

**CORE CURRICULUM ASSESSMENT REPORT**  
**AY22-23 (CYCLE D)**

**15 July 2024**



TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

Office of Institutional Effectiveness  
& Evaluation

## **Abbreviations & Definitions**

AAC&U	American Association of Colleges and Universities
AH	American History (Foundational Component Area)
C	Communication (Foundational Component Area)
CA	Creative Arts (Foundational Component Area)
CARS	Curricular Approval Request System
CCC	Texas A&M University Faculty Senate–Core Curriculum Council
FCA	Foundational Component Area
GPS	Government/Political Sciences
LPC	Language, Philosophy, & Culture (Foundational Component Area)
LPS	Life & Physical Sciences (Foundational Component Area)
M	Mathematics (Foundational Component Area)
OIEE	Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation
SACSCOC	Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges
SBS	Social & Behavioral Sciences (Foundational Component Area)
TCC	Texas Core Curriculum

## Table of Contents

Abbreviations & Definitions .....	ii
Executive Summary .....	1
Texas Core Curriculum .....	2
Description and Outcomes .....	2
Core Objectives .....	2
Foundational Component Areas .....	3
Assessment Methodology.....	5
Course Selection .....	5
Artifacts .....	6
Rubrics.....	6
Achievement Levels .....	7
Scoring.....	8
Teamwork Inventory.....	9
Findings .....	10
Oral Communication .....	10
Visual Communication .....	11
Visual Communication Creation .....	11
Visual Communication Interpretation .....	13
Teamwork .....	14
College Station (Overall) Teamwork Survey Results .....	14
Creative Arts (College Station) FCA Teamwork Survey Results.....	16
Life & Physical Sciences (College Station) Teamwork Survey Results.....	17
Galveston (Overall) Teamwork Survey Results .....	19
How to Use Results for Continuous Improvement .....	21
Appendix A: Oral Communication Rubric.....	22
Appendix B: Visual Communication Creation Rubric.....	23
Appendix C: Visual Communication Interpretation Rubric .....	24
Appendix D: Teamwork Inventory .....	25

Appendix E: Courses Due for Assessment in AY22-23 .....	26
Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation .....	28

## **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 Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC).

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 are: American History; Communication; Creative Arts; Government/Political Sciences; Language, Philosophy, & Culture; Life & Physical Sciences; Mathematics; and Social & Behavioral Sciences.

The Texas Core Curriculum (TCC) refers to the expected learning outcomes as core objectives. These include Communication Skills, Critical Thinking Skills, Empirical & Quantitative Skills, Personal Responsibility, Social Responsibility, and Teamwork.

The core learning objectives assessed for all Foundational Component Areas (FCA) during the 2022-23 academic year were Oral Communication and Visual Communication. On average, students demonstrated the expected knowledge and skills at the benchmark level for Oral Communication and Visual Communication. Teamwork was assessed for Creative Arts and Life & Physical Sciences FCAs. The majority of students reported that Teamwork was a part of their educational experience. This report provides results at the institutional, FCA, and campus levels. Course-level reports may be available on request. Email [assessment@tamu.edu](mailto:assessment@tamu.edu) for more information.

## 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 Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC). The faculty and administrators of Texas A&M University are invested in and focused on assessing the overall effectiveness of the general education program.

### *Core Objectives*

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:** to include effective development, interpretation, and expression of ideas through written, oral, and visual communication.
- **Critical Thinking Skills:** to include creative thinking, innovation, inquiry, and analysis, evaluation, and synthesis of information.
- **Empirical & Quantitative Skills:** to include the manipulation and analysis of numerical data or observable facts resulting in informed conclusions.
- **Personal Responsibility:** to include the ability to connect choices, actions, and consequences to ethical decision-making.
- **Social Responsibility:** to include intercultural competence, knowledge of civic responsibility, and the ability to engage effectively in regional, national, and global communities.
- **Teamwork:** 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.

## ***Foundational Component Areas***

The core curriculum courses are organized into the following **Foundational Component Areas (FCA)** in which a student should acquire and advance defined student learning outcomes the Texas Core Curriculum (TCC) refers to as Core Objectives. Texas Administrative Code states, “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, SACSCOC, 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 is collected by 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 detailed in the table below.

**Centralized Assessment Objective Rotation Schedule**

Rotation 1	Rotation 2	Rotation 3
Visual Communication Oral Communication Teamwork	Critical Thinking Social Responsibility	Written Communication Personal Responsibility Empirical & Quantitative Skills

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 Appendix E for the list of courses due for assessment in AY22-23.

The list of courses up for recertification in a given academic year is published on the OIEE website, and instructors of record are communicated with via TAMU email. 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 (student-produced work) 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, vary in assessment design. Prominent designs include essays, research papers, lab reports, written assignments, objective-specific exam questions, recorded audio/video presentations, portfolios, presentations, or demonstrations to which a rubric—or other detailed criteria—are applied.

Artifacts 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.

The Teamwork objective is handled differently and discussed in more detail beginning on page 8.

### ***Rubrics***

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

During AY22-23, three rubrics were used to assess the core learning objectives of Oral Communication and Visual Communication.

The Oral Communication Rubric (See Appendix A) has three criteria:

- Purpose and Development
- Intent
- Expression/Presentation

Visual Communication was assessed with one of two rubrics, applied based on the artifacts.

The Visual Communication Creation Rubric (See Appendix B) has three criteria:

- Purpose and Development
- Intent
- Aesthetic/Expression of a Created Visual

The Visual Communication Interpretation Rubric (See Appendix C) has three criteria:

- Purpose and Development
- Intent
- Clarity of Interpretation of a Visual

### ***Achievement Levels***

Achievement-level definitions generally describe the expectations for evidence of student learning at each of the primary achievement levels. Mid-points between the primary achievement levels are indicated by the prefix “pre.” The score range of 4.00-4.99, or *developing*, is the standard achievement level affirmed by the CCC.

**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.

### Achievement Level and Description by Score Range (continued)

Score Range	Achievement Level	Description
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 randomly selected artifacts. OIEE hires scoring staff with expertise in the core learning objectives and a majority of the FCA disciplines to serve as core curriculum assessment scorers.<sup>1</sup> A scoring supervisor leads the scoring team through calibration exercises using the scoring rubric, benchmark artifacts, 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.

Each artifact receives a score from two scorers.<sup>2</sup> 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> "Expert" is defined as having a masters level degree or higher from a discipline within the FCA.

<sup>2</sup> In AY22-23, all artifacts received two scores except for those collected from courses in Italian and Japanese due to the inability to locate a second scorer with proficiency in these languages.

## ***Teamwork Inventory***

The Teamwork Inventory (see Appendix D) was put forth by faculty and instructor representatives teaching in the Communication FCA during Summer 2015. They were:

- Stacy Aschenbeck
- Valerie Balester
- Jennifer Jones Barbour
- Craig Kallendorf
- Ryan Neighbors
- Nancy J. Street

The survey was an instrument proposed in lieu of artifact collection because of its connection to small group communication research.<sup>34</sup> Additional categorical items were added to determine the extent to which teamwork/teamwork-oriented assignments were used in the variety of courses comprising the Core Curriculum. The rationale was that students participate on many different teams, in many different settings, over a variety of time periods. For example, a student may work on separate teams to complete a lab assignment, give an oral presentation, complete a community service project, or participate in a semester long group project. Thus, the work that students produce that could be used to demonstrate a student's teamwork skills could include a range of artifacts which may or may not be assessable for teamwork skills outside of direct observation of teamwork interactions. Additionally, following/recording a group's processes over time to assess the quality of the teamwork is time prohibitive. Therefore, the self-assessment tool was designed to measure the quality of a process, rather than the quality of an end product. This instrument is also designed to assess the teamwork skills of an individual student, not the team as a whole.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Briggs, R. O., Reinig, B. A., & de Vreede, G.J. (2006). Meeting satisfaction for technology-supported groups: An empirical validation of a goal-attainment model. *Small Group Research*, 37, 585-611.

<sup>4</sup> Savelsbergh, C.M.J.H., van der Heijden, B.I.J.M., & Poell, R. F. (2009). The development and empirical validation of a multidimensional measurement instrument for team learning behaviors. *Small Group Research*, 40, 578-607.

<sup>5</sup> Taken from the framing language used on the Teamwork Self-Assessment, June 2015.

## Findings

The purpose of this section is to describe the assessment results of the AY22-23 assessment schedule (Cycle D). Evidence of student learning was collected in Fall 2022 and Spring 2023 across three campuses (College Station, Galveston, and Qatar) for the state-mandated learning objectives of Oral Communication and Visual Communication. Evidence of student learning was collected in Fall 2022 from College Station and Galveston campuses for the state-mandated learning objective of Teamwork.

The score range of 4.00-4.99, or the *developing* achievement level, is the standard achievement level affirmed by the CCC. For Oral Communication, overall student achievement met or exceeded the benchmark of *developing*. Overall, student achievement in Visual Communication met the benchmark of *developing*. The majority of students reported that Teamwork was a part of their educational experience.

### Oral Communication

Overall, student achievement in Oral Communication reached or exceeded *developing* levels. 1,420 total artifacts—collected from the College Station and Galveston campuses—were assessed.

#### Oral Communication: Institutional Results—All Campuses (n=1,420)

Criterion	Mean	SD	Achievement Level
Purpose and Development	4.86	1.36	Developing
Intent	5.05	1.43	Pre-competent
Expression/Presentation	4.72	1.35	Developing

At both College Station and Galveston, student achievement for all rubric criteria met or exceeded the benchmark. At both campuses, student achievement for Intent reached *pre-competent* levels.

#### Oral Communication: College Station Results (n=1,322)

Criterion	Mean	SD	Achievement Level
Purpose and Development	4.87	1.37	Developing
Intent	5.05	1.45	Pre-competent
Expression/Presentation	4.73	1.36	Developing

### Oral Communication: Galveston Results (n=98)

Criterion	Mean	SD	Achievement Level
Purpose and Development	4.69	1.28	Developing
Intent	5.03	1.23	Pre-competent
Expression/Presentation	4.53	1.19	Developing

FCA-level results between campuses did not differ significantly, so they are reported in aggregate. In all FCAs, student achievement in all rubric criteria met or exceeded the benchmark of *developing*. Student achievement for Intent reached *pre-competent* levels for LPS, and SBS.

### Oral Communication: FCA Results

Criterion	CA	LPC	LPS	M	SBS
Purpose and Development	4.74	4.61	5.15	4.55	4.80
Intent	4.94	4.54	5.51	4.80	5.03
Expression/Presentation	4.69	4.42	4.99	4.39	4.71

### Visual Communication

Overall, results indicate that student achievement of Visual Communication met or approached the benchmark of *developing*. 1,460 total artifacts, collected from all three campuses, were assessed. Results are reported by the rubric applied.

#### Visual Communication Creation

The Visual Communication Creation Rubric was applied to 78% of the artifacts scored (n=1,141).<sup>6</sup> Overall, student achievement in Visual Communication Creation met or approached the benchmark of *developing*.

---

<sup>6</sup> The courses assessed with the Visual Communication Creation Rubric were: AFST 201, AGLS 235, ARAB 201, ARAB 202, ARCH 350, CHEM 107, CHEM 117, CHEM 120, COMM 340, COMM 365, DCED 202, ECON 203, ENGL 212, ENGL 219, ENGL 306, ENGR 482, GEOL 208, GERM 201, GERM 202, HLTH 236, INST 222, ITAL 202, JAPN 201, JAPN 202, JOUR 102, MARS 210, MAST 270, MATH 147, MATH 167, PERF 221, PERF 222, PERF 225, PERF 301, PHIL 240, PHIL 482, RUSS 202, SCEN 101, SCEN 102, SOCI 304, URPN 201, and URPN 370.

**Visual Communication Creation Rubric: Institutional Results—All Campuses (*n*=1,141)**

Criterion	Mean	SD	Achievement Level
Purpose and Development	4.33	1.42	Developing
Intent	4.31	1.44	Developing
Aesthetic/Expression of a Created Visual	3.99	1.51	Pre-developing

At both College Station and Galveston, student achievement was highest in Purpose and Development and lowest in Aesthetic/Expression of a Created Visual.<sup>7</sup>

**Visual Communication Creation Rubric: College Station Results (*n*=1,013)**

Criterion	Mean	SD	Achievement Level
Purpose and Development	4.34	1.44	Developing
Intent	4.33	1.44	Developing
Aesthetic/Expression of a Created Visual	4.00	1.51	Developing

**Visual Communication Creation Rubric: Galveston Results (*n*=108)**

Criterion	Mean	SD	Achievement Level
Purpose and Development	4.33	1.30	Developing
Intent	4.31	1.43	Developing
Aesthetic/Expression of a Created Visual	3.90	1.59	Pre-developing

FCA-level results between campuses did not differ significantly, so they are provided in aggregate.

**Visual Communication Creation Rubric: FCA Results**

Criterion	CA	LPC	LPS	M	SBS
Purpose and Development	4.76	4.32	4.33	4.96	3.92
Intent	4.67	4.28	4.41	4.97	3.85
Aesthetic/Expression of a Created Visual	4.44	4.16	3.87	4.35	3.60

<sup>7</sup> Qatar campus results are not provided because only two courses submitted artifacts assessed with the Visual Communication Creation Rubric.



### *Visual Communication Interpretation*

The Visual Communication Interpretation Rubric was applied to 22% off the artifacts scored ( $n=319$ ). Artifacts were collected from College Station and Galveston.<sup>8</sup> Student achievement in Visual Communication Interpretation approached or met the benchmark of *developing*.

#### **Visual Communication Interpretation Rubric: Institutional Results—All Campuses ( $n=319$ )**

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Achievement Level</b>
<b>Purpose and Development</b>	3.97	1.65	Pre-developing
<b>Intent</b>	4.20	1.42	Developing
<b>Clarity of Interpretation of a Visual</b>	3.72	1.62	Pre-developing

At the College Station campus, student achievement met or approached the benchmark.<sup>9</sup>

#### **Visual Communication Interpretation Rubric: College Station Results ( $n=299$ )**

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Achievement Level</b>
<b>Purpose and Development</b>	4.01	1.67	Developing
<b>Intent</b>	4.24	1.45	Developing
<b>Clarity of Interpretation of a Visual</b>	3.76	1.65	Pre-developing

FCA-level results between campuses did not differ significantly, so they are provided in aggregate.

#### **Visual Communication Interpretation Rubric: FCA Results**

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>CA</b>	<b>LPC</b>	<b>LPS</b>
<b>Purpose and Development</b>	4.76	3.83	3.09
<b>Intent</b>	4.82	4.11	3.44
<b>Clarity of Interpretation of a Visual</b>	4.36	3.58	3.06

---

<sup>8</sup> The courses assessed with the Visual Communication Interpretation Rubric were: CHEM 120, CHIN 202, COMM 340, ENGL 219, ENGL 330, FILM 299, FILM/FREN 425, KINE 223, RELS 202, SPAN 201, and SPAN 202.

<sup>9</sup> Galveston campus results are not provided because only two courses submitted artifacts assessed with the Visual Communication Interpretation Rubric.

## **Teamwork**

The Teamwork Self-Assessment Tool was administered to all students enrolled in courses up for assessment in the Foundational Component Areas of Life & Physical Sciences and Creative Arts in late Fall 2022, in the College Station and Galveston campuses. Students on the Qatar campus were not included due to their adjusted academic calendar.

10,479 students from College Station and 606 students from Galveston were invited to participate in a survey about their specific course through HelioCampus—the cloud-based system used for end-of-course Student Course Evaluations. Students enrolled in multiple courses participating in this assessment received multiple invitations. Upon opening the survey, they were asked the questions listed in Appendix D: Teamwork Inventory.

Results by campus are reported below. FCA results are provided for the College Station campus. FCA results are not provided for the Galveston campus due to the low response rate. Course-level results and Galveston FCA results are available upon request.

### *College Station (Overall) Teamwork Survey Results*

The response rate at the College Station campus was 32% with the total respondents at 3,348. The overall College Station results are provided in the tables below.

The following table notes the responses to the question: Which of the following best describes the nature of the teamwork/group work (involving two or more people) you did in this course?

**College Station Teamwork Type**

<b>Teamwork Type</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>% Respondents</b>
None	700	21%
One or two brief activities during the semester not requiring work outside of class	221	7%
Periodic group discussions but not with the same group of classmates	168	5%
Regular small group activities with the same group of classmates	658	20%
At least one long-term group project requiring out of class work	685	21%
Group work was a regular occurrence in the course culminating in a significant portion of the final grade	916	27%

The majority of respondents (80%) indicated that Teamwork was a part of their learning experience. Responses from students indicating there was no teamwork in the course were removed from the analysis and not included in the results in the table below. Students were asked: Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements based on the following scale: 1 = Strongly Agree | 2 = Agree | 3 = Neutral | 4 = Disagree | 5 = Strongly Disagree | Not Applicable

#### College Station Teamwork Survey Results

Question	N	Average	Median	SD
If something was unclear, the team/group asked questions of each other.	2,649	1.42	1.00	0.67
I treated everyone in the team/group with respect.	2,648	1.23	1.00	0.47
As a team/group we addressed conflict, if we had any, constructively.	2,562	1.54	1.00	0.79
I individually worked hard to help the team/group to be successful.	2,637	1.39	1.00	0.61
Other team/group members could depend on me to finish my work on time.	2,626	1.30	1.00	0.56
I contributed to team/group discussion effectively.	2,632	1.34	1.00	0.56
I helped other team/group members participate.	2,649	1.48	1.00	0.68
Team/group members elaborated on each other's contributions and ideas.	2,651	1.49	1.00	0.73
All team/group members contributed equally to our project.	2,615	1.66	1.00	0.98
As a team/group we encouraged each other to look at our work from different perspectives.	2,630	1.59	1.00	0.79
After making a mistake, the team/group worked together to analyze the cause.	2,618	1.56	1.00	0.78
As a team/group member, I listened carefully to others.	2,636	1.34	1.00	0.55
I am happy with the results of our team/group project/activity.	2,634	1.40	1.00	0.69
I was satisfied with the conversations our team/group had about our project/activity.	2,634	1.45	1.00	0.73
I was treated with respect by everyone in the team/group.	2,637	1.29	1.00	0.59

### *Creative Arts (College Station) FCA Teamwork Survey Results*

The response rate for the Creative Arts FCA at the College Station campus was 27% with the total respondents at 731.<sup>10</sup> The results are provided in the tables below.

The following table notes the responses to the question: Which of the following best describes the nature of the teamwork/group work (involving two or more people) you did in this course?

**Creative Arts (College Station) Teamwork Type**

Teamwork Type	N	% Respondents
None	35	5%
One or two brief activities during the semester not requiring work outside of class	60	8%
Periodic group discussions but not with the same group of classmates	44	6%
Regular small group activities with the same group of classmates	85	12%
At least one long-term group project requiring out of class work	364	50%
Group work was a regular occurrence in the course culminating in a significant portion of the final grade	143	20%

The majority of respondents (96%) indicated that Teamwork was a part of their learning experience. Responses from students indicating there was no teamwork in the course were removed from the analysis and not included in the results in the table below. Students were asked: Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements based on the following scale: 1 = Strongly Agree | 2 = Agree | 3 = Neutral | 4 = Disagree | 5 = Strongly Disagree | Not Applicable

**Creative Arts (College Station) Teamwork Survey Results**

Question	N	Average	Median	SD
If something was unclear, the team/group asked questions of each other.	692	1.45	1.00	0.72
I treated everyone in the team/group with respect.	694	1.20	1.00	0.43
As a team/group we addressed conflict, if we had any, constructively.	668	1.59	1.00	0.84

---

<sup>10</sup> The courses represented by student respondents include: ARCH 350, COMM 340, ENGL 212, ENGL 219, DCED 220, FILM 299, PERF 221, PERF 225, PERF 301, and PERF 386.

### Creative Arts (College Station) Teamwork Survey Results (continued)

Question	N	Average	Median	SD
I individually worked hard to help the team/group to be successful.	688	1.36	1.00	0.59
Other team/group members could depend on me to finish my work on time.	694	1.27	1.00	0.52
I contributed to team/group discussion effectively.	695	1.31	1.00	0.54
I helped other team/group members participate.	690	1.50	1.00	0.72
Team/group members elaborated on each other's contributions and ideas.	692	1.51	1.00	0.78
All team/group members contributed equally to our project.	692	1.64	1.00	1.01
As a team/group we encouraged each other to look at our work from different perspectives.	589	1.62	1.00	0.84
After making a mistake, the team/group worked together to analyze the cause.	675	1.69	1.00	0.88
As a team/group member, I listened carefully to others.	690	1.30	1.00	0.51
I am happy with the results of our team/group project/activity.	694	1.39	1.00	0.69
I was satisfied with the conversations our team/group had about our project/activity.	690	1.42	1.00	0.73
I was treated with respect by everyone in the team/group.	693	1.26	1.00	0.56

### *Life & Physical Sciences (College Station) Teamwork Survey Results*

The response rate for the Life & Physical Sciences FCA at the College Station campus was 34% with the total respondents at 2,617.<sup>11</sup> The results are provided in the tables below.

The following table notes the responses to the question: Which of the following best describes the nature of the teamwork/group work (involving two or more people) you did in this course?

### Life & Physical Sciences (College Station) Teamwork Type

Teamwork Type	N	% Respondents
None	665	25%
One or two brief activities during the semester not requiring work outside of class	161	6%

<sup>11</sup> The courses represented by student respondents include: ASTR 101, CHEM 107, CHEM 117, CHEM 120, FIVS 205, GEOL 208, GEOS 110, KINE 223, POSC 201, and SCEN 101.

### Life & Physical Sciences (College Station) Teamwork Type (continued)

Teamwork Type	N	% Respondents
Periodic group discussions but not with the same group of classmates	124	5%
Regular small group activities with the same group of classmates	573	22%
At least one long-term group project requiring out of class work	321	12%
Group work was a regular occurrence in the course culminating in a significant portion of the final grade	773	30%

The majority of respondents (75%) indicated that Teamwork was a part of their learning experience. Responses from students indicating there was no teamwork in the course were removed from the analysis and not included in the results in the table below. Students were asked: Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements based on the following scale: 1 = Strongly Agree | 2 = Agree | 3 = Neutral | 4 = Disagree | 5 = Strongly Disagree | Not Applicable

### Life & Physical Sciences (College Station) Teamwork Survey Results

Question	N	Average	Median	SD
If something was unclear, the team/group asked questions of each other.	1,957	1.41	1.00	0.65
I treated everyone in the team/group with respect.	1,954	1.25	1.00	0.49
As a team/group we addressed conflict, if we had any, constructively.	1,894	1.52	1.00	0.77
I individually worked hard to help the team/group to be successful.	1,949	1.40	1.00	0.61
Other team/group members could depend on me to finish my work on time.	1,932	1.31	1.00	0.57
I contributed to team/group discussion effectively.	1,937	1.35	1.00	0.56
I helped other team/group members participate.	1,959	1.47	1.00	0.66
Team/group members elaborated on each other's contributions and ideas.	1,959	1.49	1.00	0.71
All team/group members contributed equally to our project.	1,923	1.66	1.00	0.97
As a team/group we encouraged each other to look at our work from different perspectives.	1,941	1.59	1.00	0.78
After making a mistake, the team/group worked together to analyze the cause.	1,943	1.52	1.00	0.74
As a team/group member, I listened carefully to others.	1,946	1.36	1.00	0.56

### Life & Physical Sciences (College Station) Teamwork Survey Results (continued)

Question	N	Average	Median	SD
I am happy with the results of our team/group project/activity.	1,940	1.41	1.00	0.69
I was satisfied with the conversations our team/group had about our project/activity.	1,944	1.46	1.00	0.72
I was treated with respect by everyone in the team/group.	1,944	1.31	1.00	0.60

### Galveston (Overall) Teamwork Survey Results

The response rate at the Galveston campus was 11% with the total respondents at 64. The overall Galveston results are provided in the tables below.

The following table notes the responses to the question: Which of the following best describes the nature of the teamwork/group work (involving two or more people) you did in this course?

### Galveston Teamwork Type

Teamwork Type	N	% Respondents
None	19	30%
One or two brief activities during the semester not requiring work outside of class	2	3%
Periodic group discussions but not with the same group of classmates	5	8%
Regular small group activities with the same group of classmates	25	39%
At least one long-term group project requiring out of class work	2	3%
Group work was a regular occurrence in the course culminating in a significant portion of the final grade	11	17%

The majority of respondents (70%) indicated that Teamwork was a part of their learning experience. Responses from students indicating there was no teamwork in the course were removed from the analysis and not included in the results in the table below. Students were asked: Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements based on the following scale: 1 = Strongly Agree | 2 = Agree | 3 = Neutral | 4 = Disagree | 5 = Strongly Disagree | Not Applicable

### Galveston Teamwork Survey Results

Question	N	Average	Median	SD
If something was unclear, the team/group asked questions of each other.	44	1.68	2.00	0.67
I treated everyone in the team/group with respect.	45	1.53	1.00	0.79
As a team/group we addressed conflict, if we had any, constructively.	43	1.72	2.00	0.77
I individually worked hard to help the team/group to be successful.	45	1.76	2.00	0.83
Other team/group members could depend on me to finish my work on time.	44	1.55	1.00	0.70
I contributed to team/group discussion effectively.	45	1.47	1.00	0.55
I helped other team/group members participate.	47	1.77	2.00	0.73
Team/group members elaborated on each other's contributions and ideas.	45	1.69	2.00	0.60
All team/group members contributed equally to our project.	43	1.86	2.00	0.91
As a team/group we encouraged each other to look at our work from different perspectives.	44	1.82	2.00	0.81
After making a mistake, the team/group worked together to analyze the cause.	45	1.80	2.00	0.76
As a team/group member, I listened carefully to others.	45	1.76	2.00	0.80
I am happy with the results of our team/group project/activity.	45	1.71	2.00	0.76
I was satisfied with the conversations our team/group had about our project/activity.	45	1.69	2.00	0.76
I was treated with respect by everyone in the team/group.	44	1.45	1.00	0.59

FCA-level results are not provided for the Galveston campus due to the low response rate (12 total respondents for CA and 52 in LPS).



## 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 rubrics, available at [assessment.tamu.edu](https://assessment.tamu.edu).
- Contact OIEE for assistance in selecting artifacts for assessment at [assessment@tamu.edu](mailto:assessment@tamu.edu).
- At the course level,
  - use objective-specific assignments to assess student learning of the core objective using the associated scoring rubric and
  - use formative assessment strategies to collect and analyze data annually to evaluate student learning of the core 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.

**NOTE:** Course-level results may be available upon request. Email [assessment@tamu.edu](mailto:assessment@tamu.edu) for more information.

## Appendix A: Oral Communication Rubric

	<b>Advanced 8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>Competent 6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Developing<sup>12</sup> 4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Beginner 2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Not Present 0</b>
<b>Purpose and Development</b>	The oral communication demonstrates a thorough awareness of context, audience, and purpose.		The oral communication demonstrates adequate awareness of context, audience, and purpose.		The oral communication demonstrates basic awareness of context, audience, and purpose.		The oral communication demonstrates little awareness of context, audience, and purpose.		No oral communication is provided.
<b>Intent</b>	The oral communication communicates relevant information that substantially enhances the presenter's purpose and can stand alone as a communication strategy.		The oral communication communicates relevant information supporting the presenter's purpose but cannot stand alone as a communication strategy.		The oral communication communicates information related to the presenter's purpose but cannot stand alone as a communication strategy.		The oral communication communicates information related to the presenter's purpose but cannot stand alone as a communication strategy and may not aid in communicating that purpose in a substantial way. (e.g., pictures of the subject which are included for no clear reason)		No oral communication is provided.
<b>Expression/Presentation</b>	The oral communication is professional, eye catching, and easy to understand. Use of oral communication elements (e.g., tone, volume, speed, clarity, etc.) is masterful.		The oral communication is clear and easy to understand. Use of oral communication elements (e.g., tone, volume, speed, clarity, etc.) indicate careful thought.		The oral communication is relatively clear and easy to understand. Use of oral communication elements (e.g., tone, volume, speed, clarity, etc.) indicate some thought.		The oral communication may not be clear but can be understood with surrounding context through use of oral communication elements (e.g., tone, volume, speed, clarity, etc.).		No oral communication is provided.

<sup>12</sup> The score range of 4.00-4.99, or *developing*, is the standard achievement level affirmed by the CCC.

## Appendix B: Visual Communication Creation Rubric

	<b>Advanced 8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>Competent 6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Developing<sup>13</sup> 4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Beginner 2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Not Present 0</b>
<b>Purpose and Development <i>Creation</i></b>	The visual demonstrates a thorough awareness of context, audience, and purpose.		The visual demonstrates adequate awareness of context, audience, and purpose.		The visual demonstrates basic awareness of context, audience, and purpose.		The visual demonstrates little awareness of context, audience, and purpose.		No visual is provided.
<b>Intent <i>Creation</i></b>	The visual communicates relevant information that substantially enhances the presenter's purpose and can stand alone as a communication strategy.		The visual communicates relevant information supporting the presenter's purpose but cannot stand alone as a communication strategy.		The visual communicates information related to the presenter's purpose but cannot stand alone as a communication strategy.		The visual communicates information related to the presenter's purpose but cannot stand alone as a communication strategy and may not aid in communicating that purpose in a substantial way. (e.g., pictures of the subject which are included for no clear reason).		No visual is provided.
<b>Aesthetic/ Expression of a Created Visual</b>	Visual is professional, eye catching, and easy to understand. Use of visual elements (e.g., white space, text size, headings, color) is masterful.		Visual is clear and easy to understand. Use of visual elements (e.g., white space, text size, headings, color) indicate careful thought.		Visual is relatively clear and easy to understand. Use of visual elements (e.g., white space, text size, headings, color) indicate some thought, with few elements of clutter.		Visual may not be clear but can be understood with surrounding context. Use of visual elements (e.g., white space, text size, headings, color).		No visual is provided.

<sup>13</sup> The score range of 4.00-4.99, or *developing*, is the standard achievement level affirmed by the CCC.

## Appendix C: Visual Communication Interpretation Rubric

	<b>Advanced 8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>Competent 6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Developing<sup>14</sup> 4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Beginner 2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Not Present 0</b>
<b>Purpose and Development</b> <i>Interpretation</i>	A detailed description is provided with specific analysis connecting the visual to a larger related context in an innovative and new way.		A detailed description is provided with general analysis connecting the visual to a larger related context but may omit or gloss over critical details.		A detailed description is provided with surface-level or general analysis attempting to connect the visual to a larger related context.		A general description is provided with vague analysis.		Visual is not interpreted.
<b>Intent</b> <i>Interpretation</i>	Interpretation accurately identifies the main idea of the visual/figure, highlighting critical details.		Interpretation accurately identifies the main idea of the visual/figure but may omit critical details.		Interpretation relates to the big picture/subject area of the main idea but may be surface level or omit critical details.		Interpretation is inaccurate or inappropriate.		No analysis or description provided.
<b>Clarity of Interpretation of a Visual</b>	Interpretation enhances the meaning of the visual and clearly explains or contextualizes the use or meaning, thus allowing the audience to fully understand the visual.		Interpretation defines the visual and clearly explains or contextualizes the use or meaning, thus aiding the audience's interpretation of the visual.		Interpretation defines the use of the visual and somewhat explains or contextualizes the use or meaning, identifying the highlights for the audience.		Interpretation loosely defines the use of the visual with a vague, nonspecific interpretation.		No visual is described or discussed.

<sup>14</sup> The score range of 4.00-4.99, or *developing*, is the standard achievement level affirmed by the CCC.

## Appendix D: Teamwork Inventory

The Teamwork Inventory is centrally administered by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation. Instructors will receive information about the administration but will not be responsible for collecting the data themselves.

1. Which of the following best describes the nature of the teamwork/group work (involving two or more people) you did in this course?

- None
- One or two brief activities during the semester not requiring work outside of class
- Periodic group discussions but not with the same group of classmates
- Regular small group activities with the same group of classmates
- At least one long-term group project requiring out of class work
- Group work was a regular occurrence in the course culminating in a significant portion of the final grade

2. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements based on the following scale:

1 = Strongly Agree | 2 = Agree | 3 = Neutral | 4 = Disagree | 5 = Strongly Disagree | Not Applicable

- I contributed to team/group discussion effectively.
- I helped other team/group members participate.
- Team/group members elaborated on each other's contributions and ideas.
- As a team/group, we encouraged each other to look at our work from different perspectives.
- If something was unclear, the team/group asked questions of each other.
- After making a mistake, the team/group worked together to analyze the cause.
- As a team/group, we addressed conflict, if we had any, constructively.
- I individually worked hard to help the team/group be successful.
- I treated everyone in the team/group with respect.
- I was treated with respect by everyone in the team/group.
- Other team/group members could depend on me to finish my work on time.
- All team/group members contributed equally to our project.
- As a team/group member, I listened carefully to others.
- I was satisfied with the conversations our team/group had about our project/activity.
- I am happy with the results of our team/group project/activity.

### Appendix E: Courses Due for Assessment in AY22-23

College/School	Course	FCA	Oral Communication	Visual Communication	Teamwork
Arts & Sciences	AFST 201	LPC	Yes	Yes	No
Agriculture	AGLS 235	SBS	Yes	Yes	No
Arts & Sciences	ARAB 201	LPC	Yes	Yes	No
Arts & Sciences	ARAB 202	LPC	Yes	Yes	No
Architecture	ARCH 350	CA	Yes	Yes	Yes
Arts & Sciences	ASTR 101	LPS	Yes	Yes	Yes
Arts & Sciences	BIOL 101	LPS	Yes	Yes	Yes
Arts & Sciences	CHEM 107	LPS	Yes	Yes	Yes
Arts & Sciences	CHEM 117	LPS	Yes	Yes	Yes
Arts & Sciences	CHEM 120	LPS	Yes	Yes	Yes
Arts & Sciences	CHEM 106	LPS	Yes	Yes	Yes
Arts & Sciences	CHEM 116	LPS	Yes	Yes	Yes
Arts & Sciences	CHIN 201	LPC	Yes	Yes	No
Arts & Sciences	CHIN 202	LPC	Yes	Yes	No
Arts & Sciences	COMM 340	CA	Yes	Yes	Yes
Arts & Sciences	COMM 365	SBS	Yes	Yes	No
Visualization, Performance, & Fine Arts	DCED 202	CA	Yes	Yes	Yes
Arts & Sciences	ECON 203	SBS	Yes	Yes	No
Arts & Sciences	ENGL 212	CA	Yes	Yes	Yes
Arts & Sciences	ENGL 219	CA	Yes	Yes	Yes
Arts & Sciences	ENGL 306	LPC	Yes	Yes	No
Arts & Sciences	ENGL 330	LPC	Yes	Yes	No
Arts & Sciences	ENGL 211	LPC	Yes	Yes	No
Engineering	ENGR 482	LPC	Yes	Yes	No
Visualization, Performance, & Fine Arts	FILM 299	CA	Yes	Yes	Yes
Visualization, Performance, & Fine Arts	FILM 425	CA	Yes	Yes	Yes
Agriculture	FIVS 205	LPS	Yes	Yes	Yes
Arts & Sciences	FREN 425	CA	Yes	Yes	Yes
Arts & Sciences	GEOL 208	LPS	Yes	Yes	Yes
Arts & Sciences	GEOS 110	LPS	Yes	Yes	Yes
Arts & Sciences	GERM 201	LPC	Yes	Yes	No
Arts & Sciences	GERM 202	LPC	Yes	Yes	No
Public Health	HLTH 236	SBS	Yes	Yes	No
Education	INST 210	SBS	Yes	Yes	No
Education	INST 222	SBS	Yes	Yes	No
Arts & Sciences	INTS 211	LPC	Yes	Yes	No

College/School	Course	FCA	Oral Communication	Visual Communication	Teamwork
Arts & Sciences	ITAL 201	LPC	Yes	Yes	No
Arts & Sciences	ITAL 202	LPC	Yes	Yes	No
Arts & Sciences	JAPN 201	LPC	Yes	Yes	No
Arts & Sciences	JAPN 202	LPC	Yes	Yes	No
Arts & Sciences	JOUR 102	SBS	Yes	Yes	No
Arts & Sciences	JOUR 365	SBS	Yes	Yes	No
Education	KINE 223	LPS	Yes	Yes	Yes
Galveston	MARS 210	SBS	Yes	Yes	No
Galveston	MAST 270	LPC	Yes	Yes	No
Arts & Sciences	MATH 141	M	Yes	Yes	No
Arts & Sciences	MATH 147	M	Yes	Yes	No
Arts & Sciences	MATH 167	M	Yes	Yes	No
Visualization, Performance, & Fine Arts	PERF 221	CA	Yes	Yes	Yes
Visualization, Performance, & Fine Arts	PERF 222	CA	Yes	Yes	Yes
Visualization, Performance, & Fine Arts	PERF 225	CA	Yes	Yes	Yes
Visualization, Performance, & Fine Arts	PERF 301	CA	Yes	Yes	Yes
Visualization, Performance, & Fine Arts	PERF 328	CA	Yes	Yes	Yes
Arts & Sciences	PERF 386	CA	Yes	Yes	Yes
Arts & Sciences	PHIL 240	M	Yes	Yes	No
Arts & Sciences	PHIL 482	LPC	Yes	Yes	No
Agriculture	POSC 201	LPS	Yes	Yes	Yes
Arts & Sciences	RELS 202	LPC	Yes	Yes	No
Arts & Sciences	RUSS 201	LPC	Yes	Yes	No
Arts & Sciences	RUSS 202	LPC	Yes	Yes	No
Arts & Sciences	SCEN 101	LPS	Yes	Yes	Yes
Arts & Sciences	SCEN 102	LPS	Yes	Yes	Yes
Arts & Sciences	SOCI 217	SBS	Yes	Yes	No
Arts & Sciences	SOCI 304	SBS	Yes	Yes	No
Arts & Sciences	SPAN 201	LPC	Yes	Yes	No
Arts & Sciences	SPAN 202	LPC	Yes	Yes	No
Arts & Sciences	STAT 201	M	Yes	Yes	No
Architecture	URPN 203	SBS	Yes	Yes	No
Architecture	URPN 201	SBS	Yes	Yes	No
Architecture	URPN 370	SBS	Yes	Yes	No

## Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation

### Purpose

The goal of assessment is to use data to make informed decisions about teaching, learning, program delivery, equity, and overall institutional effectiveness. Engaging in systematic, integrated, and thoughtful assessment of student learning, the student learning experience, and administrative and support functions helps our campus to ensure a high-quality, equitable experience for all students.

OIEE is committed to this endeavor and to assisting our faculty and staff in the continuous improvement of their programs and processes.

Mailstop: 1157 TAMU, College Station, TX 77843-1157

Campus Location: Henderson Hall, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor

Phone: (979) 862-2918

Email: [assessment@tamu.edu](mailto:assessment@tamu.edu)

Website: <https://assessment.tamu.edu/>

HelioCampus Login for Texas A&M University: <https://tamu.aefis.net/>



TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

Office of Institutional Effectiveness  
& Evaluation