses involve the synthesis and interpretation of artistic expression and enable critical, creative, and innovative communication about works of art.

- **Government/Political Sciences (GPS)**
  - Courses in this category focus on consideration of the Constitution of the United States and the constitutions of the states, with special emphasis on that of Texas. Courses involve the analysis of

governmental institutions, political behavior, civic engagement, and their political and philosophical foundations.

- **Language, Philosophy, & Culture (LPC)**
  - Courses in this category focus on how ideas, values, beliefs, and other aspects of culture express and affect human experience. Courses involve the exploration of ideas that foster aesthetic and intellectual creation to understand the human condition across cultures.

- **Life & Physical Sciences (LPS)**
  - Courses in this category focus on describing, explaining, and predicting natural phenomena using the scientific method. Courses involve the understanding of interactions among natural phenomena and the implications of scientific principles on the physical world and on human experiences.

- **Mathematics (M)**
  - Courses in this category focus on quantitative literacy in logic, patterns, and relationships. Courses involve the understanding of key mathematical concepts and the application of appropriate quantitative tools to everyday experience.
- **Social & Behavioral Sciences (SBS)**
  - Courses in this category focus on the application of empirical and scientific methods that contribute to the understanding of what makes us human. Courses involve the exploration of behavior and interactions among individuals, groups, institutions, and events, examining their impact on the individual, society, and culture.

State policy requires colleges and universities to approve core curriculum courses in these FCAs, gather evidence of student learning, and demonstrate effort of continuous improvement. The regional accreditor for institutions in Texas, SACS-COC, also requires documentation of continuous improvement efforts for collegiate-level general education for its undergraduate degree programs (Section 8, Standard 8.2.b).

ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

Course Selection

All current Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board certified core curriculum courses are recertified by the Texas A&M University Faculty Senate – Core Curriculum Council (CCC) through a two-part process which occurs over a four-year cycle (resulting in four separate cohorts).

Recertification is a two-year process: In Year 1, student-produced work collected by the Office for Institutional Effectiveness and Evaluation (OIEE) for centralized assessment. Assessment results are shared with the CCC and instructors. Then, in Year 2, faculty prepare and submit a description of practice as part of the recertification curricular review conducted by the CCC. The faculty description of practice describes representative practice across the sections of the course for addressing the core learning objectives, as well as how assessment data from Year 1 has informed pedagogical practice at a course level.

Instructors for each core course are responsible for addressing the FCA requirements and applicable core objectives every time the course is taught. However, courses are assigned to one of four cohorts continuously rotating through recertification over a four-year period. Cohort assignments are based on student enrollment and the year in which a course is initially approved for the core, ensuring each course goes through a curricular review every four years. The student learning outcome data collected by OIEE for the centralized assessment of core learning objectives is based on a three-year scheduled assessment rotation. The standard cycle of assessment of learning objectives for centralized assessment includes a three-year rotation of the core learning objectives among cohorts (see Figure 2).

Figure 2. Centralized Assessment Objective Rotation Schedule

Rotation 1	Rotation 2	Rotation 3
Visual Communication (VC) Oral Communication (OC) Teamwork (T)	Critical Thinking (CT) Social Responsibility (SR)	Written Communication (WC) Personal Responsibility (PR) Empirical & Quantitative Skills (EQS)

These two rotating cycles (centralized assessment and recertification) occur concurrently to ensure each course in the core curriculum provides evidence of student learning of the core learning objectives aligned with the mandatory core learning objectives at least four times across a 12-year period. See www.assessment.tamu.edu for specific course scheduled rotations.

The list of courses up for recertification in a given academic year is sent to the academic departments. During the first year of the process, all sections of the identified course taught during the long semesters (fall and spring) submit student produced work aligned to the assigned core objective(s) to the OIEE. OIEE facilitates the scoring of artifacts on the designated rubric, reporting results at the FCA-level and, for courses with more than one section/instructor, course level. During the second year of the process, an appointed representative from the department offering the course will complete recertification documentation using the Curricular Approval Request System (CARS) for the CCC to review for the final recertification decision. This process intentionally separates the curricular review process recertification and the centralized assessment of the core objectives.

The CCC evaluates the CARS forms and confirms with OIEE to ensure assessment requirements were met before recertifying a course for another four years. Centralized assessment results are shared with the CCC, academic departments, and university administration to demonstrate the intentional assessment for continuous improvement of the required core objectives as well as compliance with state and regional accreditation mandates.

Artifacts

Artifacts, or student produced work, are collected from each section of a course for fall and spring semesters. Artifacts are compiled across sections at the course level and reviewed for validity. For valid artifacts, a random, but proportional sample is pulled for centralized assessment using the appropriate rubric for the core learning objective (see next section for description).

Artifacts vary in assessment design. Prominent designs include essay, research paper, lab report, written assignments, including objective-specific exam questions, recorded audio/video presentations, portfolios, or demonstrations to which a rubric—or other detailed criteria—are applied.

Rubrics

Analytic scoring rubrics are designed to assess student proficiency in each learning objective using an 8-point criterion scale (see Appendices A and D). The rubrics were collaboratively constructed and approved by the CCC based on research conducted by OIEE, rubrics previously developed by TAMU faculty, and the VALUE rubrics developed by the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U).

The core learning objectives assessed during the 2020-2021 academic year were *Critical Thinking* and *Social Responsibility*.

The five criteria used for the *Critical Thinking* rubric (See Appendix A) are adaptations from AAC&U Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric.

- Explanation of Issues
- Evidence *(selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion)*
- Influence of Context and Assumptions
- Student's Position *(perspective, thesis/hypothesis)*
- Conclusion and Related Outcomes *(implications and consequences)*

The three criteria used for the *Social Responsibility* rubric (See Appendix E) are adaptations from AAC&U Civic Engagement, Global Learning, and Intercultural Knowledge & Competence VALUE Rubric.

- Awareness of Current Cultural Worldview Frameworks
- Civic Contexts/Structures
- Social Challenges/Issues

Achievement Level Definitions

Achievement-level definitions generally describe the expectations for evidence of student learning at each of the primary achievement levels with mid-points indicated by the label "pre" preceding the associated primary achievement level (see Table 1). The score range of 4.00-4.99, or *Developing* achievement level, is the standard achievement level affirmed by the CCC.

Table 1. Achievement Level and Description by Score Range

Score Range	Achievement Level	Description
8.00	Advanced	Evidence of student learning met all or most of the criteria for the advanced category, exceeding expectations.
7.00-7.99	Pre-advanced	Evidence of student learning met some of the criteria for both advanced and competent categories, exceeding expectations.
6.00-6.99	Competent	Evidence of student learning met all or most of the criteria for the competent category, exceeding expectations.
5.00-5.99	Pre-competent	Evidence of student learning met some of the criteria for both competent and developing categories, exceeding expectations.
4.00-4.99	Developing	Evidence of student learning met all or most of the criteria for the developing category, meeting standard expectations.
3.00-3.99	Pre-developing	Evidence of student learning met some of the criteria for both developing and beginner categories, nearly meeting expectations.
2.00-2.99	Beginner	Evidence of student learning met all or most of the criteria for the beginner category, not meeting expectations.
1.00-1.99	Pre-beginner	Evidence of student learning met some of the criteria for both beginner and not present categories, not meeting expectations.
0.00-0.99	Not present	Evidence of student learning met all or most of the criteria for the not present category, not meeting expectations.

Scoring

The scoring team comprised of assessment staff members in OIEE apply the rubrics to the randomly selected artifacts described above. OIEE hires scoring staff with expertise[1] in the core learning objectives and a majority of the FCA disciplines to serve as core curriculum assessment scorers. A scoring supervisor leads the scoring team through calibration exercises using benchmark artifacts, the scoring rubric, and scoring anchor sets. Once a scorer qualifies to score by demonstrating the standard expected level of agreement for each criterion, the scorer is certified to score for the core learning objective.

During scoring, interrater reliability is consistently monitored to ensure standard agreement rates. Where scorer agreement exceeds adjacent achievement levels, the artifact is escalated to the scoring supervisor for review and rating confirmation. If a scorer's rating consistently exceeds the bounds of standard agreement rates, the scorer undergoes recalibration and recertification as a scorer. If recertification is not achieved during recalibration, the scorer is dismissed from the scoring team.

[1] "Expert" is defined as having a Masters level degree or higher from a discipline within the FCA.

FINDINGS

The purpose of this section is to describe the assessment results in the 2020-2021 academic year for the Foundational Component Areas (FCA) of **Critical Thinking** and **Social Responsibility**.

Instructors-of-record for 82 courses in the **AY 2020-2021** assessment schedule (Cycle B) were required to show evidence of student proficiency in the state-mandated learning objectives of:

- **Critical Thinking Skills (CT)** - *creative thinking, innovation, inquiry, and analysis, evaluation and synthesis of information.*

Instructors-of-record for 59 courses in the **AY 2020-2021** assessment schedule (Cycle B) were required to show evidence of student proficiency in the state-mandated learning objectives of:

- **Social Responsibility (SR)** - *intercultural competence, knowledge of civic responsibility, and the ability to engage effectively in regional, national, and global communities.*

Evidence of student learning was collected in Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 across three campuses (College Station, Galveston, and Qatar) from approximately 388 instructors across 898 course sections for approximately 40,199 students.

For both Critical Thinking and Social Responsibility, results indicate that student achievement of the core learning objectives averaged approaching benchmark at the *pre-developing* achievement level.

Results – Critical Thinking

Across the institution, achievement was highest in the *Explanation of Issues* and *Evidence* categories, whereas achievement was lowest in *Influence of Context and Assumptions* and *Student's Position* categories (see Table 2).

Table 2. Institutional Average

Critical Thinking *N*=1,856			
Criterion	*M*	*SD*	*Achievement Level*
Explanation of Issues	3.68	1.01	Pre-developing
Evidence	3.57	0.89	Pre-developing
Influence of Context and Assumptions	2.30	0.93	Beginner
Student's Position	2.69	0.88	Beginner
Conclusion and Related Outcomes	2.76	1.12	Beginner
Aggregate Total	**3.00**	**0.97**	**Pre-developing**

At the FCA level (see Appendix B), while achievement reflected the observed strengths and weaknesses per criterion at the institutional level, achievement levels were highest for courses in *American History, Communication*, and *Creative Arts* (see Table 3).

Table 3. Achievement Level by FCA– All Campuses

FCA	ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL
American History	Pre-developing
Communication	Developing
Creative Arts	Pre-developing
Government/Political Science	Beginner
Language, Philosophy, and Culture	Pre-developing
Life and Physical Sciences	Beginner
Mathematics	Pre-beginner
Social and Behavioral Sciences	Beginner

At the campus level, (see Appendix C) some differences were noted in course averages. For example, it was observed that a course on one campus averaged scores at the *Pre-advanced* achievement level while the same course on a different campus averaged scores at the *Pre-beginner* level. Additionally, overall averages reflected similarity in achievement levels for only two of the three campuses.

Results - Social Responsibility

Across the institution, achievement was highest in the *Awareness of Context & Cultural Worldview Frameworks* and *Social Challenge/Issues* categories, whereas achievement was lowest in the *Civic Contexts/Structures* category (see Table 4).

Table 4: Overall Results – All Campuses

Social Responsibility *N*=764			
Criterion	*M*	*SD*	*Achievement Level*
Awareness of Context & Cultural Worldview Frameworks	3.86	1.10	Pre-developing
Civic Contexts/Structures	2.05	1.05	Beginner
Social Challenge/Issues	3.35	1.11	Pre-developing
Aggregate Total	**3.09**	**1.09**	**Pre-developing**

At the FCA level (see Appendix E), while achievement reflected the observed strengths and weaknesses per criterion at the institutional level, achievement levels were highest for courses in *American History* and *Social and Behavioral Sciences* (see Table 6).

Table 6. Achievement Level by FCA– All Campuses

	ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL
American History	Pre-developing
Creative Arts	Beginner
Government/Political Science	Beginner
Language, Philosophy, and Culture	Beginner
Social and Behavioral Sciences	Pre-developing

Results at the campus level provide score totals for each criterion of the scoring rubric (see Appendix F). At the campus level, there was wider variation in overall campus averages than observed for Critical Thinking. The category of *Civic Content/Structures* and was observed in greatest need for improvement.

STATUS UPDATE ON PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED ACTIONS

In response to actions identified in AY 2019-2020, in AY 2020-2021, the CARS recertification application form was redesigned to include the required field for faculty description of practice, including changes to practice based on assessment results. The CCC and OIEE co-hosted orientation training sessions in the fall and spring semesters to orient faculty to the new CARS form.

Also in AY 2020-2021, OIEE collaborated with the Center for Teaching Excellence and Undergraduate Studies to develop a redesign of web content for www.core.tamu.edu to include a repository of instructional resources and materials related to teaching and assessing the Core Curriculum. The launch of this redesigned website is scheduled for Spring 2021.

Additionally, OIEE developed and published resources to support Core Curriculum Assessment efforts, including a *Companion Manual* (with Assignment Checklists), *Guides to Assessing the Core Objectives* (with exemplar artifacts), and *Unpacking the Rubrics: On-Demand Video Exemplar Review.* These resources provide support in the pedagogical and technical aspects of assessing all core learning objectives.

In AY 2020-2021, OIEE is piloting the integration of centralized assessment data collection with the Learning Management System to support technical infrastructure to increase efficiency and effectiveness of artifact sharing resulting in higher validity rates for scorable artifacts transferred to OIEE. This action will support a more complete population of valid artifacts from which the assessment sample is drawn.

Coordinated with this effort is the launch of a professional development webinar series in Fall 2022 for live discussion and feedback on assessment of the core learning objectives including optimizing artifact design for maximizing potential for measuring student learning.

HOW TO USE RESULTS FOR CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

- Review results for each component of the rubric and identify areas for improvement.
- Refer to support resources, including assignment checklists and exemplar artifacts, available at www.assessment.tamu.edu.
- At the course level,
    - use objective-specific assignments to assess student learning of the core learning objective using the associated scoring rubric and
    - use formative assessment strategies to collect and analyze data annually to evaluate student learning of the core learning objectives and to pilot initiatives for improvement.
- Strengthen continuity of student learning outcomes for courses across sections, semesters, modalities, and campuses.
- Submit the assessment instrument planned for use in the assessment of the core learning objectives with the recertification application for review by the CCC.

For more information on Core Curriculum Assessment, refer to the Companion Manual at www.assessment.tamu.edu.

NOTE: Course level results may be available upon request. Email assessment@tamu.edu for more information.

DATA-INFORMED ACTIONS

Sample evidence of seeking improvement based on the analysis of results for student learning outcomes related to general education competencies includes a variety of activities such as:

- professional development workshops and seminars for faculty collaboration on core instruction and thought partnership on revising pedagogical practices each semester to increase student learning;
- curricular revisions to learning activities to provide students with a greater opportunity to learn and demonstrate associated knowledge, skills, and abilities through performance tasks; and,
- revisions of instructional activities to better promote instructional integrity of the student learning outcomes across course sections, campuses, and instructional delivery modality.

Professional Development

In response to evidence of student learning, department leaders and instructors have initiated a variety of activities to support and promote professional development opportunities for faculty on instructional improvement. For example, in the Life and Physical Sciences FCA, a Student Success Committee has been formed of faculty who teach core courses to ensure that course objectives are being met. They now host required trainings at the start of each semester for faculty teaching core courses, and they offer several professional development opportunities throughout each semester to support pedagogical practice for improved student learning.

Changes to Instructional Practice

In the Communication FCA, department leaders and instructors facilitate monthly discussions about teaching the core learning objectives and what that looks like in practice. In these collaborative discussions, they consider adjustments to learning activities to better support student learning for the lower performing categories of the common scoring rubric and other ways to improve teaching and assessing the core learning objectives. Decisions are implemented at the end of the semesters, with department guidance, the course director creates course standardizations that meet core goals, provides training and accountability for all instructors in meeting those goals and expectations, supports implementation in the class, and holds instructors accountable to the standard expectations of the core learning objectives.

In the Social and Behavioral Sciences FCA, course instructors have indicated changes to practice through adjusting expectations for learning through instructional activities that align more closely with the expectations for learning outlined on the common scoring rubrics for the core learning objectives.

In the American History FCA, department leaders use the data from assessing core learning objectives to suggest changes to pedagogical practice. For example, as described in the recertification application,

> *The Director of Undergraduate Studies will work to ensure that each of the relevant FCA learning outcomes are being met. He or she will perhaps suggest to faculty that (for example) they might need to more actively promote "visual communication" or place a heavier emphasis on "social responsibility" and provide suggestions as to how their colleagues have done so.*

In the Creative Arts FCA, instructors use data analysis at the course level in conjunction with college and FCA averages of overall core learning assessment results to make changes to instructional practice. For example, an instructor reported the following evidence of seeking improvement based on analysis of results in the recertification application. In direct response to the evidence of student learning for the core learning objective of Critical Thinking:

> *These scores were between 1.37 and 2.06 points higher than the college averages. In response to these course specific scores, courses will emphasize drawing out the presuppositions/assumptions an author must have in order for the logic of their argument to hold, and what the broader implications of a view might be. This will be done in the students' essays and will further be addressed expressly in class discussion. Students' positions on a specific work of art will be developed in an oral presentation given to the class. This assignment will also require that students consider the assumptions and conclusions of their position as part of their presentation.*

Further, an instructor reported the following evidence of seeking improvement based on analysis of results on the recertification application for the core learning objective of Social Responsibility:

> *In response to these scores, this course has now introduced evaluating artworks from diverse global lineages, accompanied by an explanation of their context or historical production. The course has also introduced readings from authors who explicitly take up aesthetic creation and appreciation from the perspective of groups who may face social challenges due to civic or structural marginalization. These readings extend, expand, and challenge more universalist conceptions of art and beauty, and seek to contextualize aesthetic production that may arise in response to a specific situation or issue.*

These changes to instructional practices indicate the use of results in seeking improvements to course instruction and student learning related to general education competencies.

APPENDIX A
CRITICAL THINKING - RUBRIC

	Advanced 8	7	Competent 6	5	Developing 4	3	Beginner 2	1	Not Present 0
Explanation of Issues	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding.		Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions.		Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.		Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description.		No Issue or problem stated.
Evidence *(selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion)*	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/ evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly.		Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/ evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or syntheses. Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning.		Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/ evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning.		Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/evaluation. Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question.		No information or evidence provided.
Influence of Context and Assumptions	Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.		Identifies own and others' assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.		Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa).		Show an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions). Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position.		No awareness of present assumptions.
Student's Position *(perspective, thesis/hypothesis)*	Specific position (perspective, thesis/ hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/ hypothesis) are acknowledged. Others' points of view are synthesized within position (perspective, thesis/ hypothesis).		Specific position (perspective, thesis/ hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue. Others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/ hypothesis).		Specific position (perspective, thesis/ hypothesis) acknowledges different side of an issue.		Specific position (perspective, thesis/ hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious.		No position statement given.
Conclusion and Related Outcomes *(implications and consequences)*	Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical and reflect student's informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order.		Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.		Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); Some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.		Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified.		No conclusion.

APPENDIX B
CRITICAL THINKING
FCA Level Results

Results by Criteria per FCA – All Campuses

	AH	C	CA	GPS	LPC	LPS	M	SBS
Explanation of Issues	4.40	5.25	3.64	3.86	4.36	3.42	1.78	3.22
Evidence	4.10	4.94	3.81	3.16	3.82	3.08	2.67	4.07
Influence of Context & Assumptions	2.77	4.24	2.73	2.49	2.64	1.84	0.92	2.31
Student's Position	2.91	4.15	3.06	2.92	2.82	2.30	2.23	2.55
Conclusions & Related Outcomes	3.07	4.24	3.49	2.53	2.79	2.32	2.37	2.68
TOTAL	**3.45**	**4.56**	**3.35**	**2.99**	**3.29**	**2.59**	**1.99**	**2.97**

APPENDIX C
CRITICAL THINKING
Campus Level Results

College Station

	AH	C	CA	GPS	LPC	LPS	M	SBS
Explanation of Issues	4.28	5.45	3.59	4.40	4.41	3.37	1.82	3.58
Evidence	4.01	5.05	3.81	4.16	3.82	3.04	2.70	4.03
Influence of Context & Assumptions	2.65	4.31	2.68	3.15	2.67	1.84	0.90	2.48
Student's Position	2.77	4.26	2.94	3.34	2.84	2.30	2.25	2.81
Conclusions & Related Outcomes	2.93	4.40	3.43	3.29	2.78	2.31	2.35	2.68
TOTAL	**3.33**	**4.69**	**3.29**	**3.67**	**3.30**	**2.58**	**2.00**	**3.12**

Galveston

	AH	C	CA	GPS	LPC	LPS	M	SBS
Explanation of Issues	5.16	5.67	4.10	3.33	3.68	4.27	2.45	1.45
Evidence	4.64	5.67	3.80	1.23	3.82	3.63	2.50	4.27
Influence of Context & Assumptions	3.48	6.38	3.15	1.20	2.26	1.92	0.30	1.47
Student's Position	3.80	5.13	4.10	2.55	2.53	2.27	2.05	1.25
Conclusions & Related Outcomes	3.98	5.25	4.05	1.83	2.97	2.45	4.15	2.70
TOTAL	**4.21**	**5.62**	**3.84**	**2.03**	**3.05**	**2.91**	**2.29**	**2.23**

Qatar

	AH	C	CA	GPS	LPC	LPS	M	SBS
Explanation of Issues	---	2.17	---	2.22	---	---	0.40	---
Evidence	---	2.78	---	2.0	---	---	2.30	---
Influence of Context & Assumptions	---	1.22	---	1.78	---	---	1.90	---
Student's Position	---	1.78	---	1.56	---	---	2.10	---
Conclusions & Related Outcomes	---	1.17	---	0.11	---	---	0.90	---
TOTAL	---	**1.82**	---	**1.53**	---	---	**1.52**	---

APPENDIX D
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
RUBRIC

	Advanced 8	7	Competent 6	5	Developing 4	3	Beginner 2	1	Not Present 0
Awareness of Current Cultural Worldview Frameworks	Demonstrates a ***sophisticated*** understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.		Demonstrates ***adequate*** understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.		Demonstrates ***surface-level*** understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.		Demonstrates ***limited or no*** understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.		No understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture
Civic Contexts/ Structures	**Demonstrates knowledge of/ commitment to** the role of *collaboration* and working across and within community contexts and structures plays in achieving a civic aim *and* identifies ways to actively engage in civic contexts and structures.		**Demonstrates knowledge of/ commitment to** the roles of working actively within community contexts and structures play *in* achieving a civic aim *and* identifies intentional ways to be involved in civic contexts and structures.		**Identifies intentional ways** to *participate in* civic contexts and structures.		**Identifies surface-level** ways to *engage* with civic contexts and structures.		Did not identify any civic contexts/ structures.
Social Challenges/ Issues	Addresses social challenges or issues *in an informed way* and ***evaluates*** the local and/or broader consequences of individual and/or collective (i.e., regional, national, or global) interventions or responses		Addresses social challenges or issues *in an informed way* and ***identifies*** the local and/or broader consequences of individual and/or collective (i.e., regional, national, or global) interventions or responses		*Explains* the social challenges or issues with ***minimal discussion*** of the local and/or broader consequences of individual and/or collective (i.e., regional, national, or global) interventions or responses		*Identifies* basic social challenges with ***no discussion*** of the local and/or broader consequences of individual and/or collective (i.e., regional, national, or global) interventions or responses		Did not identify any social challenges/issues.

APPENDIX E
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
FCA Level Results

Results by FCA per Criteria – All Campuses

	AH	CA	GPS	LPC	SBS
Awareness of Content & Cultural Worldview Frameworks	3.93	3.58	2.73	4.06	4.26
Civic Contexts/Structures	2.46	1.07	2.45	1.41	2.60
Social Challenge/Issues	3.26	1.94	3.43	3.47	3.60
Aggregate TOTAL	**3.22**	**2.20**	**2.87**	**2.98**	**3.49**

APPENDIX F
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
Campus Level Results

College Station

	AH	CA	GPS	LPC	SBS
Awareness of Content & Cultural Worldview Frameworks	4.16	3.63	3.42	4.32	4.62
Civic Contexts/Structures	2.61	1.01	3.14	1.52	2.75
Social Challenge/Issues	3.39	1.62	4.10	3.53	3.80
TOTAL	**3.39**	**2.09**	**3.55**	**3.12**	**3.72**

Galveston

	AH	CA	GPS	LPC	SBS
Awareness of Content & Cultural Worldview Frameworks	2.63	3.35	1.10	2.58	2.45
Civic Contexts/Structures	1.60	1.30	0.94	0.77	1.85
Social Challenge/Issues	2.57	3.20	1.79	3.14	2.57
TOTAL	**2.27**	**2.62**	**1.28**	**2.16**	**2.29**

Qatar

	AH	CA	GPS	LPC	SBS
Awareness of Content & Cultural Worldview Frameworks	---	---	0.50	---	---
Civic Contexts/Structures	---	---	0.00	---	---
Social Challenge/Issues	---	---	1.30	---	---
TOTAL	---	---	**0.60**	---	---

APPENDIX G

AY20-21 Courses Due for Assessment

AFST 204 / ENGL 204	ENGL 338	KINE 120
AFST 300 / HIST 300	ENGL 362 / HISP 362	MATH 142
AFST 301 / HIST 301	ENGL 376	MATH 152
AFST 345 / HIST 345	ENTO 322	MUSC 226
ANSC 107	EPSY 321	MUSC 325 / PERF 325
ANTH 202	ESSM 309	MUSC 326
ANTH 210	GEOG 201	MUSC 327 / PERF 327 / AFST 327
ARCH 213	GEOG 203	NFSC 300
ARCH 458	GEOG 305	OCNG 251
ARTS 149	GEOL 101	PHIL 330
ASTR 102	GEOL 102	PHIL 375
ATMO 202	GEOS 210	PHYS 202
BESC 204	HISP 206	POLS 207
BIOL 107	HIST 103	RELS 200
BIOL 112	HIST 105	RELS 220
CLAS 261	HIST 210	RELS 312
CLAS 262	HIST 214	RENR 205
COMM 203	HIST 220	SOCI 205
COMM 205	HIST 222 / RELS 222	SOCI 312
COMM 335	HIST 230	SOCI 313
ENDS 101	HIST 232	SOCI 319 / SPMT 319
ENGL 103	HIST 234	SPMT 220
ENGL 104	HIST 258	SPTM 337
ENGL 206	HIST 304	THAR 155
ENGL 221 / MODL 221	HIST 347 / RELS 347	THAR 156
ENGL 232	HORT 335	THAR 281
ENGL 335	INST 251	