2006 Annual Assessment Report
Core Curriculum Committee
The University of Texas at Dallas

A. Executive Summary

It was an extremely busy year for the Core Curriculum Committee (CCC) and the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning. (CELT). The CCC is indebted to staff of CELT for all their efforts in developing the online Assessment Tool and in helping instructors with their course assessment plans and reports.

In the spring the CCC developed and refined learning objectives for each of the eight component areas of the Core Curriculum. A course-specific assessment procedure was pilot tested in summer 2006 and was fully implemented in fall 2006. We now have an online Assessment Tool that provides the infrastructure for our continuing assessment of all Core Curriculum courses. Instructor cooperation was good in the summer (approximately 85%) and was very good in the fall (95%). Base on the fall assessments, 53% of the 312 Core courses met all their Core learning objectives, 29% met between one-half and all their objectives, and only 17% of courses failed to meet at least one-half their objectives. As a follow-up, the CCC held open "report card" meetings attended by instructors for each of the eight components of the Core Curriculum. These meetings generated numerous suggestions about how to improve the assessment process and to improve our Core Curriculum offerings. Based on these findings, and on additional reports from the Math Focus Group, the Director of Rhetoric, and the Collegiate Learning Assessment, the CCC formulated four major initiatives and a number of specific initiatives directed toward Math, Rhetoric, and the Assessment Tool. The most pressing of these initiatives focuses on improving math placement and instruction.

B. Definition of the Core Curriculum

Core Component Learning Objectives. In the fall of 2005, the CCC carefully reviewed THECB's *Exemplary Learning Objectives* [see Appendix A] for clarity and compatibility with UTD's unique mission. Based on this review, clearer and more measurable student learning objectives were created for each of the eight component areas of the core curriculum. For each component, 3-4 student learning objectives were specified. These objectives serve the dual purpose of guiding course learning activities and specifying the foci of assessments needed to evaluate student success in achieving the objectives. Based on the results from summer 2006 course assessments, the CCC made additional modifications to the learning objectives for three of the component areas. The current learning objectives are contained in **Appendix B**.

Approved Courses in the Core Curriculum. The specific courses approved by the CCC are available online via the Course Lookup facility on the UTD home page.

C. Methods of Assessing Core Curriculum Courses

Move to Course-specific Assessment System 2005-present. Beginning in the fall of 2005, the CCC worked closely with the UTD Center for Effective Learning and Teaching (CELT) to develop a comprehensive and regularized system of evaluating the Core Curriculum at the level of individual courses. The goals were to a) articulate clear learning objectives for each component of the Core Curriculum, b) have instructors identify course-specific learning objectives that address the broader Core Curriculum learning objectives, c) have instructors gather multiple types of embedded and

summative benchmark assessments to evaluate student success toward meeting learning objectives, and d) have instructors submit to the CCC semesterly assessment reports wherein they describe assessment methods and results, along with future plans for improving the course. The CCC's intent was to use these course assessment reports as part of an annual evaluation of the effectiveness of general education at UTD and to formulate actions to be taken to improve it. More generally, the goal was to create a culture of assessment and an infrastructure that supports continuous cycles of assessment-analysis-improvement-assessment and so on extending indefinitely into the future. It took considerable effort, but by the end of 2006, the CCC and CELT had succeeded in accomplishing all these goals.

Alignment of Core Curriculum Objective and Course-Specific Objectives. In the spring of 2006, instructors of all core curriculum courses were required to submit lists of student learning objectives for their courses. CELT provided instruction in how to formulate learning objectives in terms of Blooms' taxonomy, and then CELT reviewed, provided feedback on, and eventually approved instructors' lists. These lists of learning objectives were included in course syllabi starting summer 2006 and were used by the CCC to evaluate whether course-specific objectives were aligned with Core Curriculum learning objectives. This process was repeated fall 2006 and spring 2007, and will continue in the future.

Course Assessment Planning. Beginning in spring 2006, CELT undertook a major initiative to educate instructors in how to develop effective methods of assessing student attainment of core course learning objectives. Workbook manuals **[http://sacs.utdallas.edu/hotdox/assessment-workbook-2006-03-01.pdf]**and step-by-step instructions **[Appendix C]** were developed and made available to instructors. Numerous meetings, workshops, and individual consultations were held with instructors. The goal was for instructors to create Course Assessment Plans prior to the semester that would guide assessment activities during the term. Plan documents took the form of a table with each row representing a specific learning objective. For each objective, separate columns asked for information about a) statement of the learning objectives, b) specific assessment methods, c) criterion of success, and d) planned timeline of assessment. The focus was on having instructors create or identify embedded benchmark assessments that would meaningfully reveal the number of students that achieve each of the Core Curriculum learning objectives. The emphasis was deliberately on embedded assessments, rather than standardized assessments, because the University faculty wanted to encourage instructors to find unique and innovative ways to address broad learning objectivs. Although there was initial difficulty in shifting the mindset of instructors away from "grading students" to "evaluating learning effectiveness," eventually the vast majority of instructors came to appreciate the necessity of assessment. Starting in fall 2006, CELT released a new online Assessment Tool that allowed instructors to use a web-based interface to enter Course Assessment Plans and Reports **[** http://sacs.utdallas.edu/assessment/ **]**. This web-based system included a number of features that greatly facilitated the submission, tracking, reviewing, approving, and archiving plans/reports. The Tool is an important development in infrastructure that has greatly helped to regularize the assessment planning process. Plans for fall 2006 and spring 2007 are accessible (with authorization) at http://sacs.utdallas.edu/sacs_tools.

Course Assessment Reporting. Starting in summer 2006, at end of each semester instructors compile their assessment results for each learning objective in order to determine the number of students who met, partially met, or did not achieve the Core Curriculum's learning objectives. These results are entered into the online Core Course Assessment Report, along with a) copies of the actual assessments used, b) a discussion analyzing the meaning of the results, and c) proposed future actions to be taken to improve student achievement of learning objectives **[**http://sacs.utdallas.edu/assessment/ **]**.   The CCC

reviewed all reports and provided corrective feedback where necessary. The quality of the reports was generally very good, although there was unevenness and room for improvement in the spring 2007 reports.

Other Course Information Considered. The CCC also compiled into a table other information about each course, including a) enrollment, b) distribution of final grades, and c) student course evaluation ratings. Course syllabi were also reviewed.

D. **Results of Core Curriculum Courses Assessment**

Instructor Cooperation. There has been steady improvement in instructor cooperation. During summer 2006, 73 (73%) instructors submitted assessment plan, whereas in fall 2007, 265 (85%) submitted plans and in spring 2007, 262 (91%) submitted plans. Submission of assessment reports has been even better. During summer 2006, 85% of instructors submitted reports whereas 300 out of 312 course sections (96%) were submitted for fall 2006. Overall, the CCC is extremely pleased with and grateful for the high levels of cooperation from faculty and will continue to work to achieve 100% cooperation.

Quality of Assessment Plans and Reports. The CCC and CELT realized that it would take time for instructors to learn to effectively assess student learning objectives. Considerable effort was directed toward providing individual instructors assistance in preparing plans/reports and providing corrective feedback on submitted plans/reports. These efforts are paying off. The quality of the assessment plans and reports have steadily improved across the summer, fall and spring semesters. A common shortcoming of reports in summer 2006 was that they did not address all the Core Learning Objectives. This problem has been completely eliminated in the spring 2007 plans. Another common shortcoming was that plans included only one method of assessment for each objective. In fall 2006, roughly 33% of reports included only one assessment for at least one objective **[Appendix D]**. This problem has also been nearly eliminated in the spring 2007 plans. The CCC has now shifted its focus to addressing a number of other shortcomings evident in a minority of assessment reports. These include a) too few assessment items to ensure valid measurement, b) assessments not uniquely and exclusively measures of learning objectives, c) success criteria set too high or low, d) failure to report numerical results, c) failure to provide actual assessments, e) no or limited discussion/analysis of results, and f) no or limited discussion of planned actions to improve the course.

Number of Courses Meeting Learning Objectives. The following table summarizes the number of courses that met, partially met, and did not meet the criterion of success that had been specified. For reporting purposes, the CCC adopted fairly conservative criteria for classifying courses. To be classified as "met" criteria, 100% of a course's outcome assessments (i.e., rows) must have met or surpassed success criteria. To be classified as "partially met," 50% to 99% of a course's outcome assessments must have met or surpassed success criteria. Courses that met success criteria for less than 50% of assessed outcomes were classified as "not met." When averaged across component areas, 53% of courses had met 100% of course objectives, 29% of courses had met 50% to 99% of course objectives, and 17% of courses had met less than 50% of course objectives. Overall, 82% of courses had met or partially met their learning objectives. The CCC viewed these results as indicating that the vast majority of UTD students were achieving the learning objectives of the Core Curriculum. There was, however, noteworthy variability across different component areas of Core, with the Math component achieving relatively less success in meeting objectives, and Writing, Science and Government achieving relatively greater success. Therefore, there is still room for improvement and the CCC should formulate action plans to improve specific aspects of general education at UTD.

Number of Core Courses Meeting Learning Objectives

code			Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
10	Writing	Met	53	59.6	59.6
		Met Partially	28	31.5	91.0
		Not Met	8	9.0	100.0
		Total	89	100.0	
20	Math	Met	13	32.5	32.5
		Met Partially	15	37.5	70.0
		Not Met	12	30.0	100.0
		Total	40	100.0	
30	Science	Met	61	62.9	62.9
		Met Partially	16	16.5	79.4
		Not Met	20	20.6	100.0
		Total	97	100.0	
40	Humanities	Met	7	46.7	46.7
		Met Partially	7	46.7	93.3
		Not Met	1	6.7	100.0
		Total	15	100.0	
50	Fine Arts	Met	5	50.0	50.0
		Met Partially	4	40.0	90.0
		Not Met	1	10.0	100.0
		Total	10	100.0	
60	History	Met	5	38.5	38.5
		Met Partially	5	38.5	76.9
		Not Met	3	23.1	100.0
		Total	13	100.0	
70	Government	Met	3	50.0	50.0
		Met Partially	3	50.0	100.0
		Total	6	100.0	
80	Soc/Beh Science	Met	11	44.0	44.0
		Met Partially	9	36.0	80.0
		Not Met	5	20.0	100.0
		Total	25	100.0	

Met = 100% of objectives met in course.
Met partially = 50% to 99% of objectives met in course.
Not Met = Less than 50% of objectives met in course.

Analysis of Course Assessment Process and Findings. The CCC discussed at length the strength and limitations of using course-specific assessments as a means of evaluating the success of the Core Curriculum. Strength include a) engaging instructors as active partners in the assessment process, b) respecting the unique strengths and interests that specific instructors bring to the course, c) the ability of course-specific assessments to diagnostically identify aspects of the course that need improvement, and d) the creation of a broader culture of assessment that improves the quality of instruction and learning. Limitations include a) the considerable training involved in bringing instructors up to speed about the logic and methods of assessment, b) the considerable investment of time and energy by a

large number of instructors to plan, gather, and report assessments (which take time about from teaching itself), and c) the inherent difficulty of identifying meaningful assessments and success criteria.

This last difficulty is a particular point of frustration because it is caused by an inherent tension between two goals of assessment. One goal of assessment is to demonstrate accountability to the outside world (i.e., that student are achieving learning objectives). This goal creates a natural pressure to select assessments and criteria of success which show that students (and by extension courses) are successful. Obviously, identifying assessments and criteria of modest ambitiousness would guarantee accomplishing this goal. On the other hand, a second goal of assessment is to gather diagnostic information that helps improve instruction and learning. Here, selecting assessments of modest ambitiousness are of little value. If nearly 100% of students met objectives, we make ourselves appear wonderful to the outside world, but gained virtually no insight into limitations and avenues of improvement. Ideally, we can identify assessments and criteria that serve both goals, but this will take time and experience with assessments. It also takes a commitment by SACS and by the University administration to emphasis the diagnostic goal of assessment over the accountability goal. Perceived pressure to produce pleasing accountability results would likely soften assessment standards and reduce the diagnostic value of the assessment process. Accordingly, throughout this first year of implementing the course-specific assessment process, CELT and CCC have repeatedly emphasized to instructors that they should focus on gathering diagnostic information and should not be concerned about "looking good" in terms of accountability.

E. Other Assessments of the Core Curriculum

Collegiate Learning Assessment 2005-2006. Although no one component area of the Core Curriculum is exclusively devoted to the development of critical thinking, the enhancement of critical thinking is included as a student learning objective for most components of the Core. In this vein, the University has for the past three years been participating in the Collegiate Learning Assessment study (CLA) conducted by the Council for Aid to Education. The CLA is a standardized test purported to assess students' performance on tasks that require them to think critically, reason analytically, solve realistic problems, and write clearly. Although the CCC views that CLA as a less than ideal method of assessing critical thinking (primarily because it is detached from specific course curriculum), the results have shed some light on students' general levels of critical thinking. Samples of 93 freshmen and 68 seniors at UTD took part in the 2004-2005 assessment and samples of 81 freshmen and 76 seniors took part in the 2005-2006 assessment (see attached CLA 2005-2006). Overall, the results reveal that compared to national norms, UTD freshmen and seniors achieve very high levels of critical thinking. By the senior year, roughly 75% of UTD seniors scored above the national 80th percentile in critical thinking, indicating that UTD graduates achieved high levels of critical thinking. The report also revealed, however, that students' gains in critical thinking between freshmen and senior years were less than statistically expected when SAT scores were taken into consideration. Essentially, the results suggested that seniors' critical thinking skills had grown little beyond those of freshmen. This lack of gain was not typical of comparison universities whose students on average showed a 100+ point gain between freshmen and seniors. Caution, however, should be exercised in interpreting these findings because they are based on cross-sectional rather than longitudinal comparisons. As such, differences between freshmen and seniors may represent sample selection differences rather than valid assessments of gain. Overall, the findings suggest that UTD students demonstrate high levels of critical thinking but that more might be done to challenge students to engage in critical analysis beyond their current high levels.

Rhetoric Report 2007.   Student writing was evaluated twice, in spring 2002 and spring 2003, in the context of the Rhetoric 1302 which is required of all UTD students. Writing samples were gathered from 10% of students enrolled in this course (N =34) both semesters. A scoring rubric was developed that examined five areas of competency: Rhetorical Knowledge; Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing; Collaboration, Research and Processes, and Technology. Overall, performance met expectations (65% rated 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale), but indicated that there was room for improvement. The Director of the Rhetoric Program identified a number of improvements that could be made in course curriculum and resources.

A follow-up report was issued in January of 2007 by the new Director of the Rhetoric Program **[Appendix E]**. That report indicated a number of the suggested improvements from the 2003 report had been implemented with some success. No new assessments were reported, but the Director plans to draw upon the newly created core-specific assessment system implemented by the Core Curriculum Committee to regularize the assessment of writing at UTD. The report also outlines a number of planned changes in the Rhetoric Program aimed toward enhancing feedback to students, instructor training, and assessment of program effectiveness.

Math Focus Groups, 2001 and 2006. In the fall of 2001, a committee of faculty and administrators was formed to evaluate student performance in college algebra and statistics courses. Students graduating from UTD are expected at a minimum to master the formal principles of college-level algebra and one advanced field of mathematics beyond college algebra, the minimum being inferential statistics. The committee developed specific benchmark assessment items (based on the THECB's Exemplary Educational Objectives for math) that were administered to a random sample of students (N = 75) who had taken all their mathematics courses at UTD. The results reveal that overall, an average of 85.7% students had achieved the learning objectives. The committee concluded in their 2003 report **[Appendix F]** that "The results from our spring 2003 mathematics evaluation of liberal arts and social and behavioral science students seems a satisfactory indication of these student's mastery of the broad educational objectives in mathematics set down by the UT System."

In the spring of 2006, a Math Focus Group committee was formed to evaluate student performance in introductory calculus courses. The committee included administrators and faculty from Math, Engineering/Computer Science, Management, and Natural Science. The committee was charged with evaluating the failure/withdrawal rates in calculus courses and devising a plan for improving student learning of calculus. In that an important priority of UTD is to graduate more science, engineering, and business professionals, it is imperative that the university have effective mechanisms that lead to a greater numbers of students achieving proficiency in calculus. The committee gathered considerable data and compared trends within UTD to those at other major universities **[Appendix G]**. The committee concluded that a) the rates of students earning grades of D, F or Withdrawing from courses (the "DFW" rate) for first-time freshmen was comparable to other tier-one schools (roughly 25%), but b) since UTD enrolls more transfer students, DFW rates for all students taking calculus course are higher than comparison universities (roughly 38% at UTD compared to 33% at UT Austin). In addition, student performance in UTD's pre-calculus courses was not a good predictor of subsequent performance in calculus and therefore did not appear to provide adequate preparation for success in calculus. The committee made several recommendations for improving screening, grading, and student attendance.

F. Analysis of Results for 2006

In March 2007, the CCC discussed the meaning of the forgoing results and possible future actions. Two initiatives were approved and implemented.

1. **Open Hearing on Math and Writing**. The first initiative called for the CCC to conduct "hearings" to explore ways to improve foundation-level math and writing instruction at UTD. The results of the Course Assessment Reports for the math component revealed lower-than-hoped for levels of successfully meeting learning objectives (70%). In addition, past analyses of grades awarded in calculus courses have indicated that 30% to 40% of students attempting these courses earn grades of D, F, or W. In that an important priority of UTD is to graduate more science, engineering, and business professionals, it is imperative that the university have effective mechanisms that lead to a greater numbers of students achieving proficiency in calculus. The CCC also noted that the Course Assessment Reports painted a surprisingly rosy assessment of student writing proficiency (90% successful). The committee felt that these results ran counter to often-voiced complaints by instructors that many students lack basic writing skills. In addition, based on assessment reports and course syllabi, the CCC noted considerable unevenness across introductory and advanced writing courses in terms of a) the amount of writing required, b) the extent and type of feedback given by instructors, and d) the likely validity of assessments. This led the CCC to conclude that we should explore ways to increase the quantity and quality of writing instruction across the University.

   These hearings were held in conjunction with the Component Committee Reviews in April 2007 (see below). Faculty, administrators, and students were invited to participate in these open hearings. The goal was to formulate specific recommendations that could be implemented if possible starting fall, 2007. The hearings were reasonably well attended, with about a dozen attendees each. Minutes of hearings were taken and are contained in **Appendix J**.

2. **Core Component Committee Reviews**. The second initiative called for committees of faculty to be formed for each of the eight components of the Core Component Committees. Membership included instructors who taught courses in the component area and relevant administrators. These committee meetings were held during the weeks of April 16th and 23rd. Committees were charged with reviewing and discussing the Course Assessment Reports submitted by instructors along with other relevant data on enrollment, grades, student evaluation ratings and course syllabi **[Appendix H]**. Committees then prepared a "report card" giving an account of their component **[Appendix I]**. Reports include considerations of a) the level of effort instructors invested in the assessment process, b) the appropriateness and meaningfulness of the assessments gathered, c) how assessment methods and criteria of success should be revised and improved, d) whether and how learning objectives should be revised, e) the adequacy and appropriateness of instructors' action plans, and f) general considerations about how the core components might be improved.

G. Recommendations for 2007 and Beyond

After reviewing and discussing all the results and analyses of the 2006 assessment cycle, the CCC arrived at the following specific recommended actions to be taken in fall 2007 and beyond.

Major Initiatives

1. **Establish a Math Learning Center at UTD**. See the Math Report Card [Appendix J] for discussion of the rationale for this center. Such a center would have several missions: a) plan and coordinate of math curriculum and sequences, b) develop and administer a comprehensive

placement testing and learning assessment system, c) administration of all math service courses (developmental through calculus) that are currently all taught by lecturers, d) develop and administration of 24-7 tutoring, e) develop and administer online refresher courses to help students prepare for placement tests, f) provide instructor and TA training and resources, and g) conduct research on the effectiveness of various math instruction methods. It is strongly suggested that the center be headed by a director with a background in math education/administration and that it be a stand-alone unit from the Math Department. The rationale for the center being a separate unit is that the center would be in a better position to be responsive and accountable to all the degree programs across the university that depend on math training and would relieve the Math Department from the heavy burden of hiring and supervising such a large cadre of senior and part-time lecturers.

2. **Establish a Writing Center at UTD.** See the Writing Report Card [Appendix J] for discussion of the rationale for this center. Such a center would have several missions: a) plan and coordinate the Core Curriculum writing courses, b) develop and implement student- and course-level assessments to evaluate progress toward learning objectives, c) develop and administer a writing tutoring service, d) develop and administer online refresher courses in writing mechanics, f) educate instructors across the university to more effectively improve student writing (i.e., a "writing across the curriculum" philosophy), and g) conduct research on the effectiveness of various writing instruction methods. Such a center should probably stand as a unit separate from any one department and include an administrative director and a staff of graduate and professional assistants.

3. **Encourage all programs to adopt a "writing across the curriculum" philosophy.** A strong version of this approach requires writing in all courses taught at the university. A more moderated version of this approach requires writing in a large number of targeted courses where it makes sense that writing take place. This approach may make sense for some majors more than others and that perhaps this should be left up to individual programs. The general thrust is that we should encouraging more student writing and that instructors need to find ways to maximize student engagement in writing and discussion in large lecture courses. Apparently, other large universities are finding ways to engage students to a greater degree.

4. **Require that writing samples be gathered and centrally stored for every student taking a course satisfying the 010 Writing requirement.** This could be readily done by way of ether Turnitin.com or WebCT drop box. The Core Curriculum Committee found it difficult to evaluate whether the current system of fostering writing skills (i.e., RHET 1302 + an Advanced Writing course) is successful because instructional methods and assessment procedures vary so widely (from moderate-sized lecture courses to individual student projects) that they fail to provide a meaningful gauge of student mastery level. The Core Curriculum Committee would independently score a sub-set of student papers vis-à-vis the writing learning objectives to get a more standardized outcome assessment. If this method proves feasible, then in the future we may be able to move to a "sampling" strategy of assessing the Writing component of the Core. This would reduce the workload of assessment on individual instructors.

Specific Initiatives:

In the event that the above described centers can not be immediately established, we recommend that the following steps be taken to address problems we have identified in the Current Core Curriculum.

5. **The Math Department**:
   a. Should conduct a comprehensive review of the mathematic skills required by each major in the university and then redesign, if necessary, our course sequences to more effectively address

8

those needs. This review will necessarily consider the varying levels of student aptitude and prior preparation. The ultimate goal should be to produce a greater number of students competent at the level of math necessary for success in their major. The current sequence of two theoretical calculus courses is not sufficient to address the diverse needs of the university.

b. Should develop and implement a comprehensive placement and achievement battery of test items that can be used to reliably and validly a) place students in appropriate courses, b) evaluate whether individual students, within a course, achieve proficiency necessary for placement into the next course in the sequence, and d) evaluate the courses effectiveness in meeting learning objectives. We strongly recommend that an expert specifically trained in math assessment and curriculum be brought in to head up this effort.

c. Should develop and offer an additional non-accelerated calculus sequence. For example, we Math 2413, 2414, and 2415 in addition to our current accelerated sequence of Math 2417 and 2419. This is the tact that UT Austin has taken.

d. Is strongly encouraged to adopt a policy of using commonly agreed upon sets of test items across all sections of a course number in their SACS Assessment Reports. This would enable instructors to submit a common assessment plan (thus reducing the work on individually designed assessments) and would provide a more meaningful common benchmark to evaluating course effectiveness.

e. Should develop and administer a free online refresher module in the concepts of high school algebra and calculus. Such a module could facilitate student performance in freshmen chemistry and other entry-level courses relying on high school algebra concepts.

6. **The School of Arts and Humanities**:
   a. Should develop a standard method of assessing the learning objectives for all sections of RHET 1302. The past practice of having individual instructors develop individualized course assessment plans has placed too great a burden on CELT and the Core Curriculum Committee for instructing and coaching each instructor to produce plans; in addition, the plans themselves have been of highly variable quality.
   b. Should develop a writing screening test and a free self-paced instructional course/module that focuses on writing (grammar, punctuation, organization, etc.). Student could be required to complete such a course/module before/with basic and advanced writing courses.

7. **The SCAS Assessment Team**:
   a. Develop a generic scoring rubric that could be used by instructors in all writing courses. The consensus was that while this would be very helpful to have as guidelines, there was resistance to requiring all instructors to use the same assessment rubric. Buhrmester, Gooch, and Wilson agreed to develop such a rubric and make it available to instructors who wished to adopt it.
   b. Make readily available on the Assessment Tool prototypical examples of acceptable Assessment Plan/Report for each component of the Core Curriculum.
   c. Upgrade the Assessment Tool so that it would accept Letek formatted materials. If this proves impossible, then allow instructors to send in separately attached Letek files.
   d. Allow instructors of multiple sections of one course to submit one assessment plan/report that covers all sections.
   e. Inform instructors that they should assess those things that may meaningfully help them improve rather than focusing on assessments that may make the course look good for outside accountability.
   f. Add entry options to the Assessment Tool for "general considerations" and "other action plans" that are not aligned with specific learning objectives. There was frustration expressed by the

structure of the current Assessment Report format that narrowly aligns action plans with specific learning objectives, assessments, and outcomes.

g. Add a question to the Assessment Report asking about the amount of time invested in assessment per section/report. This would provide information documenting the time investment in the current assessment process.

h. Add a copy function to the assessment tool that would allow instructors to roll forward their assessment plan from one semester to the next semester.

Source Note: Core Curriculum: Assumptions and Defining Characteristics (Rev. 1999).
Report of the Advisory Committee on Core Curriculum (1997-98)

CORE COMPONENTS AND RELATED EXEMPLARY EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES

In designing and implementing a core curriculum of at least 42 semester credit hours, each Texas college and university should select and/or develop courses which satisfy exemplary educational objectives specified for each component area. The following exemplary educational objectives should be used as basic guidelines for selected component areas. Exemplary educational objectives become the basis for faculty and institutional assessment of core components.

Since it is difficult to define exemplary educational objectives for a core curriculum outside of some framework of the general areas of content, the objectives and outcomes described below are suggested as those that meet the intent of Senate Bill 148. The outcomes for student learning provide both guidelines for instruction and a profile of students as they complete each component of a core curriculum. Although these component areas could easily be "translated" directly into disciplinary or departmental terms, it is not necessary to restrict the areas to one or a few departments. These objectives could be met in a number of differing course configurations, including multi-disciplinary courses.

Colleges and universities across the state have specific missions and different roles and scope. The way in which colleges and universities achieve these outcomes will thus vary. These outlines are not intended in any way to impose restrictions on the creativity of the classroom instructor or to dictate pedagogical methods. The emergent profile of the students, however, will presumably have common characteristics insofar as they achieve the specified outcomes. A core curriculum experience will prepare them to learn effectively through the rest of their college years so that they carry these aptitudes for learning into their life careers.

I. COMMUNICATION (composition, speech, modern language)

The objective of a communication component of a core curriculum is to enable the student to communicate effectively in clear and correct prose in a style appropriate to the subject, occasion, and audience.

Exemplary Educational Objectives

1. To understand and demonstrate writing and speaking processes through invention, organization, drafting, revision, editing, and presentation.
2. To understand the importance of specifying audience and purpose and to select appropriate communication choices.
3. To understand and appropriately apply modes of expression, i.e., descriptive, expositive, narrative, scientific, and self-expressive, in written, visual, and oral communication.
4. To participate effectively in groups with emphasis on listening, critical and reflective thinking, and responding.
5. To understand and apply basic principles of critical thinking, problem solving, and technical proficiency in the development of exposition and argument.
6. To develop the ability to research and write a documented paper and/or to give an oral presentation.

II. MATHEMATICS

The objective of the mathematics component of the core curriculum is to develop a quantitatively literate college graduate. Every college graduate should be able to apply basic mathematical tools in the solution of real-world problems.

Exemplary Educational Objectives

1. To apply arithmetic, algebraic, geometric, higher-order thinking, and statistical methods to modeling and solving real-world situations.
2. To represent and evaluate basic mathematical information verbally, numerically, graphically, and symbolically.
3. To expand mathematical reasoning skills and formal logic to develop convincing mathematical arguments.
4. To use appropriate technology to enhance mathematical thinking and understanding and to solve mathematical problems and judge the reasonableness of the results.
5. To interpret mathematical models such as formulas, graphs, tables and schematics, and draw inferences from them.
6. To recognize the limitations of mathematical and statistical models.
7. To develop the view that mathematics is an evolving discipline, interrelated with human culture, and understand its connections to other disciplines.

III. NATURAL SCIENCES

The objective of the study of a natural sciences component of a core curriculum is to enable the student to understand, construct, and evaluate relationships in the natural sciences, and to enable the student to understand the bases for building and testing theories.

Exemplary Educational Objectives

1. To understand and apply method and appropriate technology to the study of natural sciences.
2. To recognize scientific and quantitative methods and the differences between these approaches and other methods of inquiry and to communicate findings, analyses, and interpretation both orally and in writing.
3. To identify and recognize the differences among competing scientific theories.
4. To demonstrate knowledge of the major issues and problems facing modern science, including issues that touch upon ethics, values, and public policies.
5. To demonstrate knowledge of the interdependence of science and technology and their influence on, and contribution to, modern culture.

IV. HUMANITIES AND VISUAL AND PERFORMING ARTS

The objective of the humanities and visual and performing arts in a core curriculum is to expand students' knowledge of the human condition and human cultures, especially in relation to behaviors, ideas, and values expressed in works of human imagination and thought. Through study in disciplines such as literature, philosophy, and the visual and performing arts, students will engage in critical analysis, form aesthetic judgments, and develop an appreciation of the arts and humanities as fundamental to the health and survival of any society. Students should have experiences in both the arts and humanities.

Exemplary Educational Objectives

1. To demonstrate awareness of the scope and variety of works in the arts and humanities.
2. To understand those works as expressions of individual and human values within an historical and social context.
3. To respond critically to works in the arts and humanities.
4. To engage in the creative process or interpretive performance and comprehend the physical and intellectual demands required of the author or visual or performing artist.
5. To articulate an informed personal reaction to works in the arts and humanities.
6. To develop an appreciation for the aesthetic principles that guide or govern the humanities and arts.
7. To demonstrate knowledge of the influence of literature, philosophy, and/or the arts on intercultural experiences.

V. SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

Appendix A

The objective of a social and behavioral science component of a core curriculum is to increase students' knowledge of how social and behavioral scientists discover, describe, and explain the behaviors and interactions among individuals, groups, institutions, events, and ideas. Such knowledge will better equip students to understand themselves and the roles they play in addressing the issues facing humanity.

Exemplary Educational Objectives

1. To employ the appropriate methods, technologies, and data that social and behavioral scientists use to investigate the human condition.
2. To examine social institutions and processes across a range of historical periods, social structures, and cultures.
3. To use and critique alternative explanatory systems or theories.
4. To develop and communicate alternative explanations or solutions for contemporary social issues.
5. To analyze the effects of historical, social, political, economic, cultural, and global forces on the area under study.
6. To comprehend the origins and evolution of U.S. and Texas political systems, with a focus on the growth of political institutions, the constitutions of the U.S. and Texas,federalism, civil liberties, and civil and human rights.
7. To understand the evolution and current role of the U.S. in the world.
8. To differentiate and analyze historical evidence (documentary and statistical) and differing points of view.
9. To recognize and apply reasonable criteria for the acceptability of historical evidence and social research.
10. To analyze, critically assess, and develop creative solutions to public policy problems.
11. To recognize and assume one's responsibility as a citizen in a democratic society by learning to think for oneself, by engaging in public discourse, and by obtaining information through the news media and other appropriate information sources about politics and public policy.
12. To identify and understand differences and commonalities within diverse cultures.

Core Curriculum Components and Objectives 2007

Core Curriculum

The University of Texas at Dallas requires that all students complete a general education Core Curriculum of 42 semester credit hours that serves as a broad foundation for the undergraduate degree. These requirements must be met by every student pursuing a baccalaureate degree at The University of Texas at Dallas, regardless of his or her major. Specific approved courses must be used to satisfy each core requirement (see the Schedule of Classes). In accordance with *Texas Education Code* Chapter 61, Subchapter S, a student who successfully complete the entirety of a recognized Core Curriculum at another Texas public institution of higher education may transfer that block of courses to U.T. Dallas where it will be substituted for the U.T. Dallas Core Curriculum.

Communications (Chart 010) 6 hours
The goal of the communications component of the core curriculum is to develop students' mastery in writing. Students must complete one course that requires them to learn to communicate effectively in clear and correct prose and to master several modes of writing, including descriptive, expository, narrative and self-expressive. Students must also complete a second writing-intensive course that may require them to master specific forms of writing tailored to the professional standards in their major field of study. All courses require that students write, received detailed feedback about, and revise at least 15 double-spaced pages.

    <u>Component Learning Objectives</u>:
1. Students will be able to write effectively using appropriate organization, mechanics, and style.
2. Students will be able to construct effective written arguments.
3. Students will be able to gather, incorporate, and interpret source material in their writing.
4. Students will be able to write in different ways for different audiences.

Mathematics (Chart 020) 6 hours
The goal of the mathematical component of the core curriculum is to develop quantitatively literate citizens, capable of applying mathematical tools in the solution of real world problems. Familiarity with mathematical concepts and tools will enable persons to better cope with the complex financial, business, investing, and daily living problems encountered in the modern world. Students must master the formal principles of a college-level math (algebra or calculus at a level higher than high school algebra II) and one advanced field of mathematics beyond college math (logical reasoning and inference; the application of mathematical concepts; statistical methods; or formal principles of calculus or advanced algebra).

    <u>Component Learning Objectives</u>:
1. Students will be able to apply basic mathematical methods to modeling and solving real-world problems.

2.   Students will be able to formulate and interpret basic mathematical information, numerically, graphically, and symbolically.
3.   Students will be able to identify and explain the limits of mathematical models.

Natural Science (Chart 030) 9 hours

The goal of the natural science component of the core curriculum is to develop an appreciation of the intricacies of the natural world and to be able to describe and explain some of the basic principles of how the natural world functions. A more scientifically literate population will better cope with understanding and acting on issue of a scientific nature that affect their lives. Each student must complete 9 credit hours of science courses, one of which must have a laboratory component.

Component Learning Objectives:
1.   Students will be able to describe laws, theories or findings basic to the science discipline.
2.   Students will be able to apply scientific laws and principles of the discipline to arrive at problem solutions.
2. Students will be able to explain how experiments or observations validate or test scientific concepts.

Humanities (Chart 040) 3 hours

The goal of the humanities component of the core curriculum is to examine a variety of literary, philosophical, and/or historical works drawn from the humanities and presented in an established context as examples of expressions of individual and human values. Students will develop proficiency in research, critical thinking, and writing through a series of assignments in which they will demonstrate analytical processes of thought as well as intellectual responses to designated materials. Students must complete at least one course that is representative of literature, philosophy, cultural studies, modern language, or classic language.

Component Learning Objectives:
1. Students will be able to examine and analyze a variety of works from the humanities, particularly those connected to literature and philosophy.
2. Students will be able to analyze and critically evaluate such works in the context of culture, society, and values as well as be able to compare and contrast the works with each other.
3. Students will be able to apply considered analysis and respond to works in the humanities as examples of human expression and aesthetic and philosophical principles.

Fine Arts (Chart 050) 3 hours

The goal of the fine arts component of the core curriculum is to expose and illuminate at least one and possibly multiple forms of artistic expression, including but not exclusive to the traditional areas of the performing and visual arts. Through a series of discussions and examinations or reports and/or papers, students will demonstrate their critical awareness of the fine arts, a knowledge of the scope and variety of forms within specific artistic expressions, and an appreciation for the aesthetic principles that guide the creation and evaluation of art on both an individual and cultural level. Students must complete at least one course that is representative of one or more of the visual or performing arts.

Component Learning Objectives:
1. Students will be able to examine and respond critically to a variety of artistic forms in at least one and possibly multiple forms of expression drawn from either the visual or performing arts or some combination thereof.
2. Students will be able to demonstrate an appreciation for artistic expression and ability to analyze specific works of art within a cultural or social context.
3. Students will be able to develop a critical approach to a given form or forms of art and will be able to articulate a response in an intelligent and informed manner.

American and Texas History (Chart 060) 6 hours

The goal of the American and Texas history component of the core curriculum is to develop students' comprehension of the scope of American and Texas historical development through an examination of social, institutional, political, and cultural evolution over specified periods of time in the history of the United States and the State of Texas. Students must complete two courses that address the history of the United States or the State of Texas.

Component Learning Objectives:
1. Students will be able to identify, explain, and give examples of significant developments in American and/or Texas history over a defined span of time.
2. Students will be able to examine and analyze historical development through knowledge of institutional, social, cultural, and political evolution and change over a defined span of time.
3. Students will be able to interpret and evaluate the acceptability of historical evidence.

Government (070) 6 hours

The objective is to increase students' comprehension of the history and evolution of political institutions, and the interrelationship between institutions such as executive and legislative; the role that political institutions play in the lives of citizens, and to demonstrate the relationship between citizens and political institutions including activities such as voting and interest group activity that provides awareness for citizen influence. This knowledge is designed to equip students to be better informed citizens capable of making important decisions in various political contexts. Students must complete two courses that include consideration of the Constitution of the United States and the constitutions of the states, with special emphasis on the Texas Constitution.

Component Learning Objectives:
1. Students will be able to provide examples of and apply important theoretical and scholarly approaches to understanding state and national institutional behavior, citizen involvement and interaction between citizens and institutions of government
2. Students will be able to analyze and appreciate historical trends in development of government institutions and their constitutional foundations.
3. Students will be able to identify, describe, and analyze various mechanisms of citizen political involvement.

Social and Behavioral Science (Chart 080) 3 hours

The goal of the social and behavioral science component of the core curriculum is to increase students' knowledge of how social and behavioral scientists describe, explain, and critically

analyze the behaviors and interactions among individuals, groups, institutions, cultures, events and ideas. Such knowledge will better equip students to understand themselves and the roles they play in addressing the issues facing humanity. Students must complete at least one course that is representative of the following social and behavioral sciences: anthropology, economics, geography, psychology, sociology, or women's studies.

Component Learning Objectives:
1. Students will be able to describe major theoretical and scholarly approaches, empirical findings, and historical trends in the social/behavioral science discipline.
2. Students will be able to describe and apply basic research methods in the social/behavioral science discipline.
3. Students will be able to apply modes of critical thinking used in the social/behavioral science discipline.

Instructions for Core Curriculum Reports (1-23-07)

I. Introduction. You are the instructor of a course that is intended to satisfy one of eight General Education Core Curriculum requirements at UTD. To insure that courses address general education goals, the UTD Core Curriculum Committee (CCC) has established a number of student learning objectives that each of the eight types of Core Course must minimally address. These objectives were adapted from State of Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board objectives.

The purpose of your Core Assessment Plan is to create the blue-print for gathering assessments to be incorporated into the Core Assessment Report that you must submit at the end of the semester. You will use these assessments to evaluate how successfully your course achieved the Core Curriculum Learning Objectives and then use these results to formulate ways to improve the course's specific objectives, assessments, and learning activities in the future.

II. Submission Process and Timeline. Here are the steps in the process:
1. Instructors submit Assessment Plan via the online Assessment Tool by February 9, 2007.
2. CCC reviews Plan and either approves or requests specific revisions by February 19, 2007.
3. Instructor gathers and records assessments over the course of the semester.
4. Instructor submits completed Assessment Report via online Assessment Tool by May 14, 2007.
5. CCC reviews Report and either approves or requests specific revisions.

Key Guidelines:

In general, your plan must:
A) address all the (blue-line) Core Learning Objectives,
B) include at least two different assessment for each of the blue-line Core Objectives, and
C) **not use** the same assessment/score to evaluate more than one Objective. Thus, for example, if there are three blue-line Core Objectives, you need a total of (at least) 6 different assessments/scores to evaluate the three Core Objectives.

III. Brief Step-by-step Instructions

1. Go to http://sacs.utdallas.edu/assessment/ and log in using your NetID and email password.

2. Click on the **"my reports"** tab and then check on the "**2007 Spring**" button. Now click on the course number under "Section."

3. **IMPORTANT**: **Don't click on the "submit assessment plan" button on the "2. submit plan" tab** until you are completely done entering information. Once you click this buttons, you are unable to make changes in your plan.. If you prematurely click this button, please email Duane Buhrmester at buhrmest@utdallas.edu and he'll reset the system so you can make changes.

4. Click on the **"1. plan" tab**. This displays the section of the plan/report that you complete and submit for approval at the beginning of the semester. It should look similar to this:

Appendix C

Review: Assessment Plan   plan | results | analysis | overview | info | review

Survey of Western Art History: Renaissance to the Modern World - Chart 050
D. Goode / dgoode@utdallas.edu

1. Core Curriculum Course Objective: Students will be able to examine and respond critically to a variety of artistic forms in at least one and possible multiple forms of expression drawn from either the visual or performing arts or some combination thereof.

.	#	Course Specific Objective	Assessment Activity	Success Criteria	Assessment Timeframe
		no course objectives have been specified for this area.			
⊞		add new objective (expand and edit this row to add a new objective)			

2. Core Curriculum Course Objective: Students will be able to demonstrate an appreciation for artistic expression and ability to analyze specific works of

5. Click on the "+" on the far left under the first "1. Core Curriculum Course Objective." It should then look similar to this:

Review: Assessment Plan [plan] [results] [analysis] [overview] [info] [review]

Survey of Western Art History: Renaissance to the Modern World - Chart 050
D. Goode / dgoode@utdallas.edu

1. Core Curriculum Course Objective: Students will be able to examine and respond critically to a variety of artistic forms in at least one and possible multiple forms of expression drawn from either the visual or performing arts or some combination thereof.

.	#	Course Specific Objective	Assessment Activity	Success Criteria	Assessment Timeframe
		no course objectives have been specified for this area.			

Course Objective ⑦
click here to repeat the above course objective

Assessment Activity ⑦

Success Criteria ⑦

Timeframe ⑦

[save changes]

2. Core Curriculum Course Objective: Students will be able to demonstrate an appreciation for artistic expression and ability to analyze specific works of

Note, if you click on the ?, you will see further assistance on what to enter in a given box.

6. In the text box to the right of **Course Objective**, type in a course learning objective that is consistent with, or is subsumed under, the first Core Curriculum Objective (here referred to as a "blue-line" objectives) that spans across the top of the window. You can either use a course-specific learning objective from your course syllabus or duplicate the general blue-line Core Objective (by copying and pasting in the blue-line text from above). More on selecting learning objectives.

7. Next enter one **Assessment Activity** that will be used to evaluate whether the course succeeds in meeting this Course Objective. Your description needs to be specific enough so that we can tell that it is different from the other assessments you describe in your plan. Remember, the guidelines dictate that the numerical results from one assessment activity can not be used to evaluate multiple Course Objectives (i.e., guideline C). A good example of specificity might be: "4-5 embedded multiple-choice items from each of the midterm and final exams that assess critical thinking about works of art." A (bad) example of insufficient specificity might be: "Exam 1 and Exam 3". More on selecting assessment activities.

8. In the **Success Criteria** window enter the number (or percentage) of students who must succeed at the Assessment Activity in order for you to conclude that the course has met the learning objective.

Disciplines and courses differ in their success criteria. For example, some instructors consider the course successful in meeting an objective if 25% of the students pass the benchmark. Other instructors look for 90% success. More on choosing success criteria.

9. Enter the **Timeframe** of when the Assessment Activity will take place. Be specific so that you will know when you must gather and record particular assessments. For example, "exam 1" or "paper due at the end of the semester.

10. Click on the "save changes" at the bottom of the window. You must do this to save what you have done so far.

11. Now, you must **enter at least one more row** of Objectives/Assessments/Criteria/Timeline for the first blue-line Core Curriculum Course Objective. To open another row in the table, click on the "+" next to where is says "**add new objective** (expand and edit this row to add a new objective)". This will open another window that looks like #6 above.

12. Repeat #7 to #10 above. Be sure that your description of this Assessment Activity makes it clear how the activity is different from the assessment activity you entered earlier.

13. Repeat #7 to #12 for each of the blue-line Core Objectives, entering at least two rows for each objective. Remember, you must have assessments for **all the blue-line Objectives** listed in the Plan template.

14. Finally, click on the **"2. submit plan"** tab after you have entered and saved your plans for all of the blue-line Core Objectives. Click on the "submit assessment plan" button at the bottom. The CCC will review the plan and let you know if any adjustments need to be made.

15. Throughout the semester, make certain that you are using your plan as a blueprint for gathering your assessment data. Once the CCC approves your plan, you can begin to input your assessment items and findings in the 2. results and 3. analysis sections of the Assessment Tool. Your final assessment report will be due two weeks after the last day of final exams. More on gathering and reporting assessments.

A. Selecting Learning Objectives.

1. **Learning objectives** specify the knowledge and skills that the course's curriculum and learning activities intend to foster in students. Learning outcomes should reflect clear, measurable student outcomes.

2. Each course approved to satisfy a component of UTD general-education Core Curriculum **must address all** the blue-line Core Curriculum Objectives. These required learning objectives are adapted from State of Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board objectives that are fine-tuned by the UTD Core Curriculum Committee (CCC). They are highlighted in blue on the online Assessment Tool. A Core course may have learning objectives beyond those required by the CCC.

3. Your assessment plan must contain at **least two (2) rows** of Objectives/Assessments for each CCC blue-line objective (the example below shows three rows). There are two ways to handle the learning objectives for these 2+ rows. If you have two or more course-specific learning objectives (as listed in our course syllabus) that conceptually address the CCC objective, then they can be listed one each per row. Alternatively, you can duplicate the general CCC objective for each of the rows. It is important to know that you might have many more objectives on your syllabus than reflected in this assessment of your class. That is fine and even expected. You can also mix these to methods as in the following example:

1. Assessment Planning

| | 1. plan | 2. submit plan | 3. results | 4. analysis | 5. submit report | overview |

Introduction To Psychology - Chart 080
Section: psy2301.001.06f / Instructor(s): J. Bartlett, D. Buhrmester

1. Core Curriculum Course Objective: Students will be able to explain and apply major theoretical and scholarly approaches, empirical findings, and historical trends in a social/behavioral science.

.	#	Course Specific Objective	Assessment Activity	Success Criteria	Assessment Timeframe
⊞	1.1	Students will be able to explain and apply major theoretical and scholarly approaches, empirical findings, and historical trends in a social/behavioral science.	5-10 multiple-choice benchmark items embedded in each of four midterm exams that specifically assess students performance at describing and differentating basic biological, perceptual, cogntive, developmental, social, personality and abnormal theories of human thought and beahavior.	Average > %75 pass across set of items.	exams 1-4
⊞	1.2	Differentiate basic theories of psychology addressing biological, perceptual, cogntive, developmental, social, personality and abnormal aspects of human thought and beahavior.	4 rubric-scored essay exam questions (one per midterm exam) requiring students to compare and contrast the key contentions of different conceptual approaches.	At least 70% of students will average earning 7 of 10 points on essays.	Exams 1-4
⊞	1.3	Students will be able to explain and apply major theoretical and scholarly approaches, empirical findings, and historical trends in a social/behavioral science.	End-of-semester student self-evaluation ratings of achievement of this learning objective	At least 80% of student report the being successful or very successful in achieving this course goal.	Survey included with end-of-semester course evaluations.
⊞		add new objective (expand and edit this row to add a new objective)			

2. Core Curriculum Course Objective: Students will be able to explain and apply basic research methods in a social/behavioral science.

4. Best practices in assessment require that learning objectives must be stated in language that conforms to Bloom's hierarchy of types of learning. The CCC's objectives conform to Bloom's language. See the Assessment Workbook for how to phrase course-specific learning objectives: http://sacs.utdallas.edu/hotdox/assessment-workbook-2006-03-01.pdf (pages 20-21). Stating

learning objectives with Bloom's verbs will allow you to assess them much more easily than using non-specific wording.

[Back](#) to Instructions

B. Selecting Assessment Activities.

1. The goal of an assessment activity is to yield a quantitative evaluation of how well the course's curriculum and learning activities are achieving a specific learning objective. For example, if I have a course objective that students be able describe to Freud's conceptions of the id, ego and super ego, then I need to have a means of assessing how many students actually achieve this learning objective. The main criteria should be face validity: a colleague or SACS reviewer should be able to read the item and think, "Yep, that looks like a reasonable way to assess that learning objective." More on the logic of course assessment.

2. Each of the blue-line CCC Core Learning Objectives must be assessed by **two or more different types of assessment** activities (this guideline parallels A.3. above). Each type of assessment needs to be entered as **a separate row** in the table (e.g., 1.1 for one type of assessment and 1.2 for the second type of assessment).

    a. In the Assessment Activity window, specify the **type of assessment**, approximate **number of items**, and substantive **focus of the assessment**.

    b. Different **"types"** of assessment include, for example, multiple choice, true-false, fill-in, short answer, essay question, problem calculation, paper assignment, writing sample, class presentation, class discussion/participation, journal entries, or project report (this list is not exhaustive of the possibilities). Assessments need not contribute toward students' course grades (e.g., number of students speaking during class discussion as an indicator of student involvement, or samples of un-graded "three-minute writing exercises" that are evaluated for critical thinking.)

    c. If you don't gather different types of assessments in your course, another way to satisfy this guideline is to draw subtypes of items from one of the above categories. For example, if you only gather multiple choice assessments, then identify one subset of items that measures lower-level learning (i.e., define or describe) and another that measures higher-level learning (i.e., apply or reason).

    d. In terms of "**number of items**", it is better if assessments include multiple items where possible (e.g., it's better to use a set of 5 multiple choice items rather than just one multiple choice item); this increases the reliability and validity of the assessment. However, all the items in a set must have a similar su'stantive focus that address the specific learning objective. Thus, using a score from an entire exam is appropriate only if **all** the items in the exam specifically and narrowly assess the learning objective of interest.

    e. Description of the substantive "**focus of the assessment**" needs to be specific enough so that we can tell that it is different from the other assessments described in your plan. A good example of specificity might be: "4-5 embedded multiple-choice items from each of the midterm and final exams that focus on critical thinking comparing major psychology theories." A bad example of insufficient specificity might be: "Exam 1 and Exam 3".

3. Assessments must yield evaluative results that are **specific to a particular learning objective**, not to the entirety of the course. This is why course grades are not appropriate assessments; course grades are too global to tell us whether we are achieving specific learning objectives.

4. The same **assessment/score can not be used to evaluate multiple objectives**. For example, the overall grade from one exam can not be used to evaluate two learning objectives, one about

substantive knowledge and the other about research methods. The reason being, with only one numeric result, it would be impossible to determine whether the course was succeeding at one objective but failing at the other. You can, however, use the same **type** of assessment to evaluate multiple objectives. For example, it would be fine to use a subset of items from one exam to assess substantive knowledge while a separate subset of items from that exam is used to assess mastery of research methods.

Back to Instructions

The logic of course evaluation is different from the logic of evaluating students (i.e., assigning student grades). Course evaluation answers the question ***"how well are the course's curriculum and learning activities doing at achieving the desired learning outcomes among students?"*** In contrast, student evaluation/grading answers the question ***"how well did a specific student achieve the desired learning outcomes?*** The focus of the former is evaluating the curriculum and learning activities, whereas the focus of the later is evaluating individual differences in student performance.

The confusing part is that these two types of "performance" are intertwined. One factor influencing student performance (in addition to individual capability and effort) is the effectiveness of the courses curriculum and learning activities. An important way to ascertain course "performance" depends on evaluating the proportion of students for whom the course succeeded in fostering the desired learning outcomes. If a low proportion of students achieved a learning objective, it could have been due to several factors: a) the course's learning activities were not appropriate to produce the desired outcomes; b) the learning objectives were unreasonably high; c) the students, taken as a group, were not capable of, or prepared to, benefit from the learning activities, or d) the students, taken as a group, were not exerting the effort needed to benefit from the courses learning activities. Deciding which factors, or combination of factors, are responsible for failing to achieve learning objectives involves ruling out, through empirical or logical analyses, alternative possibilities. For example, if I know my students as a group are bright and hard working (perhaps based on high school grades, SAT's, performance in other college courses, and amount of time/effort devoted to studying for the class) then I can narrow the problem down to the learning activities, the learning objectives and/or the background preparation of the students as a group.

Back to Selecting Assessment Activities

Back to Instructions

C. Selecting Success Criteria.

1. Conceptually, the **Criterion of Success** stipulates a) a **threshold** of success and b) the proportion **of students** who must surpass the threshold in order to conclude that the course has met the learning objective. For example, on an essay question, earning 7 of 10 possible points might be the threshold I think achieves the desired learning outcome. My numerical result would then be the number/percentage of students who surpassed this threshold.

2. Please **DO NOT USE COURSE LETTER GRADES** as success criteria. SACS does not view **course grades** as valid assessments of specific learning objectives. SACS (rightly) sees course grades as a measure of students' overall performance, not as measures of specific course outcomes. The goal of the SACS assessment is to measure how well our courses are performing at meeting our specific objectives. Therefore, we should evaluate the success of the course in terms of the percent of students who achieve specific objectives. You can, however, use letter grades on specific assignments/exams as "numeric results," provided that the entire assignment/exam speaks discriminatively to one specific learning objective. For example, if you give a letter grade for writing assignment that specifically (and narrowly) assesses critical thinking (which is a specific course objective), then it is permissible to state the success criteria as "70% of the students will earn a grade of B or better based on scoring criteria/rubric which evaluates the sophistication of critical thinking."

3. *How high or low you should set your threshold of success?* There is no definitive/prescribed answer, but we suggest that you set the percent of students between 70-80% and that you select assessment items that have a difficulty/challenge level (i.e., the percent of students who will pass the item) between 70-80%. Our reasoning for this recommendation is that if these assessments are to provide useful information that we can use to improve our courses, the assessments need to provide diagnostic scores. Selecting "easy" item (e.g., 90% difficulty) and a low-ish thresholds (e.g., 60% achieve) will yield rosy evaluations (i.e., 98% of students achieved objective) but give us no insight into how to improve the course. In addition, what SACS most wants to see is a meaningful *assessment cycle* in which we a) identify areas that need to be improved, b) implement changes, and c) make assessments again to see if the changes worked. We can't have a cycle of improvement unless we identify limitations.

4. Here is one **logic for establishing a criterion for success**. It is based on the assumption that the number of students achieving a learning outcome is a joint additive function of student factors (capability and conscientiousness) and course factors (learning activities and level of objectives). Let's say I have a learning objective that I believe 100% of students who are capable and conscientious should achieve. I would set my success criteria at 100% were it not for the fact that less that 100% of the students in the course are truly "capable and conscientious." If I estimate that perhaps 25% of the students are not "capable and conscientious," then I would logically down-grade my success criteria to 75%. In so doing I am asserting that I will deem that the course learning activities were successful if 75% of the students achieved the learning objective. The success criterion moves up or down depending on my beliefs and assumptions. For example, if I believe a higher-level learning objective is within the grasp of only 50% of capable and conscientious student, and I assume that 75% of my students are capable and conscientious, then I would set my success criteria at 37.5%. While the process of setting success criteria is not arbitrary, it is relative to the beliefs and assumption you make.

5. Different types and numbers of assessment items require **different success criteria**. Here are possible ways to handle different types of assessments.
    a. <u>**Single-item measures**</u>. This can be a single multiple-choice item, an essay item, a problem solution, final project, performance, team project, or a term paper. Please be aware that a single item on an exam is not the best way to measure an outcome. Multi-item measures provide more reliable and valid assessments of what students have actually learned.
        i. *Dichotomous outcome*: Report % students passing. For example, the percentage of students in class correctly answering a multiple-choice item or a true/false item.
        ii. *Multi-point outcome (e.g., number of points earned out of 10 possible for an essay question)*: Set a cut point (e.g., 7/10 points) for "passing" and then report % students surpassing that cut point. To do this, record points for all students, count number of students surpassing the cut point, and divide by the total number of students.
    b. <u>**Multi-item measures**</u>. These can be a set of multiple-choice items, a set of essay items, or multiple scores from one assignment (e.g., a term paper).
        i. *Homogenous types of items (e.g., all multiple-choice items)*. Report the "Average rate of passing across the set of items" (e.g., Average > %75 pass across the set of items). This is often described as the average item difficulty. It is computed by averaging within a set of items the percent of students passing each item (e.g., [% pass item1 + % pass item2 + % pass item3] divided by 3). This information can be taken directly from the Scantron Item Analysis report. This method is easer to compute than "75% of student score above 75%" which requires that you count for each student the number of items s/he passed and then compute the percent of students who passed at least 75% of the items in the set.
        ii. *Mixed types of items (e.g., mix of dichotomous and multi-point items).* Report a composite success rate that is the average of the rates for each type of assessment. For example, if you had a 5-item multiple choice "average rate of passing" of 80% and had a one-item essay of 70% of students earning 25/30 points or more, then the composite success rate would be 75% (i.e., [70% + 80%]/2). You could give more weight to one type of measure in the composite if appropriate.

[Back](#) to Instructions

D. Gathering and Reporting Assessments

1. You should **plan ahead** to make your tasks of gathering, recording, computing, and reporting course assessments as painless as possible. The over-arching message is that a few minutes of planning at the outset of your course could save you many hours of work later on. Also, it will be impossible to archive samples of student work if you turned back the exams, paper, etc. to students without making copies.

2. **Devise a system of recording specific scores throughout the semester.** Here are some suggestions about how to record assessment scores.
   a. **Multiple Choice and True-False Items.** If you use scantron-like answer sheets, ask for the "item analysis report" during the machine scoring. It will provide percent/number of students passing each question. If you hand score multiple choice items, then create a hand tally sheet on which you record correct/incorrect hash marks as you score each exam item that feeds into your assessment. This will save the time of having to flip back through individual exams later to find and record the number of students getting the item correct.
   b. **Essay and Problem Solution Questions.** These are questions that you or your TA hand score using scoring criteria/rubric. Record scores separately in your grade book for each question that is used in the course assessment. Otherwise, you later need go back through individual exams to pull these scores out.
   c. **Sub-parts of Papers.** Let's say that you plan to assess critical thinking that is evident in student term papers. Since the critical thinking score will probably be one of several scoring components in you paper-grading rubric, you will want to record the critical thinking score separately from the overall paper scores.

3. **Saving assessments.** You will be asked to include in your final report the actual items (i.e., questions, problems, instructions, scoring criteria/rubric, etc.) you used in your assessments. You will electronically paste these items into a window under the "3. results" tab of the Assessment Tool (see the example at INSERT URL). To simplify this task, you may want to accumulate these items in a text file throughout the semester. At a minimum, be sure to keep electronic copies of all tests, assignments, etc. you give during the semester.

4. **Keeping samples of student work.** We've adopted what we hope is a minimalist approach to archiving samples of students work. You should keep these samples secure in a file folder in your office. You may be asked to present these samples should a SACS visitor audit your course assessments.
   a. **Multiple choice or true-false items.** There is no need to keep copies of student tests or answer sheets.
   b. **Essay and problem solution answers.** Save three samples of student answers representative of three levels of mastery: exemplary, adequate, and not-meeting-the-criteria level. These can be photo copies with student identifiers removed
   c. **Papers and projects**. Save 3 samples of student answers representative of three levels of mastery: exemplary, adequate, and not-meeting-the-criteria level. These can be photo copies with student identifiers removed.
   d. **Oral presentations**. Save 3 samples of student score sheet rubrics representative of three levels of mastery: exemplary, adequate, and not-meeting-the-criteria level. It is not necessary to record students' presentations

Number of Assessments (rows)

Number of Assessments for Objective 1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1	.3	.3	.3
	1	49	16.6	16.6	16.9
	2	144	48.8	48.8	65.8
	3	80	27.1	27.1	92.9
	4	18	6.1	6.1	99.0
	5	2	.7	.7	99.7
	6	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	295	100.0	100.0	

Number of Assessments for Objective 2

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	51	17.3	17.3	17.3
	1	52	17.6	17.6	34.9
	2	121	41.0	41.0	75.9
	3	53	18.0	18.0	93.9
	4	12	4.1	4.1	98.0
	5	3	1.0	1.0	99.0
	6	3	1.0	1.0	100.0
	Total	295	100.0	100.0	

Number of Assessments for Objective 3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	52	17.6	17.6	17.6
	1	64	21.7	21.7	39.3
	2	131	44.4	44.4	83.7
	3	46	15.6	15.6	99.3
	4	2	.7	.7	100.0
	Total	295	100.0	100.0	

Number of Assessments for Objective 4

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	4	1.4	4.5	4.5
	1	25	8.5	28.4	33.0
	2	47	15.9	53.4	86.4
	3	10	3.4	11.4	97.7
	4	1	.3	1.1	98.9
	5	1	.3	1.1	100.0
	Total	88	29.8	100.0	
Missing	System	207	70.2		
Total		295	100.0		

Report on Writing Assessment at the University of Texas at Dallas
Year 2006-07
(Response to the *Year 2003* Report)
Prepared by John C. Gooch, Ph.D., Director of Rhetoric and Writing

Summary
This report responds to the *Report on Writing Assessment at the University of Texas at Dallas: Year 2003*, and it also explains our recent efforts to implement effectively the Rhetoric Program. To date, we have adhered closely to the "maxims" identified in the 2003 report, but we are making some changes, particularly with regard to assigning grades for student essays and portfolios, that, to some extent, depart from the approach this program has historically taken in evaluating student writing. By assigning grades for individual assignments, we believe we are empowering teachers to determine more systematically a student's performance in the course. In addition, the Rhetoric Program has begun implementing new training opportunities for Rhetoric TAs and new measures for assessing their performance in the classroom. We are also embracing a renewed commitment to student-centered learning as well as a renewed commitment to helping students improve their writing skills so that they can succeed in other academic coursework and also in their professional lives. In our efforts to "close the loop," we will continue to revise and solidify evaluation/assessment methods, complete annual program-level assessments, and build stronger ties University-wide with other schools and academic programs.

A Vision for the Rhetoric Program
The following report responds to the *Report on Writing Assessment at The University of Texas at Dallas: Year 2003*, which reports program-level writing assessment data, achievements, and goals of the Rhetoric and Writing Program. Although the Rhetoric and Writing Program has changed somewhat over the last three and half to four years, the basic goal of the program has remained the same. We strive to teach students to improve their writing and critical thinking skills so that they may excel in both their personal and professional lives as well as in their academic coursework in other disciplines.

As the Director of Rhetoric, three major goals comprise my vision for this program. First, the Rhetoric Program should teach students to become better writers for their other academic courses. Second, the Rhetoric Program should train students to apply effectively their writing skills in workplace contexts and future professions. Third, and perhaps most importantly, the Rhetoric Program should train students to become better citizens who can comprehend different forms of rhetoric (e.g., digital rhetoric, visual rhetoric, and textual rhetoric) and who can communicate effectively in writing as active participants in a democracy. To achieve these goals, we should emphasize the students learn to comprehend argument in an academic sense and also exercise their own abilities to write arguments to specific audiences. Clearly, the Rhetoric Program's business is to teach rhetoric and writing, which necessitates students also learn to enhance their critical thinking skills and to synthesize research as evidence in support of their positions. They must then demonstrate aptitude in expressing critical thinking skills in written communication. Computer technology represents one tool for enhancing the learning experience, but technology does not represent the focal point of teaching. Rather, our

teachers use computer technology to enhance the overall learning experience for students and to create a positive learning environment.

The preceding paragraph represents my guiding philosophy as Director of Rhetoric. The Rhetoric Program should embody a humanities' mission, and more specifically, a humanities mission for the 21st Century. Our approach to the Rhetoric Program should not deviate from these "roots," so to speak, in recognizing the magnitude and impact of human creativity and human achievement. Therefore, I have structured this report so that it communicates the Rhetoric Program's commitment to these overarching goals. In addition to providing a response to the *Report on Writing Assessment at The University of Texas at Dallas: Year 2003*, this document details our progress to date, future directions, and how we plan to "close the loop" to improve writing instruction in the Rhetoric Program.

Writing Assessment Data from the 2003 Report
In 2003, the Rhetoric Program conducted a writing assessment based upon a random sample of student portfolios using a web-based application called the Learning Resource Record Online (LRO). The 2003 report states that a "total of 34 portfolios were read (representing about 10% of all students passing the course in all sections during Spring 2003)" (page 1). Program administrators conducted the assessment in three phases, all of which involved the ranking of portfolios according to a holistic rubric. In addition, they measured student performance according to five separate competencies:

- Rhetorical Knowledge
- Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing
- Collaboration
- Research and Processes
- Technology

(Each competency is more specifically defined in Appendix B of the 2003 report.)

The group then ranked portfolios on a scale from 1 to 5, with each number representing the following:

- 1 = Competencies not evident
- 2 = Competencies rarely evident
- 3 = Competencies sometimes evident
- 4 = Competencies frequently evident
- 5 = Competencies extensively evident

For their study sample, the Rhetoric Program administrators found that, for both 2002 and 2003, over 50% of students scored 4 or above with regard to four of five competencies. However, between 2002 and 2003, administrators saw a percentage decline in three of the five competency categories for student portfolios scoring 4 or better. The "Collaboration" competency saw the greatest decline, dropping from 65% in 2002 to 44.1% in 2003 (see following table).

	2002	2003	change+-
Rhetorical Knowledge	76%	76%	---
Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing	76%	67.6%	- 8.4
Collaboration	65%	44.1%	- 21.0
Research and Processes	64%	53%	- 11.0
Technology	58%	70.6%	+ 12.6

(Recreated from *Year 2003* report, page 3)

The Rhetoric Program continues its commitment to helping students improve in each of these five competency areas (with some diminished emphasis on "technology"). While the 2003 data suggests that the Rhetoric Program has succeeded in helping many, if not most, students improve their writing ability, the perception among many UTD faculty members remains that their upper-division students cannot effectively write for their upper-division courses. Negative comments from faculty imply that student writing competence continues to diminish, as the declining percentages for competencies between 2002 and 2003 would also suggest.

Because I have only served in my capacity as Director for less than a year, I have not yet conducted any program-level writing assessment, but I plan to do so at the end of the 2006-07 academic year. We are, however, making changes to our methods for evaluating student work in these classes. For the last several years, the Rhetoric Program has adopted a holistic method of evaluation requiring the use of portfolios. Under this system, students submit all of their work (e.g., major assignments, minor assignments, drafts, online responses/posts) at the end of the semester. Teachers assess student work based on overall improvement, and they only assign two actual letter grades – one grade at midterm and one for the final grade. We have begun changing this practice, and as of Spring 2007, teachers are now giving individual grades for major writing assignments, although we have retained an element of holistic evaluation in our assessment of student writing.

Enrollment Trends, Changes in Program Administration
The 2003 report indicates that in academic year 2003-2004, the undergraduate enrollment had "increased 8.6 percent" over the previous year – "from 7,959 to 8,646" (*Year 2003 Report*, page 4). In addition, the report states that "this year [2003-04] we have a record number of freshmen (around 1400), and the exponential growth each year has put a strain on our resources that in past years seemed sufficient" (page 4). In partial response to these new demands, the Rhetoric Program hired one new Assistant Director of Rhetoric and Writing as well as a Technology TA assistant sometime in 2002 or 2003. In addition, new computers for "all rhetoric classrooms and instructor offices were installed in January 2003" (page 5).

Currently, I serve as the only administrator for the Rhetoric Program. I was asked to serve as Director when the previous Director of Rhetoric and Writing as well as the Assistant Director resigned in May/June 2006. I officially began my duties in July/August 2006. As I understand it, the School of Arts and Humanities will conduct a nationwide search in 2007-08 to hire a permanent director who will begin his or her

duties in Fall 2008. Furthermore, the Rhetoric Program no longer employs a Technology TA to assist with computer needs in classrooms; we rely upon the Arts and Humanities technology support staff when teachers and students experience computer problems.

On a different note, I am led to believe that Rhetoric 1302 enrollments may have dropped slightly since the completion of the 2003 report. In 2005-06, we taught 975 students in our Rhetoric classes (548, Fall 2005 and 427, Spring 2006). This school year, we taught 512 first-year students in Fall 2006, and our current enrollment for Spring 2007 sits at 393. Our overall enrollment in Rhetoric 1302 for this school year has declined by approximately 70 students from the previous year. The 2003 report also suggests that the Rhetoric Program taught the majority of the 1400 first-year students entering UTD in 2003-04, but enrollments for 2005-06 and 2006-07 suggest that student numbers have declined somewhat since 2003-04. In Fall 2006, we employed 22 Rhetoric TAs for 32 sections, and the School of Arts and Humanities canceled only one section due to low enrollment. The School of Arts and Humanities has canceled nine sections due to low enrollment in Spring 2007. For Spring 2007, we currently employ 16 Rhetoric TAs to teach 24 sections of Rhetoric 1302. However, a declining Spring semester enrollment for Rhetoric 1302 does represent the normal trend for this course.

Recommendations from the 2003 Report
The 2003 report also makes recommendations for bolstering writing instruction University-wide. For example, the report suggests that the three-hour upper division writing requirement should "be supplemented by a sophomore level prerequisite course offered in the School of Arts & Humanities" (page 6). The report also recommends implementing Rhetoric 1300, a "much-needed course in ESL and developmental writers (*sic*)" (page 6). Other calls for action include requests for additional classroom space, computer equipment, the creation of a campus Writing Center, and funding for conducting the annual year-end writing assessment.

To date, UTD has added neither the sophomore-level writing requirement nor the Rhetoric 1300 course. Recent deliberations addressed the need for possibly adding another writing course to the core curriculum (e.g., Rhetoric 1301 – the first semester, first year course offered at most other universities as English 1301); however, no further discussions – to my knowledge – have taken place since the end of the Fall 2006 semester. In their report to the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) in December 2006, both the current Director for Communication/Professional Communication and I explained that writing requirements at UTD remain very consistent with writing requirements at other major universities in Texas (e.g., UT-Austin, University of North Texas, and Texas Tech University) and also other states. On a different note, and to my knowledge, the Rhetoric Program has received no funding for year-end writing assessments, and our classroom space and computer equipment remain as they were in 2003. A Writing Center or Writing Lab does exist on the UTD campus, but it exists very much apart from the Rhetoric Program and the School of Arts and Humanities.

The 2003 report also strongly recommends using the Learning Resource Online (LRO) system for conducting year-end writing assessments. During the last three to four years,

Rhetoric Program teachers have steadily quit using this system, and to my knowledge, no Rhetoric teachers currently use the LRO in their classes. Moreover, the Rhetoric and Writing Program has not conducted a program-level writing assessment since 2003, so previous administrators have not used it for that purpose. Teachers had used the LRO for portfolio submissions, but many teachers have devised other methods for implementing online portfolios in their classes.

In addition to the aforementioned recommendations, the 2003 report presents "maxims" for guiding the Rhetoric Program as it implements recommendations (page 7). The report provides eight maxims, each beginning with the words, "We need…" (page 7). The Rhetoric Program administrators stress several needs, including:

- The need to ensure assessment does not hinder learning;
- The need to include any reporting for SACS that could also be used in our assessment plans and reports, as well as similar information gained during any departmental self-studies;
- The need to look at low end and high end writing samples so that it magnifies the differences more than looking at middle quality writing samples; and
- The need to involve faculty at all levels of curriculum planning, instructor training, and assessment. (page 7)

We have adhered closely to these maxims just in the short time I have served as Director of Rhetoric. For example, we have solicited input from faculty in Literary Studies and History as well as from members of the UTD higher administration. We have also asked other Arts and Humanities faculty to speak to TAs during the first-of-the-year meeting, held in early August, and I have personally asked other faculty to lead training sessions and conduct informational workshops. In addition, we are taking the necessary steps to ensure that assessments support and affirm student-learning objectives and outcomes. We have also very conscientiously gathered data for SACS reports that we can also use in assessing the effectiveness of the Rhetoric Program. These examples represent only a few of the ways in which we are continuing our efforts to strengthen the Rhetoric Program at UTD.

New Methods for Assessing Student Writing (Grades for Individual Assignments)
According to the grade distribution reports for Spring 2006, Rhetoric Program teachers issued 76% As and Bs in Rhetoric 1302 (65% A+, A, A-, and B+). This percentage of high grades represents a completely unrealistic distribution and does not, in my view, accurately reflect the level of student writing in these classes. Based on my experience, the average grade in a first-year writing course should be C+ or C, with B or B- representing the average grade for an "exceptional" class. I have not yet studied the grade distributions across sections for Fall 2006, but it is my hope that grades were far less inflated.

Grade inflation in Rhetoric 1302 is attributable to a number of possible causes. For example, the Rhetoric program has for several years, as previously mentioned, stipulated a holistic and portfolio approach to evaluating student performance. In other words, our

teachers were only assigning two letter grades during the semester (a midterm grade and a final grade). Ostensibly, this approach required that teachers critically examine a student's performance from the beginning of the term to the end, and then they assigned a grade based on overall improvement in a student's writing. Students were also permitted to present a written argument supporting why they should receive a certain grade in the course. However, many teachers have seemingly evaluated student performance based on quantity, rather than quality, of work. If a teacher saw that all required assignments were present in the portfolio and the student had demonstrated some improvement, then the teacher assigned an "A" for the student in the course. In my opinion, the lack of a systematic approach to evaluation encourages teachers, particularly less experienced teachers, to privilege sheer volume over quality of work.

In response to this problem, we have implemented a modified grading scale for Spring 2007 that allows teachers to assign individual grades on final drafts as well as the end-of-the-semester portfolio. We have retained elements of holistic evaluation (e.g., students can argue for grades); however, individual grades, as measures, will help the teacher more systematically arrive at a final grade. Moreover, most Rhetoric TAs want to assign grades, and most students are asking for individual grades on their work. A small group of Rhetoric TAs and I will meet at the end of Spring 2007 to determine a more permanent system of evaluation and grading scale, and we will implement that system beginning Fall 2007.

The 2003 report establishes binary oppositions between "teaching" and "learning" as well as "writing improvement" and "making better grades." It states, "We have always stressed that any assessment of writing should be tied to LEARNING as opposed to TEACHING so that the focus is on making sure our students are learning to improve their writing, rather than on whether they are making better grades" (page 4). Although the program will continue to emphasize student-centered learning, the issuance of grades does not impede student-centered learning nor represent an obstacle to students improving their writing. The assigning of grades as part of writing assessment helps students understand their performance more concretely so that they might improve their writing. In addition, several students have remarked that previous holistic evaluation methods were "too subjective." Granted, any evaluation method carries with it a greater or lesser degree of subjectivity, but specific measures enable teachers to calculate more systematically a student's performance. Moreover, teachers have expressed that they, in using the previous holistic approach, had no systematic way or method for determining or calculating a student's final grade. In the final analysis, assigning grades and improving writing complement, rather than contradict, one another.

Rhetoric TA Performance
As Director, I have now made it my standard practice to observe all Rhetoric teachers at least once during the school year; I plan to conduct these observations every academic year during the Fall semester. The vast majority of our Rhetoric TAs have demonstrated above average competence in the classroom, and many have experimented with creative approaches to this course. They have demonstrated creativity, thoroughness, and

conscientiousness, and furthermore, they genuinely care about student learning. In most respects, I am very pleased with our Rhetoric TAs' overall performance.

All TAs are required to use the standardized syllabus, and they must also use the textbooks the Rhetoric Program has adopted (*Aims of Argument* and *A Writer's Resource*). In addition, all Rhetoric TAs must follow the standardized syllabus explicitly. They can, however, rearrange and alter the schedule as long as they teach the required content. I have allowed teachers to add thematic readings and short homework assignments, but they are not permitted to substitute any readings or assignments in the syllabus. Standardization has become a paramount concern in our Rhetoric 1302 classes, and we have taken the necessary steps to ensure consistency and continuity across sections.

Commitment to Teaching Writing Skills
The previous Director of Rhetoric and Writing created the standardized syllabus for 2006-07. The previous Director is to be credited with effectively integrating our new texts for the course, *Aims of Argument* and *A Writer's Resource*, as well as creating sophisticated assignments that call upon students to exercise their critical thinking skills. Furthermore, these assignments require students to practice writing arguments, to synthesize research, and to engage their own writing processes. Our course reflects a renewed emphasis on teaching writing skills; specifically, we are emphasizing to no small degree the student's ability to construct arguments, use evidence, and persuade audiences.

We ask students in Rhetoric 1302 to complete three major writing assignments. These assignments also require students to submit several drafts before final submission their essays. The three major assignments are titled *Inquiry Argument*, *Textual and Visual Essay*, and the *Convincing* or *Motivating Argument*. These assignments reflect progression in terms of complexity and length. We evaluate students based on their ability to present and defend an argument, synthesize research in support of an argument, construct effective sentences, and establish a clear purpose as well as address a clear audience.

These assignments are designed to help meet specific core objectives. For Spring 2007, UTD's Core Curriculum Committee created one new objective specific for Rhetoric 1302, in addition to the other three objectives that all other UTD Communications classes must fulfill:

- Students will be able to write in different ways for different audiences (specific to Rhetoric 1302);
- Students will be able to write effectively using appropriate organization, mechanics, and style;
- Students will be able to construct effective written arguments; and
- Students will be able to gather, incorporate, and interpret source material in their writing.

We have listed these objectives on the first page of the standardized syllabus, and we use these objectives in completing SACS assessment plans and final reports.

SACS Assessment Plans and Final Reports
I have been told that Rhetoric TAs have performed well as related to timely submission of SACS materials. As of November 21, 2006, the SACS team had returned only seven of 32 assessment plans to TAs for corrections and/or modifications. Rhetoric TAs have demonstrated the utmost in cooperation and diligence in completing these tasks and meeting the deadlines. They have also demonstrated considerable initiative in learning the expectations of this process and then accurately executing based on those expectations. For Fall 2006, only one Rhetoric TA failed to submit a final report for SACS. (This person, for other specific reasons, no longer teaches Rhetoric 1302.)

Rhetoric Teaching Assistant Training Initiatives
For Spring 2007, we have begun a series of training workshops emphasizing different themes relevant to teaching Rhetoric 1302. Five experienced Rhetoric TAs are conducting these workshops. These more experienced TAs have developed creative and successful approaches to their writing classes, approaches that I have asked them to share with other Rhetoric teachers. In addition, other faculty from Arts and Humanities have volunteered to help train Rhetoric TAs. One professor of Literary Studies, for instance, has volunteered to conduct a grading workshop at the outset of the 2007-08 academic year to help teachers learn to more effectively assess and evaluate student writing.

Classroom Technology
We teach Rhetoric classes in three different computer-based environments. These classrooms contain Macintosh IMac computers as well as LCD projection screens. A need does exist to update this technology because, as I understand it, the technology is now approximately five years old. We are also experiencing difficulties with the computers; freezes and crashes consistently hamper instruction.

I have considered a few possibilities for updating the technology in these labs. First, we can possibly establish a wireless connection in these classrooms, completely removing all computers and asking students to bring laptops. However, this option assumes that most, if not all, students own laptop computers, and while most UTD students are technologically savvy, most students do not own laptops. Second, we can also write a grant proposal requesting funds for technological upgrades. The Director of Communication/Professional Communication and I have already discussed such an option for the professional communication computer classrooms. The technology in those classrooms desperately needs attention. Every semester, we experience constant (and increasingly annoying) technological malfunctions in the Dell/PC-based professional communication classrooms. To date, we are continuing in our efforts to identify strategies for updating and upgrading technology.

Closing the Loop
During both the current semester and future academic terms, the Rhetoric Program will take the following actions to "close the loop" on a programmatic level:

- Revise and solidify evaluation methods, grading scale

- Continue making available new opportunities for TA training

- Identify technology needs and implement strategies for meeting those needs

- Complete program-level assessment at the end of 2006-07 academic year

- Assess the effectiveness of Spring 2007 evaluation methods for student assignments

- Build stronger ties campus-wide with other schools and also the campus Writing Lab/Center

- Continue to identify specific and more effective assessments for meeting Rhetoric 1302 course objectives

- Seek new methods of instruction that affirm student-centered learning and help students become better writers

In close, I am enthusiastic and excited about the direction the Rhetoric Program is taking. We have employed a good group of Rhetoric TAs who are committed to excellence in teaching and very much care about student learning. Furthermore, we have totally embraced a commitment to teaching writing skills, emphasizing the construction of arguments, clear organization and focus, and also effective style and sentence structure. We will continue teaching students to enhance and improve their writing skills so that they can become more active and successful participants in all facets of democratic society and also their individual lives.

Math Assessment in the Core Curriculum
The University of Texas as Dallas
Spring 2003

Introduction

In compliance with the University of Texas System mandate to assess mathematics competency in the core curriculum, UTD created a mathematics assessment committee in the fall of 2001 to plan the implementation of the evaluation program. The Mathematics Planning Committee, comprised of members of the mathematics faculty, made the initial decisions as to the scope and depth of the assessment. The creation of the Implementation Committee, comprised of faculty directly responsible for the relevant math instruction, was charged with the implementation of the program. The evaluation was completed during the spring 2002 semester.

Planning

The mathematics planning committee made several decisions regarding the organization, scope, and target population for the math assessment.

1. The assessment should include only those students who complete their math core curriculum requirements at UTD. Therefore, assessment will be limited to students who begin UTD as first-time freshmen.
2. Students whose degree plans include at least one year of calculus are judged to have surpassed the core curriculum objectives in mathematics and are exempt from assessment. This includes all students with majors in the School of Business, School of Engineering and Computer Science, and School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics. This represents about 67% of all native undergraduate students.
3. All native students who complete the core curriculum in mathematics by taking courses in college algebra and quantitative methods will be subject to the assessment.
4. Assessment should be limited to students in College Algebra 1300, 1306, and 1314; Statistics 1342, Psychology 2317, and Social Science 3305. The last three courses all involve statistics and quantitative methods.
5. Assessment of educational objectives should be embedded in homework assignments, quiz and examination questions, and projects that are ongoing components of classes.

Implementation

At the recommendation of the Mathematics Planning Committee, the Implementation Committee was formed to operationalize their recommendations. This committee was comprised of the faculty responsible for teaching the targeted classes in algebra and statistics. This committee was chaired by Professor Wiorkowski from the mathematics department and included faculty members from behavioral and brain sciences, mathematics, and social sciences. Their first task was to develop a series of questions deemed suitable to assess the following exemplary objectives in mathematics set down by the UT System.

II. MATHEMATICS

 The objective of the mathematics component of the core curriculum is to develop a quantitatively literate college graduate. Every college graduate should be able to apply basic mathematical tools in the solution of real-world problems.

 Exemplary Educational Objectives

1. To apply arithmetic, algebraic, geometric, higher-order thinking, and statistical methods to modeling and solving real-world situations.

2. To represent and evaluate basic mathematical information verbally, numerically, graphically, and symbolically.

3. To expand mathematical reasoning skills and formal logic to develop convincing mathematical arguments.

 4. To use appropriate technology to enhance mathematical thinking and understanding and to solve mathematical problems and judge the reasonableness of the results.

 5. To interpret mathematical models such as formulas, graphs, tables and schematics, and draw inferences from them.

 6. To recognize the limitations of mathematical and statistical models.

 7. To develop the view that mathematics is an evolving discipline, interrelated with human culture, and understand its connections to other disciplines.

Over several months this committee generated a pool of questions thought to represent each mathematics objective and met several times to discuss the adequacy of specific questions. The pool of questions (See Attachment 1) underwent several revisions in reaction to the concerns of specific committee members. Two questions from each of the seven objectives were selected by individual faculty to include in their standard evaluations and homework

assignments. All instructors agreed to keep permanent records of all students' answers to the assessment questions and release them to the Office of Undergraduate Education at the end of the spring 2003 semester. Responses to assessment items were scored as percent correct.

Results

The responses of all eligible students (N=75) were extracted from the population of students taking college algebra and quantitative methods classes during the spring semester. Data were aggregated by course and objective. Scores were expressed as percent correct.

Table 1

				Exemplary Educational Objective				
	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	Total
Percent Correct	93.28%	79.60%	77.02%	83.20%	85.80%	88.93%	92.67%	85.74%

Table 1 collapses responses across classes to view the assessment results by objective. Student proficiency ranged from a high of 98.28% for the objective relating to mathematical skills and real-world situations to a low of 77.02% on the objective assessing mathematical arguments. The average percent correct, 85.74% would correspond to an approximate grade of B- for students.

Table 2 repartitions the results by course having collapsed across objective. The slight difference in total percent correct between the two tables results from rounding errors in aggregating the data. Student performance varied minimally based on whether the course was taught within the math department (84.3%) or by faculty from other schools (86.9%). There were also small differences between classes in college algebra (85.7%) and quantitative methods (87.5%).

Table 2

Course	Number	Average Correct
MATH 1306-001	13	93.08%
STAT 1342-002	8	79.78%
MATH 1314-001	12	77.78%
PSYCH 1372	21	91.84%
SOC 3305 BRAY	9	80.56%
STAT 1342-001	10	81.97%
STAT 3305 TARAS	2	88.93%
Total Number	75	
Average over Classes		84.85%

Summary

The results from our spring 2003 mathematics evaluation of liberal arts and social and behavioral science students seems a satisfactory indication of these student's mastery of the broad educational objectives in mathematics set down by the UT System. The implementation committee is meeting again this fall to generate additional assessment questions, recalibrate the metrics used to grade the responses, and discuss how we might alter the curriculum in specific classes to improve student scores with regard to specific objectives.

School of Natural Sciences & Math – Math Focus Group
Executive Summary Report 2006

The Math Focus Group Committee was established in Spring of 2006, to study and make recommendations on the retention issues related to mathematics gateway courses (mainly calculus courses). The Committee consisted of Drs. Ray Allum, Cy Cantrell, Mary Chaffin, Michael Coleman, John Ferraris (Committee Chair), John Hoffman, Ali Hooshyar, and Simeon Ntafos. To understand the retention issues a considerable amount of data was studied, some of which will be presented in this summary. In order to have some DFW benchmark rates, average DFW rate over three years for UT-Austin, University of New Mexico and UTD are presented:

University	Science Calculus I	Pre-Calculus	Applied Calculus I
U of New Mexico	46.20%	41.50%	45.10%
UT-Austin	30.15%	25.35%	36.82%
UT- Dallas (over all)	42.07%	34.72%	35.61%
UTD (1st time freshman)	28.07%	31.66%	22.50%

The Committee's finding indicates that UTD's DFW rate for first-time freshmen is comparable to tier-one schools. However, unlike tier one schools, UTD has more upper division students, part-time students and transfer students who are still taking gateway courses, or are repeating them. Thus a higher over all DFW rate is obtained as compared to tier one schools. Looking into details of DFW rates by students' background (such as SAT, major and class level) led the Committee to make following recommendations:

1.) A grade of "C" or better be required for prerequisite courses. For example to enroll in Math 2417, students should have received a grade of "C" or better in Math 2312. This recommendation requires the undergraduate catalog to be revised accordingly.

2.) Available data indicates that students who received less than 50% on the first two quizzes in Math 2417 have a 77% chance of being in the DFW category in Math 2417. Since such "at risk" students can be identified within the first two weeks of a semester, the Committee recommends that such students be notified and be required to attend additional supplemental help sessions throughout the remaining part of the semester.

3.) The Mathematical Sciences Department continues its curriculum coordination with the clientele departments and contacts them to review and if needed update content of their service courses accordingly.

4.) Too much grade variation was noticed between different sections of pre-calculus and applied calculus. The need for further coordination between instructors teaching different sections of such courses was recommended. Similarly, further coordination between instructors teaching prerequisite courses and instructors teaching gateway courses are recommended.

5.) Requiring students to retake prerequisites, if they have satisfied prerequisites in the distant past is favored by the committee, but needs further consideration. In other words having satisfied the prerequisites in the distant past does not guarantee readiness for a course. Need to put in place the mechanism of testing readiness for such students.

6.) Available data indicates that performance in a course was better for those students who took the prerequisites as compared to those who repeated the course. Thus, it is recommended that student advisors encourage their students who receive a grade of D or F in a gateway course to take the prerequisites over again before repeating the course.

7.) Class attendance is believed to improve the DFW rate. To test this hypothesis Dean Coleman has assigned a work study student to take attendance in three sections of Math 2417 and three other sections of Math 2417 will not be taking attendance. DFW comparison between these groups at the end of the semester will assist the committee in making recommendations regarding this issue.

8.) Available data indicated that SAT II Math 2C of 630 is a good benchmark for placement in Math 2417 and SAT II 1C score of 550 is an appropriate benchmark for admission to Math 2312. However, available SAT II 1C data did not provide satisfactory benchmarks for placement in Math 2417 or Math 1325. Dean Coleman offered to provide similar data for fall 2006, so that SAT benchmark decisions and course placement could be made after more data becomes available.

Summary of Assessment Outcome, Grades, and Student Course Ratings Fall 2006

crs_sec_term_instr	Core Code	TotGrds	ClassGPA	Apercent	Bpercent	Cpercent	Dpercent	Fpercent	Xpercent	Wpercent	DFWperc	No. Measures	Measures Met	All Outcomes	Evals#18	Evals#14
						Grade Distributions							SACS Assessment Outcome		Student Course Ratings	
ATEC3320.001.06f.Johnson J	10	20	3.37	55%	30%	10%	0%	5%	0%	0%	5%	8	7	Partially	3.3	3.67
ATEC3325.001.06f.Gooch J	10	20	2.67	25%	40%	25%	5%	5%	0%	0%	10%	7	7	Met	3.8	4.07
BA4305.001.06f.Goktan B	10	55	3.14	38%	47%	11%	2%	2%	0%	5%	3%	8	8	Met	3.9	3.84
BA4305.002.06f.Kaplan M	10	13	3.85	92%	0%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	8	8	Met	4.7	4.74
BA4305.003.06f.Oliff M	10	72	3.30	51%	42%	1%	0%	6%	0%	0%	6%	8	0	Not Met	4.2	4.40
BA4305.501.06f.Goktan B	10	73	2.97	33%	42%	19%	1%	4%	0%	1%	8%	8	8	Met	3.4	3.63
BA4305.502.06f.Oliff M	10	80	3.43	59%	35%	5%	0%	1%	0%	2%	4%	8	0	Not Met	4.3	4.46
BIOL3V91.001.06f.Breen G	10	1	4.00	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	8	4	Not Met		
BIOL3V91.015.06f.D'Mello S	10	1	4.00	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	8	6	Partially		
BIOL3V91.017.06f.Goodman S	10	3	4.00	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	6	6	Met		
BIOL3V91.098.06f.Haines D	10	1	4.00	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10	10	Met		
BIS3320.001.06f.Sachs A	10	40	3.51	75%	10%	10%	3%	3%	2%	9%	7%	12	10	Partially	4.6	4.61
BIS3320.002.06f.Wright D	10	21	3.14	52%	29%	10%	0%	10%	0%	5%	9%	12	12	Met	4.3	4.56
BIS3320.004.06f.Sachs A	10	8	2.92	38%	38%	13%	0%	13%	0%	11%	11%	10	9	Partially	4.3	4.44
BIS3320.501.06f.Wright D	10	36	2.92	44%	25%	17%	6%	8%	0%	5%	13%	10	10	Met	4.0	4.20
CGS3340.501.06f.Golden R	10	1	3.67	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	12	12	Met		
CHEM4V91.003.06f.Goux W	10	3	4.00	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	8	7	Partially		
CHEM4V91.004.06f.Dieckmann G	10	2	4.00	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	11	8	Partially		
CHEM4V91.005.06f.Melton L	10	1	4.00	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	8	1	Not Met		
CHEM4V91.007.06f.Haines D	10	8	3.50	88%	0%	0%	0%	13%	0%	0%	13%	11	11	Met		
CHEM4V91.009.06f.Musselman I	10	1	4.00	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	8	8	Met		
CHEM4V91.010.06f.Pantano P	10	2	4.00	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	11	11	Met		
CHEM4V91.012.06f.Sibert J	10	6	4.00	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10	8	Partially		
CHEM4V91.018.06f.Yang D	10	0							100%	0%	100%	4	0			
CHEM4V91.021.06f.Ahn J	10	5	3.93	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	8	8	Met		
CHEM4V91.022.06f.Nielsen S	10	1	3.67	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	8	8	Met		
CLDP3394.001.06f.Holub S	10	9	2.63	33%	33%	11%	11%	11%	0%	18%	18%	8	4	Not Met	4.5	4.07
ECS3390.001.06f.Johnson J	10	19	3.46	47%	53%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	12	12	Met		
ECS3390.002.06f.Johnson J	10	19	3.44	63%	32%	0%	0%	5%	0%	0%	5%	12	12	Met		
ECS3390.004.06f.Bell L	10	18	2.93	33%	28%	39%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	11	7	Partially		
ECS3390.005.06f.Pryor T	10	20	3.38	55%	40%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	11	7	Partially		
ECS3390.006.06f.Johnson J	10	19	3.42	53%	42%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	11	11	Met		
ECS3390.007.06f.Bell L	10	15	3.56	53%	47%	0%	0%	0%	0%	6%	0%	11	11	Met		
ECS3390.008.06f.Lane S	10	17	2.78	18%	41%	41%	0%	0%	0%	6%	0%	11	11	Met		

crs_sec_term_instr	Core Code	TotGrds	ClassGPA	Apercent	Bpercent	Cpercent	Dpercent	Fpercent	Xpercent	Wpercent	DFWperc	No. Measures	Measures Met	All Outcomes	Evals#18	Evals#14
ECS3390.501.06f.Bell L	10	11	3.52	64%	27%	9%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	11	11	Met		
EE4381.501.06f.Tacca M	10	19	3.69	79%	21%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	9	9	Met	4.0	5.00
EE4381.502.06f.Tacca M	10	14	3.88	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%	0%	7%	8	8	Met	4.8	4.64
EE4382.014.06f.Kalam M	10	11	4.00	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4	4	Met	4.0	3.90
EE4382.046.06f.Bhatia D	10	1	4.00	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	8	8	Met		
EE4382.077.06f.Hu W	10	2	4.00	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	7	7	Met		
EE4387.001.06f.Blanchard A	10	2	4.00	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	9	9	Met		
EE4387.004.06f.Kalam M	10	2	4.00	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4	4	Met		
GEOS4V09.015.06f.Brikowski T	10	1	4.00	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4	4	Met		
HUMA3300.001.06f.Wickberg D	10	35	2.57	11%	57%	17%	0%	14%	0%	5%	18%	4	4	Met	3.6	3.97
HUMA3300.002.06f.Wickberg D	10	34	2.76	12%	68%	12%	0%	9%	0%	11%	13%	4	4	Met	3.3	3.47
HUMA3300.003.06f.Gossin P	10	34	3.42	53%	38%	6%	0%	3%	0%	3%	3%	8	7	Partially	4.5	4.75
HUMA3300.502.06f.Cohen M	10	33	2.45	18%	27%	39%	12%	3%	0%	6%	14%	4	3	Partially	3.3	3.67
MATH4398.002.06f.Dabkowski M	10	2	4.00	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	8	8	Met		
NATS4310.001.06f.Reed R	10	19	3.07	42%	42%	5%	11%	0%	0%	0%	11%	8	6	Partially	3.3	3.50
NSC4353.001.06f.Greenwald R	10	17	3.53	71%	24%	0%	0%	6%	0%	0%	6%	4	4	Met	4.7	4.29
NSC4353.002.06f.Greenwald R	10	14	3.71	93%	0%	0%	0%	7%	7%	0%	13%	4	4	Met	3.3	3.50
PA3310.001.06f.Robinson S	10	11	2.48	27%	27%	18%	9%	18%	0%	8%	38%	8	5	Partially	3.4	3.78
PHYS4399.004.06f.Earle G	10	1	4.00	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4	4	Met		
PSY3393.001.06f.Mills C	10	23	3.38	61%	22%	13%	0%	4%	0%	4%	13%	4	3	Partially	4.7	4.62
PSY3393.002.06f.Tillman G	10	24	3.25	46%	38%	13%	4%	0%	0%	4%	12%	3	3	Met	3.9	3.97
PSY3393.501.06f.Golden R	10	24	3.53	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4%	0%	12	12	Met	2.8	2.78
RHET1302.001.06f.Manes C	10	14	2.45	29%	29%	21%	14%	7%	0%	7%	20%	9	7	Partially	4.0	3.89
RHET1302.002.06f.Dorley B	10	15	3.71	93%	0%	0%	0%	7%	0%	0%	7%	4	4	Met	4.5	4.30
RHET1302.003.06f.Fassler J	10	13	2.85	31%	38%	23%	0%	8%	0%	13%	33%	4	0	Not Met	3.0	3.24
RHET1302.004.06f.Manes C	10	15	2.91	47%	13%	27%	13%	0%	0%	0%	13%	6	5	Partially	3.0	2.80
RHET1302.005.06f.Dorley B	10	13	3.28	62%	31%	0%	0%	8%	0%	7%	7%	4	4	Met	2.9	2.59
RHET1302.006.06f.Codd M	10	20	3.13	40%	40%	15%	0%	5%	0%	0%	5%	8	5	Partially	3.3	3.90
RHET1302.007.06f.Ali S	10	15	3.13	60%	13%	13%	0%	13%	0%	0%	13%	4	4	Met	3.8	3.94
RHET1302.008.06f.DONALD S	10	15	3.02	27%	60%	7%	0%	7%	0%	0%	7%	12	4	Not Met	3.9	3.93

						Grade Distributions						SACS Assessment Outcome			Student Course Ratings	
crs_sec_term_instr	Core Code	TotGrds	ClassGPA	Apercent	Bpercent	Cpercent	Dpercent	Fpercent	Xpercent	Wpercent	DFWperc	No. Measures	Measures Met	All Outcomes	Evals#18	Evals#14
RHET1302.010.06f.Ali S	10	14	3.36	64%	21%	7%	0%	7%	0%	0%	7%	4	4	Met	4.4	4.57
RHET1302.011.06f.DONALD S	10	14	2.79	29%	36%	29%	7%	0%	0%	7%	20%	12	6	Not Met	4.5	4.64
RHET1302.013.06f.Jordan J	10	15	3.33	53%	27%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10	10	Met	4.6	4.71
RHET1302.014.06f.Pettineo J	10	12	3.97	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	14%	29%	4	4	Met	4.6	4.42
RHET1302.015.06f.Basu S	10	19	3.86	95%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4	4	Met	4.9	4.87
RHET1302.016.06f.Jordan J	10	15	2.98	60%	13%	13%	0%	13%	0%	0%	13%	9	6	Partially	4.6	4.76
RHET1302.017.06f.Pettineo J	10	14	3.21	57%	21%	14%	0%	7%	0%	0%	7%	4	4	Met	3.7	4.15
RHET1302.018.06f.Karki D	10	19	3.25	68%	21%	0%	0%	11%	0%	5%	20%	8	5	Partially	2.0	2.89
RHET1302.019.06f.Hadjebian F	10	14	3.17	57%	29%	7%	0%	7%	0%	0%	7%	8	8	Met	3.3	3.67
RHET1302.020.06f.Serebrianik N	10	15	3.56	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	8	7	Partially	3.2	3.57
RHET1302.021.06f.Wood H	10	17	3.82	88%	12%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4	4	Met	3.8	4.00
RHET1302.022.06f.Hadjebian F	10	16	2.75	38%	31%	19%	0%	13%	0%	0%	13%	8	8	Met	2.7	3.21
RHET1302.023.06f.Serebrianik N	10	14	3.22	57%	21%	14%	7%	0%	0%	7%	20%	8	7	Partially	3.7	4.14
RHET1302.024.06f.Ramachandran	10	20	3.33	65%	20%	5%	5%	5%	0%	0%	10%	10	9	Partially	4.2	4.12

RHET1302.025.06f.Ward D	10	14	2.64	43%	21%	14%	0%	21%	0%	0%	21%	16	14	Partially	3.5	3.55
RHET1302.026.06f.Bowman S	10	13	2.41	31%	38%	0%	8%	23%	0%	13%	40%	8	5	Partially	4.5	4.29
RHET1302.027.06f.Alex K	10	19	3.51	74%	21%	0%	0%	5%	0%	5%	15%	4	4	Met	3.0	3.96
RHET1302.028.06f.Ward D	10	11	3.06	27%	45%	27%	0%	0%	0%	8%	0%	15	12	Partially	3.8	3.37
RHET1302.029.06f.Bowman S	10	15	2.69	53%	13%	7%	7%	20%	0%	0%	27%	8	5	Partially	4.3	4.40
RHET1302.030.06f.Boudard R	10	18	3.17	67%	22%	0%	0%	11%	0%	5%	10%	6	6	Met	1.3	2.60
RHET1302.501.06f.MacKenzie T	10	15	3.02	40%	40%	13%	0%	7%	0%	0%	7%	8	5	Partially	3.4	3.36
RHET1302.502.06f.Douglas T	10	15	3.53	67%	27%	0%	0%	7%	0%	11%	17%	9	8	Partially	3.8	4.21
RHET1302.503.06f.Dixon L	10	18	3.35	61%	22%	11%	0%	6%	0%	0%	6%	8	8	Met	4.0	4.24
SOC3377.001.06f.Ezzet R	10	7	2.57	29%	29%	14%	14%	14%	0%	22%	22%	7	7	Met	4.7	4.50
SPAU3390.040.06f.Kaplan K	10	0							0%	0%	0%	8	8	Met		
SPAU3390.069.06f.Kenedi H	10	0							0%	0%	0%	8	8	Met		
MATH1306.001.06f.Robinson J	20	68	2.98	38%	31%	22%	6%	3%	0%	3%	11%	6	6	Met	3.3	3.74
MATH1306.501.06f.Scott W	20	62	3.01	42%	37%	16%	0%	5%	0%	2%	5%	6	6	Met	4.8	4.84
MATH1314.001.06f.Robinson J	20	50	2.22	28%	22%	16%	12%	22%	0%	6%	40%	6	6	Met	3.4	3.39
MATH1314.002.06f.Stanford P	20	80	3.07	43%	38%	13%	3%	5%	0%	2%	10%	9	9	Met	3.6	4.57
MATH1314.003.06f.Baron M	20	69	2.32	25%	29%	20%	7%	19%	0%	1%	28%	6	3	Not Met	3.1	3.57
MATH1314.501.06f.Seekri R	20	56	2.38	27%	32%	14%	5%	21%	0%	6%	24%	6	6	Met	3.0	3.30
MATH1314.502.06f.Seekri R	20	55	2.02	13%	29%	27%	9%	22%	0%	4%	30%	6	6	Met	3.3	3.70
MATH1325.001.06f.Kehoe J	20	81	2.41	37%	21%	14%	6%	22%	0%	11%	40%	6	5	Partially	3.8	3.77
MATH1325.002.06f.Stanford P	20	112	2.77	43%	25%	13%	9%	10%	0%	12%	34%	9	7	Partially	4.3	4.34
MATH1325.501.06f.Malek S	20	63	2.12	22%	27%	21%	8%	22%	0%	12%	42%	3	3	Met	3.6	3.82
MATH1325.502.06f.Aaron N	20	54	2.25	26%	28%	11%	19%	17%	0%	8%	38%	6	3	Not Met	3.2	3.11
MATH1326.001.06f.Stanford P	20	78	2.33	24%	27%	23%	12%	14%	0%	10%	34%	9	7	Partially	3.8	3.68
MATH1326.002.06f.Blankenship J	20	37	3.24	43%	43%	8%	3%	3%	3%	0%	8%	3	0	Not Met	4.1	3.63
MATH1326.501.06f.Rotenberry J	20	45	1.42	13%	16%	22%	9%	40%	0%	22%	77%	9	5	Partially	2.3	2.28
MATH1326.502.06f.Scott W	20	39	2.33	33%	21%	21%	0%	26%	0%	11%	27%	7	7	Met	4.4	4.33
MATH2312.001.06f.Lewis D	20	101	1.99	18%	25%	21%	13%	24%	0%	13%	45%	10	6	Partially	4.1	4.22
MATH2312.002.06f.Scott W	20	70	2.29	24%	26%	27%	6%	17%	0%	3%	25%	7	6	Partially	4.1	4.27
MATH2312.003.06f.Scott W	20	111	2.34	23%	31%	22%	12%	13%	0%	7%	34%	7	6	Partially	3.8	4.03
MATH2312.501.06f.Malek S	20	64	1.82	14%	22%	23%	16%	25%	0%	9%	43%	5	3	Partially	3.9	4.20
MATH2417.001.06f.Garrett B	20	82	2.23	18%	28%	29%	9%	16%	0%	10%	28%	8	3	Not Met	3.5	3.71
MATH2417.002.06f.Allum F	20	96	2.45	28%	31%	18%	10%	13%	0%	7%	31%	8	6	Partially	4.3	4.52
MATH2417.003.06f.Garrett B	20	89	2.18	19%	27%	28%	8%	18%	1%	5%	33%	8	4	Not Met	3.8	3.29
MATH2417.004.06f.Lewis D	20	69	1.90	20%	23%	17%	9%	30%	0%	14%	49%	8	5	Partially	3.9	4.25
MATH2417.005.06f.Garrett B	20	69	1.98	14%	23%	33%	9%	20%	0%	12%	41%	8	4	Not Met	3.6	3.65
MATH2417.501.06f.Allum F	20	58	1.68	17%	21%	12%	19%	31%	1%	16%	57%	8	4	Not Met	3.8	4.24
MATH2419.001.06f.Allum F	20	88	2.06	20%	23%	20%	18%	18%	0%	5%	41%	10	6	Partially	4.0	4.25
MATH2419.002.06f.Lewis D	20	93	1.90	12%	29%	23%	11%	26%	0%	8%	46%	10	5	Not Met	3.9	4.12
MATH2419.501.06f.Lewis D	20	46	1.73	15%	13%	26%	17%	28%	2%	11%	48%	8	4	Not Met		
PSY2317.001.06f.Juhn N	20	46	2.37	11%	48%	17%	15%	9%	4%	11%	37%	6	4	Partially	3.9	4.40
PSY2317.002.06f.Juhn N	20	54	2.40	28%	28%	19%	13%	13%	6%	8%	38%	6	4	Partially	4.4	4.25
PSY2317.501.06f.Edelman B	20	62	2.86	26%	52%	13%	5%	5%	4%	6%	19%	8	5	Partially	3.8	3.94
SOCS3305.002.06f.Ho K	20	22	2.49	36%	14%	32%	5%	14%	4%	8%	36%	3	1	Not Met		
SOCS3305.501.06f.Dholakia K	20	44	3.23	52%	34%	5%	2%	7%	0%	4%	9%	7	7	Met	4.0	4.43
STAT1342.001.06f.Marks F	20	45	2.50	24%	36%	20%	4%	16%	0%	2%	23%	3	3	Met	3.1	3.28
STAT1342.501.06f.Marks F	20	29	2.54	34%	17%	28%	17%	3%	0%	3%	27%	3	3	Met	3.6	3.73
STAT3332.001.06f.Serfling R	20	72	3.41	58%	26%	13%	1%	1%	0%	5%	8%	6	6	Met	2.6	2.96
STAT3360.001.06f.Ammann L	20	59	2.84	39%	34%	15%	5%	7%	0%	6%	17%	6	0	Not Met	3.3	2.97
STAT3360.002.06f.Koshevnik Y	20	101	3.44	71%	16%	5%	3%	5%	1%	3%	12%	9	8	Partially	3.8	4.10

		Grade Distributions										SACS Assessment Outcome	Student Course Ratings

crs_sec_term_instr	Core Code	TotGrds	ClassGPA	Apercent	Bpercent	Cpercent	Dpercent	Fpercent	Xpercent	Wpercent	DFWperc	No. Measures	Measures Met	All Outcomes	Evals#18	Evals#14
STAT3360.501.06f.Watson D	20	87	2.15	22%	21%	26%	16%	15%	1%	5%	34%	9	0	Not Met	2.4	2.72
STAT3360.502.06f.Koshevnik Y	20	75	3.22	63%	17%	11%	1%	8%	0%	5%	19%	9	9	Met	3.9	4.08
BIOL1300.001.06f.Sapozhnikov I	30	49	3.67	76%	18%	2%	2%	2%	0%	2%	4%	6	6	Met	3.3	3.04
BIOL1300.002.06f.Sapozhnikov I	30	50	3.86	92%	6%	0%	0%	2%	0%	4%	2%	6	6	Met	3.7	2.98
BIOL1300.003.06f.Sapozhnikov I	30	47	3.84	91%	2%	6%	0%	0%	0%	2%	4%	6	6	Met	3.7	3.34
BIOL1300.501.06f.Friedman G	30	45	3.00	44%	31%	13%	4%	7%	0%	2%	11%	6	6	Met	3.0	2.70
BIOL1300.502.06f.Friedman G	30	10	3.07	40%	40%	10%	10%	0%	0%	0%	10%	6	6	Met	3.0	2.83
BIOL1318.001.06f.Bulla L	30	56	2.39	30%	20%	21%	18%	11%	2%	7%	31%	6	1	Not Met	3.6	3.47
BIOL1320.001.06f.Robinson S	30	26	2.40	15%	31%	38%	8%	8%	0%	10%	34%	6	6	Met	4.4	4.24
BIOL2281.001.06f.LIN W	30	23	3.23	26%	61%	13%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4	4	Met	4.6	4.60
BIOL2281.002.06f.LIN W	30	24	3.22	54%	29%	8%	0%	8%	0%	0%	8%	4	4	Met	4.1	4.29
BIOL2281.003.06f.Zhou Z	30	19	3.46	53%	37%	11%	0%	0%	0%	5%	0%	3	3	Met	4.1	4.10
BIOL2281.004.06f.Lin W	30	22	3.06	32%	45%	14%	9%	0%	0%	4%	9%	4	4	Met	4.2	4.26
BIOL2281.501.06f.Zhou Z	30	20	3.57	75%	15%	5%	5%	0%	0%	0%	5%	3	3	Met	3.6	3.63
BIOL2311.001.06f.Robinson S	30	105	2.63	38%	24%	16%	8%	14%	0%	10%	34%	6	6	Met	4.4	4.28
BIOL2311.501.06f.Burr J	30	59	2.74	24%	41%	27%	8%	0%	0%	10%	7%	6	5	Partially	3.8	4.18
BIOL2312.001.06f.Yu W	30	76	2.78	33%	30%	18%	12%	7%	0%	1%	18%	5	1	Not Met	3.9	3.63
BIOL3318.501.06f.Watts A	30	151	2.85	30%	40%	19%	5%	5%	1%	1%	11%	6	6	Met	2.6	2.84
BIOL3350.001.06f.Sapozhnikov I	30	155	3.65	76%	19%	1%	1%	3%	0%	1%	5%	7	7	Met	3.4	3.42
BIOL3350.501.06f.Sapozhnikov I	30	155	3.72	81%	14%	4%	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%	7	7	Met	3.3	3.42
BIOL3351.001.06f.Breen G	30	43	3.06	53%	19%	16%	7%	5%	0%	2%	11%	6	6	Met	3.7	3.74
BIOL3455.501.06f.Moltz J	30	27	1.84	15%	19%	30%	7%	30%	0%	20%	51%	6	3	Not Met	4.5	3.58
BIOL3455.502.06f.Moltz J	30	24	2.22	17%	38%	13%	13%	21%	0%	25%	44%	6	4	Met	4.1	3.89
BIOL3456.501.06f.Moltz J	30	33	2.85	15%	61%	15%	9%	0%	0%	3%	9%	6	4	Met	3.9	3.83
CGS2301.001.06f.O'Toole A	30	61	2.72	43%	23%	13%	5%	16%	0%	3%	20%	4	3	Partially	3.5	3.95
CHEM1111.101.06f.Gavva S	30	34	3.72	88%	6%	3%	0%	3%	0%	3%	3%	2	2	Met	3.3	3.23
CHEM1111.102.06f.Gavva S	30	35	3.68	80%	14%	3%	0%	3%	0%	3%	3%	2	2	Met	3.6	3.57
CHEM1111.103.06f.Gavva S	30	34	3.94	97%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%	0%	2	2	Met	3.8	3.77
CHEM1111.104.06f.Gavva S	30	25	3.56	80%	12%	0%	0%	8%	0%	31%	33%	2	2	Met	3.2	3.10
CHEM1111.105.06f.Gavva S	30	35	3.79	86%	11%	3%	0%	0%	0%	3%	6%	2	2	Met	2.6	2.83
CHEM1111.106.06f.Gavva S	30	34	3.81	85%	12%	3%	0%	0%	0%	3%	0%	2	2	Met	2.9	3.17
CHEM1111.107.06f.Gavva S	30	30	3.78	83%	13%	0%	0%	3%	0%	6%	3%	2	2	Met	3.3	3.44
CHEM1111.108.06f.Gavva S	30	33	3.54	76%	15%	3%	0%	6%	0%	3%	6%	2	2	Met	3.4	3.41
CHEM1111.109.06f.Gavva S	30	35	3.77	94%	0%	0%	0%	6%	0%	3%	11%	2	2	Met	3.6	3.28
CHEM1111.110.06f.Mcgovern G	30	24	3.24	63%	21%	4%	0%	13%	0%	8%	19%	3	3	Met	3.5	3.47
CHEM1111.111.06f.Mcgovern G	30	29	3.32	66%	21%	0%	3%	10%	0%	12%	24%	3	3	Met	4.0	4.12
CHEM1111.112.06f.Gavva S	30	36	3.89	94%	3%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2	2	Met	3.4	3.22
CHEM1111.113.06f.Gavva S	30	30	3.87	90%	7%	3%	0%	0%	3%	3%	3%	2	2	Met		
CHEM1111.601.06f.Mcgovern G	30	36	3.85	92%	6%	0%	0%	3%	0%	0%	3%	3	3	Met	3.3	3.79
CHEM1111.602.06f.Mcgovern G	30	12	3.81	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3	3	Met	3.9	4.17
CHEM1112.101.06f.Gavva S	30	21	3.67	86%	5%	5%	0%	5%	0%	5%	5%	2	2	Met	3.9	3.86
CHEM1112.102.06f.Gavva S	30	31	3.60	77%	13%	3%	3%	3%	0%	6%	6%	2	2	All	3.3	3.40
CHEM1112.103.06f.Gavva S	30	17	2.63	47%	18%	6%	12%	18%	0%	32%	44%	2	2	Met	3.5	3.29
CHEM1311.001.06f.Dieckmann G	30	161	2.16	16%	29%	27%	12%	15%	0%	7%	37%	6	3	Not Met	3.5	3.49
CHEM1311.002.06f.Dieckmann G	30	163	1.89	15%	20%	30%	17%	19%	0%	7%	42%	6	1	Not Met		
CHEM1311.003.06f.Nielsen S	30	144	1.82	13%	26%	26%	10%	26%	0%	14%	48%	6	3	Not Met	3.0	2.88
CHEM1311.004.06f.Melton L	30	34	1.78	24%	12%	18%	18%	29%	0%	11%	58%	6	2	Not Met	3.1	2.37
CHEM1312.001.06f.Goux W	30	100	1.92	12%	23%	30%	18%	17%	0%	11%	38%	6	1	Not Met	3.1	3.12
GEOS1103.101.06f.Pujana I	30	21	3.48	71%	14%	14%	0%	0%	0%	13%	8%	10	10	Met	4.1	3.87

crs_sec_term_instr	Core Code	TotGrds	ClassGPA	Apercent	Bpercent	Cpercent	Dpercent	Fpercent	Xpercent	Wpercent	DFWperc	No. Measures	Measures Met	All Outcomes	Evals#18	Evals#14
GEOS1103.102.06f.Pujana I	30	20	2.68	35%	25%	30%	0%	10%	0%	0%	10%	9	8	Partially	4.0	3.96
GEOS1104.101.06f.Pujana I	30	17	3.57	82%	6%	6%	0%	6%	0%	0%	6%	7	7	Met	4.4	4.62
GEOS1303.001.06f.Manton W	30	66	2.59	15%	42%	32%	8%	3%	0%	6%	16%	8	4	Not Met	3.2	3.06
GEOS1304.001.06f.Stern R	30	19	3.00	37%	42%	11%	0%	11%	0%	0%	11%	4	4	Met	4.0	3.78
GEOS3101.0S1.06f.Manton W	30	116	3.13	33%	48%	18%	0%	1%	0%	3%	1%	3	2	Partially	3.6	3.75
GEOS3110.101.06f.Brikowski T	30	13	3.51	62%	31%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2	2	Met	4.8	4.69
GEOS3110.102.06f.Brikowski T	30	15	3.13	67%	7%	13%	7%	7%	0%	6%	13%	2	2	Met	4.7	4.25
GEOS3132.101.06f.Montgomery H	30	41	3.01	39%	37%	22%	0%	2%	0%	7%	11%	1	1	Met	1.9	2.03
GEOS3132.102.06f.Montgomery H	30	24	2.53	25%	50%	4%	0%	21%	0%	0%	21%	1	1	Met	3.5	3.50
GEOS3310.001.06f.Brikowski T	30	71	3.05	35%	41%	20%	0%	4%	0%	0%	4%	2	1	Partially	4.0	4.03
GEOS3321.001.06f.Pujana I	30	17	3.02	35%	47%	12%	0%	6%	0%	6%	6%	11	11	Met	4.8	4.76
GEOS3332.001.06f.Montgomery H	30	136	2.76	42%	26%	15%	7%	11%	0%	9%	21%	4	3	Partially	4.9	4.83
GEOS3332.002.06f.Montgomery H	30	14	3.48	71%	14%	14%	0%	0%	0%	7%	13%	3	3	Met	4.3	4.47
GEOS3432.501.06f.Pujana I	30	16	3.54	75%	19%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	9	9	Met	4.0	3.83
ISGS4305.001.06f.Salter E	30	51	2.16	25%	24%	16%	18%	18%	0%	7%	33%	9	5	Partially	4.1	4.05

					Grade Distributions							SACS Assessment Outcome			Student Course Ratings	
crs_sec_term_instr	Core Code	TotGrds	ClassGPA	Apercent	Bpercent	Cpercent	Dpercent	Fpercent	Xpercent	Wpercent	DFWperc	No. Measures	Measures Met	All Outcomes	Evals#18	Evals#14
ISNS3367.001.06f.Manton W	30	109	2.64	18%	46%	22%	9%	5%	0%	3%	13%	12	5	Not Met	2.4	2.83
ISNS3367.002.06f.Pujana I	30	120	2.85	32%	34%	26%	7%	2%	0%	2%	8%	7	4	Partially	4.0	3.87
ISNS3368.001.06f.Jackson R	30	90	2.70	21%	34%	40%	2%	2%	0%	1%	4%	7	7	Met	3.9	3.94
NATS1111.101.06f.Anderson P	30	15	3.53	67%	27%	0%	7%	0%	0%	0%	7%	2	2	Met	4.7	4.26
NATS1111.102.06f.Anderson P	30	12	2.94	50%	17%	17%	8%	8%	0%	8%	15%	2	1	Not Met	4.2	4.60
NATS1111.103.06f.Anderson P	30	12	2.31	50%	8%	0%	8%	33%	0%	0%	42%	2	2	Met	4.0	4.00
NATS1311.001.06f.Anderson P	30	42	2.37	21%	29%	29%	10%	12%	0%	2%	26%	6	2	Not Met	4.1	4.31
NSC3361.001.06f.Kilgard M	30	260	2.45	27%	26%	23%	10%	13%	0%	9%	30%	9	5	Partially	4.1	4.23
NSC4352.001.06f.Atzori M	30	108	3.45	62%	24%	8%	3%	3%	0%	2%	5%	9	9	Met	3.6	3.72
NSC4354.001.06f.Thompson L	30	84	3.27	49%	33%	12%	6%	0%	0%	6%	6%	9	9	Met	3.9	3.83
PHYS1101.101.06f.Rasmussen B	30	16	3.06	69%	0%	13%	6%	13%	0%	14%	14%	4	0	Not Met	3.4	3.89
PHYS1101.601.06f.Rasmussen B	30	23	3.49	70%	17%	4%	9%	0%	0%	4%	8%	4	0	Not Met	3.5	3.50
PHYS1101.602.06f.Rasmussen B	30	19	3.54	79%	5%	11%	0%	5%	0%	26%	11%	4	4	Met	4.1	4.40
PHYS1301.501.06f.Rasmussen B	30	63	2.19	29%	19%	17%	13%	22%	0%	26%	54%	6	3	Not Met	2.0	2.19
PHYS2125.101.06f.Rasmussen B	30	30	3.83	93%	0%	3%	3%	0%	0%	0%	3%	4	4	Met	2.0	3.42
PHYS2125.102.06f.Rasmussen B	30	28	3.57	79%	7%	11%	0%	4%	0%	7%	3%	4	0	Not Met	3.9	4.17
PHYS2125.103.06f.Rasmussen B	30	25	2.52	32%	32%	8%	12%	16%	0%	7%	39%	4	0	Not Met	4.1	4.47
PHYS2125.601.06f.Rasmussen B	30	28	3.62	75%	18%	4%	0%	4%	0%	7%	10%	4	4	Met	3.9	4.10
PHYS2125.602.06f.Rasmussen B	30	26	3.62	85%	8%	0%	0%	8%	0%	7%	7%	4	0	Not Met	4.8	4.87
PHYS2126.101.06f.MacAlevey P	30	28	3.61	86%	4%	4%	0%	7%	0%	0%	7%	3	3	Met	3.5	3.96
PHYS2126.102.06f.MacAlevey P	30	28	3.91	93%	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3	3	Met	2.9	3.40
PHYS2126.103.06f.MacAlevey P	30	25	3.93	96%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3	3	Met	2.7	3.16
PHYS2126.104.06f.MacAlevey P	30	11	3.24	64%	18%	9%	9%	0%	0%	0%	9%	3	3	Met	3.8	3.63

crs_sec_term_instr	Core Code	TotGrds	ClassGPA	Apercent	Bpercent	Cpercent	Dpercent	Fpercent	Xpercent	Wpercent	DFWperc	No. Measures	Measures Met	All Outcomes	Evals#18	Evals#14
PHYS2126.105.06f.MacAlevey P	30	28	3.72	82%	18%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3	3	Met	4.0	4.30
PHYS2126.107.06f.MacAlevey P	30	28	3.82	86%	11%	4%	0%	0%	0%	7%	0%	3	3	Met	2.8	3.09
PHYS2126.109.06f.MacAlevey P	30	26	3.78	92%	4%	0%	4%	0%	0%	10%	17%	3	3	Met	2.8	3.50
PHYS2126.601.06f.MacAlevey P	30	24	3.38	75%	17%	0%	0%	8%	0%	4%	16%	3	3	Met	2.4	3.24
PHYS2126.602.06f.MacAlevey P	30	16	3.54	63%	31%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3	3	Met	3.0	3.06
PHYS2325.001.06f.Ishak-Boushak	30	98	2.96	44%	28%	16%	6%	6%	0%	6%	19%	9	8	Partially	4.5	4.62
PHYS2325.501.06f.Earle G	30	61	2.37	16%	34%	25%	18%	7%	0%	8%	29%	4	2	Partially	3.6	3.39
PHYS2326.001.06f.Rasmussen B	30	59	2.25	24%	25%	17%	24%	10%	0%	3%	39%	8	5	Partially	3.4	3.62
PHYS2326.002.06f.Gartstein Y	30	84	3.08	44%	35%	14%	0%	7%	0%	9%	17%	5	4	Partially	3.9	4.00
PHYS3342.001.06f.Gartstein Y	30	88	3.13	43%	34%	18%	0%	5%	0%	4%	11%	5	3	Partially	3.2	3.36
PSY3364.001.06f.Assmann P	30	68	2.70	29%	41%	13%	3%	13%	1%	1%	17%	3	2	Partially	3.8	3.62
SPAU3344.001.06f.Bharadwaj S	30	45	2.63	40%	18%	20%	13%	9%	0%	6%	24%	6	4	Partially	3.5	3.42
AMS2341.001.06f.Smith E	40	8	3.50	38%	63%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	8	8	Met	5.0	4.88
HUMA1301.001.06f.Arbery V	40	62	1.82	8%	18%	34%	27%	13%	0%	10%	42%	6	3	Not Met	1.9	2.19
HUMA1301.002.06f.Towner T	40	99	2.96	36%	40%	12%	3%	8%	0%	1%	13%	6	4	Partially	4.4	4.75
HUMA1301.003.06f.Arbery V	40	77	1.94	13%	21%	42%	5%	19%	0%	11%	28%	6	4	Partially	2.2	2.43
HUMA1301.004.06f.Argyros A	40	115	2.57	34%	28%	20%	4%	14%	0%	3%	19%	3	3	Met	4.1	4.19
HUMA1301.005.06f.Argyros A	40	91	2.77	36%	25%	25%	8%	5%	0%	7%	24%	3	3	Met	3.9	4.11
HUMA1301.006.06f.Turner F	40	17	3.65	82%	18%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	0%	3	3	Met	4.1	4.63
HUMA1301.501.06f.Chapman M	40	99	3.01	30%	52%	12%	0%	6%	0%	0%	6%	6	6	Met	4.5	4.75
LIT2331.001.06f.Saar-Hambazaza	40	11	2.67	36%	36%	9%	9%	9%	0%	15%	46%	6	5	Partially	4.0	4.36
LIT2331.002.06f.Adams S	40	25	2.84	20%	52%	24%	0%	4%	0%	0%	4%	10	8	Partially	3.9	3.79
LIT2331.501.06f.Coker E	40	21	2.84	48%	19%	19%	0%	14%	0%	4%	13%	6	5	Partially	4.4	4.44
LIT3300.001.06f.Arbery V	40	33	2.66	21%	52%	12%	3%	12%	0%	10%	18%	6	5	Partially	3.5	3.81
LIT3300.501.06f.Arbery V	40	33	2.52	24%	30%	24%	18%	3%	0%	6%	20%	6	4	Partially	1.8	2.13
PHIL1301.001.06f.Hiltz S	40	71	2.72	24%	49%	14%	6%	7%	0%	1%	15%	3	3	Met	3.8	3.83
PHIL2316.001.06f.Bambach C	40	31	2.88	16%	58%	19%	0%	6%	0%	18%	11%	3	3	Met	4.4	4.52
AHST1303.001.06f.Goode D	50	138	2.73	36%	25%	25%	4%	9%	0%	6%	21%	6	6	Met	4.5	4.18
AHST2331.001.06f.Methenitis M	50	50	3.06	48%	32%	12%	0%	8%	0%	0%	8%	6	6	Met	4.1	4.29
ARTS1301.001.06f.Hanlon M	50	116	2.82	40%	28%	16%	5%	10%	0%	4%	20%	6	5	Partially	2.7	2.87
ARTS1301.002.06f.Hanlon M	50	121	2.62	27%	34%	23%	5%	11%	0%	1%	16%	6	5	Partially	2.9	3.15
DANC1310.001.06f.Sanda L	50	41	2.63	39%	27%	7%	12%	15%	0%	0%	26%	6	6	Met	2.8	2.93
DRAM1310.001.06f.Reese V	50	40	2.88	48%	20%	23%	0%	10%	0%	0%	10%	6	4	Partially	3.8	3.97
FILM2332.001.06f.McLean A	50	148	2.56	20%	41%	22%	9%	8%	0%	1%	17%	6	6	Met	4.7	4.71
FILM2332.002.06f.McLean A	50	20	3.48	70%	25%	0%	0%	5%	0%	0%	5%	6	6	Met		
FILM2332.501.06f.Marshall K	50	105	1.77	10%	23%	29%	17%	22%	0%	12%	47%	4	2	Partially	3.5	3.68
MUSI1306.001.06f.Stone W	50	73	3.59	77%	14%	8%	1%	0%	0%	1%	1%	6	5	Partially	4.5	4.79
HIST1301.001.06f.Edmunds D	60	84	2.49	30%	23%	26%	10%	12%	2%	1%	22%	6	6	Met	4.6	4.68
HIST1301.003.06f.Caughfield A	60	88	2.71	20%	45%	24%	5%	6%	0%	1%	10%	9	9	Met	3.9	4.23
HIST1301.004.06f.Edmunds D	60	85	1.99	11%	27%	32%	18%	13%	3%	1%	33%	6	6	Met	4.2	4.32
HIST1301.006.06f.Bryan J	60	80	2.30	14%	40%	25%	8%	14%	0%	4%	23%	3	2	Partially	4.0	4.28

| crs_sec_term_instr | Core Code | TotGrds | ClassGPA | Grade Distributions | | | | | | | | SACS Assessment Outcome | | | Student Course Ratings | |
				Apercent	Bpercent	Cpercent	Dpercent	Fpercent	Xpercent	Wpercent	DFWperc	No. Measures	Measures Met	All Outcomes	Evals#18	Evals#14
HIST1301.007.06f.Bryan J	60	86	2.80	17%	53%	20%	7%	2%	0%	4%	9%	3	2	Partially	4.1	4.20

Course																
HIST1301.008.06f.Bryan J	60	81	2.57	23%	38%	17%	14%	7%	0%	4%	23%	3	1	Not Met	4.1	4.13
HIST1301.009.06f.Bryan J	60	86	2.69	30%	37%	20%	5%	8%	0%	4%	14%	3	2	Partially		
HIST1301.010.06f.Nickerson M	60	15	3.96	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	6%	0%	6%	6	2	Not Met	3.8	4.09
HIST1302.001.06f.TURNER D	60	82	2.50	22%	34%	24%	12%	7%	0%	6%	23%	6	2	Not Met	3.9	4.03
HIST1302.002.06f.Volanto K	60	68	2.30	21%	26%	25%	19%	9%	0%	1%	28%	6	5	Partially	3.9	4.14
HIST1302.003.06f.Caughfield A	60	84	2.44	21%	36%	24%	4%	15%	0%	1%	21%	8	7	Partially	3.9	4.06
HIST2301.501.06f.Volanto K	60	72	2.00	14%	19%	32%	22%	13%	0%	4%	39%	3	3	Met	4.0	4.17
HIST3394.001.06f.Edmunds D	60	41	2.74	22%	46%	17%	12%	2%	0%	2%	14%	6	6	Met	4.6	4.72
GOVT2301.001.06f.Bearry B	70	140	2.29	19%	29%	22%	20%	9%	0%	5%	32%	4	3	Partially	3.5	3.78
GOVT2301.003.06f.King C	70	98	2.40	14%	39%	28%	15%	4%	0%	0%	19%	6	6	Met	3.6	3.80
GOVT2301.004.06f.Thielemann G	70	225	3.14	48%	32%	12%	4%	4%	0%	5%	11%	6	6	Met	4.2	4.59
GOVT2301.005.06f.Dow D	70	21	3.38	62%	33%	0%	0%	5%	0%	0%	5%	9	9	Met	4.8	4.88
GOVT2302.001.06f.Monroe B	70	55	1.73	16%	24%	13%	16%	31%	0%	2%	50%	9	8	Partially	3.6	3.69
GOVT2302.002.06f.SMITH M	70	59	2.86	36%	29%	25%	3%	7%	0%	2%	10%	5	4	Partially	3.6	3.82
AMS4384.001.06f.Kolar J	80	11	2.76	27%	55%	0%	9%	9%	0%	15%	15%	9	4	Not Met	3.8	3.83
BA3361.001.06f.Nair P	80	128	3.32	51%	37%	9%	0%	3%	0%	0%	3%	6	6	Met	4.0	4.31
BA3361.002.06f.Ziegler L	80	25	3.80	84%	16%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	8	8	Met	4.8	4.95
BA3361.003.06f.Reed J	80	105	3.18	48%	35%	12%	1%	4%	0%	1%	5%	6	5	Partially	4.1	4.40
BA3361.501.06f.Ritchey D	80	129	3.29	57%	29%	8%	4%	2%	0%	0%	6%	6	6	Met	4.9	4.94
BA3361.502.06f.Sharma R	80	122	2.51	14%	43%	33%	4%	6%	0%	3%	9%	6	4	Partially	2.8	3.02
CJS1301.001.06f.Miller K	80	79	3.38	63%	24%	6%	4%	3%	0%	2%	6%	7	7	Met	4.6	4.80
CJS1301.002.06f.Hughes M	80	88	3.20	53%	27%	11%	2%	6%	0%	1%	8%	7	7	Met	3.6	3.75
CJS1307.001.06f.DOWNING S	80	59	3.35	53%	42%	2%	2%	2%	0%	2%	3%	6	6	Met	4.6	4.56
CJS1307.002.06f.Boots D	80	60	2.76	27%	47%	12%	7%	8%	0%	2%	15%	6	4	Partially	4.7	4.85
ECO2301.001.06f.Kalyanaraman R	80	45	2.80	29%	44%	16%	4%	7%	0%	2%	11%	6	6	Met	3.4	3.40
ECO2301.003.06f.Dumas L	80	9	3.22	33%	56%	11%	0%	0%	10%	0%	10%	5	5	Met	4.6	4.68
ECO2301.501.06f.Dave C	80	84	3.04	50%	27%	8%	6%	8%	0%	1%	14%	3	2	Partially	3.8	4.02
ECO2302.001.06f.Li X	80	95	2.91	38%	34%	22%	0%	6%	0%	10%	8%	9	6	Partially	3.5	3.50
ECO2302.002.06f.Berg N	80	100	2.91	28%	50%	14%	0%	8%	0%	5%	11%	3	3	Met	4.2	4.37
ECO2302.501.06f.Singh P	80	42	3.19	52%	33%	5%	0%	10%	0%	2%	9%	3	2	Partially	2.8	2.90
ECO3370.001.06f.Dholakia K	80	51	3.52	75%	20%	2%	0%	4%	0%	0%	4%	6	6	Met	4.6	4.58
GST2300.501.06f.Smith E	80	22	2.65	18%	50%	27%	0%	5%	0%	0%	5%	6	3	Partially	4.3	4.31
ISSS3360.002.06f.Dow D	80	20	3.52	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	9	8	Partially	3.9	4.02
PSY2301.001.06f.Bartlett J	80	22	3.56	68%	18%	14%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	6	5	Partially	4.0	4.20
PSY2301.002.06f.Holub S	80	154	2.40	18%	28%	40%	5%	10%	0%	5%	17%	6	3	Not Met	3.7	3.85
PSY3331.001.06f.Huxtable-Jester	80	107	2.96	42%	31%	17%	7%	4%	12%	4%	23%	6	3	Not Met	4.6	4.65
PSY4334.001.06f.Santrock J	80	73	2.58	30%	23%	30%	8%	8%	15%	8%	29%	3	2	Partially	3.6	3.77
SOC1301.001.06f.Meyler D	80	100	3.15	42%	39%	15%	1%	3%	0%	1%	6%	3	3	Met	4.4	4.58
SOC2300.501.06f.Smith E	80	27	2.75	19%	56%	22%	0%	4%	0%	4%	4%	6	3	Not Met		
			2.89	44%	27%	15%	6%	9%	0%	5%	18%					

Core Curriculum Component Report Card Template Fall 2006

The purpose of this meeting is to take stock of what was learned from the fall 2006 assessment of the _____ component of the Core Curriculum and to make recommendations for how to improve assessment and student learning in the future. We are holding separate meetings for each of the eight components of the Core Curriculum.

Instructions. Prior to the meeting, attendees should have reviewed the following materials online: a) individual assessment reports (posted on the online Assessment Tool at http://sacs.utdallas.edu) and b) that "Course Statistics 06f" spreadsheet that contains student course evaluation ratings, grade distributions, and a tally of assessment outcomes.

During the meeting the attendees should discuss each of the "report card" elements listed below. A working chair should be appointed to moderate the discussion and write down the groups' conclusions concerning each element. This report card should then be forwarded to the Core Curriculum Committee and included in the report to SACS.

Elements of the "Report Card"

1. How much time did instructors invest in preparing the Course Assessment Plan, gathering and collating the assessment data (beyond normal grading), and preparing the Course Assessment Report?
    a. Please report the distribution of hours spent by the instructors that are present at the meeting. Less that 3 hrs; 3-6 hrs; 6-9 hrs; 9-12 hrs; 12-15 hrs; more than 15 hrs
    b. Please list aspects of the assessment process that were most time consuming and that need to be streamlined.

2. Are the assessments and success criteria that instructors used providing meaningful and useful evaluations of student and course success in achieving the Core Learning Objectives?
    a. Briefly describe good and bad examples of assessments.
    b. What proportion of instructors (roughly) used good vs. adequate vs. poor assessments (in terms of meaningfulness/usefulness)?

3. What are specific ways that assessments and criteria can be improved to be more meaningful/useful?
    a. Please generate specific guidelines if possible in terms of number, types, and substantive content of assessments/criteria.
    b. What different approaches might be taken to assessing this component of the core (e.g., outside of course evaluation/testing)?

4. How adequate and appropriate were instructor's "action plans" in terms of specifying meaningful ways to improve the course or assessment process?
    a. What proportion (roughly) of instructors did a good vs. adequate vs. poor job of specifying future actions to improve learning/assessment?

      b.   Please generate guidelines that instructors can use to improve action plans.

5. From a broader perspective, how might we as a university better facilitate students in achieving the Core Learning Objectives? For example, are there different courses that should be added to the Core? Should some be dropped?

6. Overall, how good a job is UTD doing at assessing and evaluating this component of the Core? Grade as A, B, C, D or F.

7. Overall, how good a job is UTD doing at facilitating students in achieving the Core Learning Objectives for this component of the Core? Grade as A, B, C, D, F or X.

Core Curriculum Component Report Cards 06f

Core Curriculum Component Report Card

Core Component: *010 Writing*
Date of meeting: *April 20, 2007*
In attendance: *Duane Buhrmester (acting chair), Candice Mills, Jay Dowling, John Gooch, Tres Thompson, Ralph Greenwald, Simeon Ntafos, Lisa Bell, Pamela Gossin, Lauren Dixon, Jeff Pettineo, Toyna Wissinger, Janet Johnson, Michael Wilson*
Report prepared by: *Duane Buhrmester*

The purpose of this meeting was to take stock of what was learned from the fall 2006 assessment of the 010 Writing component of the Core Curriculum and to make recommendations for how to improve assessment and student learning in the future. The meeting lasted 120 minutes.

Elements of the "Report Card"

8. How much time did instructors invest in preparing the Course Assessment Plan, gathering and collating the assessment data (beyond normal grading), and preparing the Course Assessment Report?
    a. Please report the distribution of hours spent by the instructors that are present at the meeting. Less that 3 hrs; 3-6 hrs; 6-9 hrs; 9-12 hrs; 12-15 hrs; more than 15 hrs

    Eight instructors present reported that it took them 6-9 hours per course and four reported that it took them 9-12 hours. The consensus was that the time spent will be reduced after the initial learning phase.

    b. Please list aspects of the assessment process that were most time consuming and that need to be streamlined.

    The consensus was that it took considerable time to score student writing for the specific aspects of writing that the CCC is interested in (i.e., the learning objectives of mechanics, arguments and use of source materials). Whereas all the instructors present routinely evaluate the quality of student writing, the focus of their evaluations do not specifically and separately address these three aspects of writing. Therefore, they were forced to change or add new dimensions to their evaluation rubrics. There was discussion about the development of a generic scoring rubric that could be used by instructors in all writing courses. The consensus was that while this would be very helpful to have as guidelines, there was resistance to requiring all instructors to use the same assessment rubric. **Buhrmester, Gooch, and Wilson agreed to develop such a rubric and make it available to instructors who wished to adopt it. There was also a call for a**

prototypical example of an acceptable Assessment Plan/Report to be posted on the Assessment Tool to assess new instructors in developing their plans/reports. Buhrmester said this would be done.

9. Are the assessments and success criteria that instructors used providing meaningful and useful evaluations of students and course success in achieving the Core Learning Objectives?

   a. Briefly describe good and bad examples of assessments.

   There was considerable discussion about the meaningfulness of our current efforts at assessments. Whereas there is a commonly voiced opinion that our students do not write nearly as well as they should, those present were not sure that we have evidence one way or another to evaluate the validity of this view. Some suggested that our students actually write better than students at other colleges, but these were informal observations. The general feeling was that our current system of evaluation does not provide a "hard" evaluation of whether or not our writing curriculum is achieving our learning objectives. There was also consideration of how high a priority the university should place on writing given competing priorities (e.g., math/science) and the cost/investment (in terms of instructor resources) required to improve writing. There was no clear consensus researched other than we should do all we feasibly can to improve writing.

   b. What proportion of instructors (roughly) used good vs. adequate vs. poor assessments (in terms of meaningfulness/usefulness)?

   The group concluded that overall the Writing assessment plans/ reports were of poor quality in Fall 2006. Many of the plans did not provide assessments that were specific to the CCC learning objectives and in some cases, writing did not appear to be a substantial focus of the course. The assessment plans/reports from the independent study/thesis/project sections in NSM were identified as especially problematic. Buhrmester pointed out that there had been considerable improvement in the 07s plans, but problems remain with some instructors believing their sections aren't/shouldn't be considered writing courses. Also, the plans/reports for the sections of RHET 1302 varied considerably in quality and Gooch (the acting Director of Rhetoric) said that he has moved to greater standardization across section of RHET 1302 in terms of curriculum and assessment.

10. What are specific ways that assessments and criteria can be improved to be more meaningful/useful?
    a. Please generate specific guidelines if possible in terms of number, types, and substantive content of assessments/criteria.

    The development of generic scoring rubrics for each learning objective.

b. What different approaches might be taken to assess this component of the core (e.g., outside of course evaluation/testing)?

There was discussion of various other methods of assessing writing, including "holistic" writing assessments taken in the freshmen and senior years. This approach could be accomplished by gathering samples of student writing in response to standard essay prompts and then scoring with a panel of trained scorers. Tim Redman indicated that he has had experience with this method and found it to be an effective method of evaluation. An evaluation along this line was done several years ago by Cynthia Haynes and provided a useful assessment. Such an approach to assessment could be done either in the context of specific writing courses or as a stand-alone program that sampled students from the entire UTD population, including transfer students who may not have taken their Rhetoric courses at UTD. The consensus was that a more systematic approach to assessment is needed if we want to document whether any future changes in the curriculum are effective.

11. How adequate and appropriate were instructor's "action plans" in terms of specifying meaningful ways to improve the course or assessment process?
    a. What proportion (roughly) of instructors did a good vs. adequate vs. poor job of specifying future actions to improve learning/assessment?

The group concluded that the action plans discussed in reports were adequate-to-good.

b. Please generate guidelines that instructors can use to improve action plans.

12. From a broader perspective, how might we as a university better facilitate students in achieving the Core Learning Objectives? For example, are there different courses that should be added to the Core? Should some be dropped?

There was extended discussion that focused on four main topics:

There was strong consensus that the university could benefit from a "writing center" that is staffed by graduate assistants trained in individual writing instruction. *Many universities have such centers and they have proven effective in assisting students to substantially improve writing. The center could also help educate instructors how to more effectively improve student writing. Such a center should probably stand as a unit separate from any one department and include a tenured faculty director, professional associated director, and a staff of graduate assistants.*

There was considerable interest in adopting a "writing across the curriculum" philosophy at UTD. *A strong version of this approach requires writing in all courses taught at the university. A more moderated version of this approach requires writing in a large number of targeted courses where it makes sense that*

writing take place. Ntafos suggested that such an approach makes sense for some majors more than others and that perhaps this should be left up to individual programs. There was also concern that adding writing requirements in large lecture courses would over-burden faculty and TA's who already are over-worked. **There was strong consensus that we should encouraging more student writing and that instructors be offered workshops in ways to improve student writing with a minimum amount of instructor investment.**

The addition of Rhet 1301 to UTD's course offerings was discussed. *After a brief digression into the history of UTD's writing curriculum, the possibility of adding Rhet 1301 was discussed. The general sentiment was that student writing would benefit by extending the formal writing instruction from the current 6 SCH (Rhet 1302 + Advanced Writing) to 9 SCH (Rhet 1302 + Rhet 1302 + Advanced Writing). Gooch said that his survey of other comparison universities suggested that the majority required 9 SCH of writing. However, there are a number of problems with moving to 9 SCH of writing. The added hours would push the total number of SCH for a few degree programs to more than would be desirable (e.g., engineering to 131 SCH). It is also not clear that UTD has the personnel to mount a second required Rhet course. There were also questions about whether students would actually benefit much from a Rhet 1301 course, at least how it is typically taught at many Texas community colleges and universities. Given the choice of adding Rhet 1301 but dropping Advanced Writing, everyone felt students would benefit more from Advance Writing than Rhet 1301.* **The university may want to explore whether some programs would be interested in requiring Rhet 1301 for their majors.**

There was considerable interest in the development of a writing screening test and a free self-paced instructional course/module that focuses on writing mechanics. *There are currently available standardized tests that assess spelling, grammar and punctuation. Instructors could require students to take the exam and then complete the free self-paced module if they did not pass. At a minimum, such instruction would at least refresh students understanding of the basic mechanics of writing. The testing and self-paced course could be managed through a "writing center."*

13. Overall, how good a job is UTD doing at assessing and evaluating this component of the Core? Grade as A, B, C, D or F.

    The group consensus was D. Buhrmester indicated that the course assessments plans had improved for Spring 2007.

14. Overall, how good a job is UTD doing at facilitating students in achieving the Core Learning Objectives for this component of the Core? Grade as A, B, C, D, F or X.

    The group consensus was C. There is considerable room for improvement in UTD's approach to fostering good writing skills.

Core Curriculum Component Report Card

Core Component: *020 Math*
Date of meeting: *April 25, 2007*
In attendance: *Duane Buhrmester (acting chair), Mary Chaffin, Simeon Ntafos, Mike Coleman, John Hoffman, David Lewis, Ray Allum, Ali Hooshyar, John Sibert, and Ben Garrett*

Report prepared by: *Duane Buhrmester*

> The purpose of this meeting was to take stock of what was learned from the fall 2006 assessment of the 020 Math component of the Core Curriculum and to make recommendations for how to improve assessment and student learning in the future. The meeting lasted 120 minutes.

<u>Elements of the "Report Card"</u>

15. How much time did instructors invest in preparing the Course Assessment Plan, gathering and collating the assessment data (beyond normal grading), and preparing the Course Assessment Report?
    a. Please report the distribution of hours spent by the instructors that are present at the meeting. Less that 3 hrs; 3-6 hrs; 6-9 hrs; 9-12 hrs; 12-15 hrs; more than 15 hrs

    The four instructors present indicated that it took them 15 hours or longer per section (and each taught 2-4 sections). The consensus was that the time spent will be reduced after the initial learning phase.

    b. Please list aspects of the assessment process that were most time consuming and that need to be streamlined.

    Several instructors indicated that the writing of the report took longer than it should because they could not copy/paste Letek formula's into the Assessment Tool. It took them considerably longer to create verbal descriptions of assessment problems. **Buhrmester indicated that he would look into the possibility of upgrading the Assessment Tool so that it would accept Letek formatted materials; if this proves impossible, then he will allow instructors to send in separately attached Letek files.**

    Instructors said that it took additional time to create separate reports for each of their multiple sections. **Buhrmester indicated that in the future instructors will be able to submit one report for assessments aggregated across sections in those cases where a) it is the same course number, b) all sections are taught by the same instructor, c) and the assessments are identical across sections. In such**

cases the instructor will submit the report under the lowest numbered section of the course and then indicate within the other sections where the main report can be found (i.e., type in the course number and section on the first line).

The instructors indicated that they spent the most time compiling results at the level of specific items. There was discussion about several ways of specifying success criteria and recording scores that have proven to reduce the time taken to record and compile results. **Buhrmester indicated that he would make available instructions outlining efficient ways to record and compile results.**

16. Are the assessments and success criteria that instructors used providing meaningful and useful evaluations of students and course success in achieving the Core Learning Objectives?

      a. Briefly describe good and bad examples of assessments.

Not discussed.

      b. What proportion of instructors (roughly) used good vs. adequate vs. poor assessments (in terms of meaningfulness/usefulness)?

Not discussed.

17. What are specific ways that assessments and criteria can be improved to be more meaningful/useful?
      a. Please generate specific guidelines if possible in terms of number, types, and substantive content of assessments/criteria.

Not discussed.

      b. What different approaches might be taken to assess this component of the core (e.g., outside of course evaluation/testing)?
Not discussed.

18. How adequate and appropriate were instructor's "action plans" in terms of specifying meaningful ways to improve the course or assessment process?
      a. What proportion (roughly) of instructors did a good vs. adequate vs. poor job of specifying future actions to improve learning/assessment?

The group concluded that the action plans discussed in reports were -good.

      b. Please generate guidelines that instructors can use to improve action plans.

19. From a broader perspective, how might we as a university better facilitate students in achieving the Core Learning Objectives? For example, are there different courses that should be added to the Core? Should some be dropped?

There was extended discussion that focused on four main topics:

Buhrmester began by summarizing the main conclusions that he drew from the two reports that Dean Coleman prepared for the Math Focus Committee (and were included in the materials for this meeting). The analyses of student grades in Calculus I (Math 2417) revealed that approximately 40% of the enrolling students did not successfully make it through the course (i.e., earned a mark of D, F, or W) which in comparison to other universities (UT Austin, A&M, New Mexico) is roughly 10% higher than expected. More fine-grained analyses show that first-time freshmen taking Cal I had a relatively low DFW rate of 20-28%, but that non-first-time freshmen students (i.e., continuing freshmen, transfer students, upper-division students [many of whom had already attempted but not passed the course before]) had an alarmingly high DWF rate of 60%+. The key factor that distinguishes first-time freshmen form the other students is their performance on the screening test (and concomitant background preparation); to enroll in the course, first-time freshmen must either score 630 or above on the SAT II Math test or have earned a score of 3 or higher on the high school AP Calculus exam. The non-first-time-freshmen students either must have either passed a Pre-Calculus course with a grade of C or better, or have met the SAT II or AP screening criteria in the past (but failed to successfully completed Calculus I and thus were retaking it). In terms of actual numbers, each fall about 300 first-time freshmen qualify to take Calculus 2417, with roughly 235 of those earning a passing grade (i.e., a C- needed to move to the next course in the sequence) and 65 not passing. In contrast, of the roughly 200 non-first-time-freshmen enrolling in the class, roughly 76 earn a passing grade and 124 do not pass. Together, this leaves a pool of about 190 students per fall semester who are faced with either retaking Calculus I or dropping out of a major that requires Calculus to progress. We assume that a similar pattern of outcomes occurs in the spring semester.

Coleman also conducted analyses of outcomes associated with taking the Math 2312 Pre-Calculus. This analysis is important because it speaks to whether the Pre-Calculus is adequately preparing students to succeed in the subsequent Calculus I course. The DFW rate for this class was roughly 43% in the fall of 2005 and 36% in fall 2006 (after raising the SAT II screening score from 460 to 550 for fall 2006). Analysis of 149 students who passed Pre-Calculus and then took Calculus I in the spring of 2006 showed that whereas 92% of students earning an A in Pre-Calculus subsequently passed Calculus I, 44% of students earning a B subsequently did not pass Calculus I and 81% of students earning a C in Pre-Calculus did not pass Calculus 1. These findings indicate that performance in Pre-Calculus is a poor screening criterion for entrance to Calculus I (except for the A vs. not-A distinction) and that perhaps the Pre-Calculus course as currently configured is less than ideal preparation for Calculus I (because students earning B's and C's are performing poorly in Calculus I).

The fact that our Pre-Calculus course does not appear to adequately prepare student to succeed in Calculus I is problematic in light of the fairly large number of student who need better preparation. Right now, if students attempt and fail Calculus I, they have few options for what they can do to increase their chances of succeeding a second time in the course. If they simply re- take Calculus over again, there is over a 60% chance that they will fail again. If they fall back and take Pre-Calculus as preparation, their chances of subsequently passing Calculus are less than 50% (unless they earn an A in Pre-Calculus). The number of students stuck in this cycle of failure is not trivial, roughly involving 100-150 per semester. Starting in fall 2006, UTD began enforcing a new 3-attempts rule where students are not allowed to attempt a course (including drops and withdraws) more than three time and must pay out-of-state tuition for their 3rd attempt. This new policy will have its greatest impact on students caught in the cycle of failure in math, forcing some to change majors and others to go off campus to complete math requirements. Still others will withdraw from UTD altogether.

Buhrmester characterized the current situation as follows. The top 20%tile of students (as indicated by scoring in the top 20%tile of the SAT II Math test) seem well served by our current Math 2417-2419 course sequence, but there is a limited absolute number of students who fall into this high tail of the normal distribution. There is a much larger potential group of students who fall in the 60th-80th%tile of the distribution who, with more intensive and appropriate preparation in algebra and pre-calculus, may go on to master calculus at levels sufficient for advanced training in engineering and science. In light of the fact that training a greater number of students in engineering and science is a high propriety for UTD and the nation, it is important that we improve our system of math education to address the needs of this segment of the student population.

There was considerable discussion about different approaches that might be taken to improve math education at UTD.

*Coleman described the math sequence at Rice University that offers both accelerated and decelerated sequences of courses. Their accelerated Math 101 and 102 Calculus courses are essentially the same as UTD's Math 2417 and 2419. They also offer decelerated preparation courses of Math 111 and 112, which are not directly equivalent to UTD's 2312 Pre-Calculus course. Rice students are allowed to fall back to 111 if they struggle in 101 (within a semester). To complete the sequence, they can follow any of 3 paths: 101 + 102, or 111 + 112 + 102, or 111 + 101 + 102. The general idea is to provide more extended bridge sequences of calculus courses to better address the needs of student who lack the preparation for 2417 + 2419. **The consensus of the group was that we should pursue the development of additional non-accelerated calculus sequences.***

*Hoffman indicated that he was conducting a survey of the engineering, computer science, and science programs to determine whether these majors actually require mastery of all the topics covered in Math 2417 and 2419. If some majors do not assume or require master of certain topics, then perhaps we can develop calculus courses that are tailored to the specific demands of those majors. For example, his survey so far suggests that upper-level biology courses require student mastery of only a subset of the topics covered in Math 2419, and thus it might be desirable to develop a Calculus for Biology sequence.. **The group agreed that we should study the calculus skills actually called for in each major to determine whether creating major-specific course sequences might yield more students with mastery of calculus needed in their fields.***

Buhrmester proposed that that a Math Learning Center be created at UTD. Such a center would have several missions: a) planning and coordination of math sequences, b) development of a comprehensive and valid placement testing system, c) administration of all math service courses (developmental through calculus) which are currently all taught by lecturers, d) tutoring, e) online refresher courses to help students prepare for placement tests, f) instructor and TA training and resources, and g) research on the effectiveness of math instruction methods. Buhrmester further suggested that the center be headed by a director with a back ground in math education/administration and that it be a stand-alone unit from the Math Department. The rationale for the center being a separate unit was that the center would be in a better position to be responsive and accountable to all the degree programs across the university that depend on math training and would relieve the Math Department from the heavy burden of hiring and supervising such a large cadre of senior and part-time lecturers. Hooshyar argued that the director of such a center should be a member of the Math Department, but Buhrmester wonder whether it was feasible for the Math Department to fully embrace a director whose background is in math education (as opposed to being primarily a math scholar) and whose only sole role is the administration of a math learning center.

*Sibert, who is heading up the Quality Enhancement Program (QEP) for the SACS review, strongly endorsed the idea of a math learning center and thought that it might fit within one of the QEP proposals his committee is considering. Specifically, they are considering a center for math and science learning. He preferred to frame the issue in terms of raising the performance of all students, rather than just focusing solely on those students struggling at the lower levels of performance. There was some discussion of how such a center might be organized and administered, but no consensus emerged. There was enthusiasm for the idea that such a center is consistent with UTD's mission as a leader in science and engineering, and that such a center could be a point of pride, standing as a testament to our commitment to educational excellence in this area. **The group generally agreed that some sort of center with a focus on math learning should be explored.***

20. Overall, how good a job is UTD doing at assessing and evaluating this component of the Core? Grade as A, B, C, D or F.

    Was not discussed.

21. Overall, how good a job is UTD doing at facilitating students in achieving the Core Learning Objectives for this component of the Core? Grade as A, B, C, D, F or X.

    Was not discussed.

Core Curriculum Component Report Card

Core Component: *030 Natural Science*
Date of meeting: *April 20, 2007*
In attendance: *Duane Buhrmester (acting chair), John Hoffman, William Manton, Greg McGovern, Paul MacAlevey, Beatrice Rasmussen, Bob Rutford, Gregg Dieckmann, Tres Thompson, Liz Salter*
Report prepared by: *Duane Buhrmester*

The purpose of this meeting was to take stock of what was learned from the fall 2006 assessment of the 030 Natural Science component of the Core Curriculum and to make recommendations for how to improve assessment and student learning in the future. The meeting lasted 110 minutes.

Elements of the "Report Card"

22. How much time did instructors invest in preparing the Course Assessment Plan, gathering and collating the assessment data (beyond normal grading), and preparing the Course Assessment Report?
    a. Please report the distribution of hours spent by the instructors that are present at the meeting. Less that 3 hrs; 3-6 hrs; 6-9 hrs; 9-12 hrs; 12-15 hrs; more than 15 hrs

    Six of the instructors present reported that it took them 6-9 hours and three instructors reported that it took more than 15 hours per section. The consensus was that the time spent will be reduced after the initial learning phase.

    b. Please list aspects of the assessment process that were most time consuming and that need to be streamlined.

    There were adamant complaints lodged that the creation of plans took much longer than necessary because the criteria for what constituted an acceptable plan kept changing. Examples were given where a plan approved in the summer was not acceptable in the fall and then the final plan that was approved in the fall

*was not acceptable in the spring. The plea was for the SAC/CCC team to stop changing the bar. **Buhrmester indicated that the CCC would do all that it can to stabilize the requirements for assessment plans/reports.***

*The general consensus was that computation of the results accounted for a significant proportion of the time investment. It also took time to identify specific assessment items. All the instructors present relied primarily on assessments they were already using to evaluate student performance. The instructors shared with each other strategies for streamlining the amount of time/effort put into the assessment process. **The general consensus was that if instructors identify assessments prior to grading, then they can fairly efficiently create separate entries in grade books that can be readily accessed at the end of the semester.***

23. Are the assessments and success criteria that instructors used providing meaningful and useful evaluations of students and course success in achieving the Core Learning Objectives?

    a. Briefly describe good and bad examples of assessments.

    There was considerable discussion about the usefulness of our current assessment system tool for improving courses. Instructors said that they had always been analyzing student performance on exams, assignments, and discussion to determine where their courses were falling short of meeting learning objective and then they would make improvements in the course where appropriate. The creation of the formal assessment plan/report had made them reflect on this process more explicitly, but that the time/effort invested in producing a formal plan/report had added few improvements beyond what their less formal efforts had provided and had taken considerable time away from teaching and research.

    *There was some discussion of how we might increase the benefits of the assessment process in the future (given that we are required to do so for external accreditation). Instructors feel caught between two different purposes of assessment that are at times are at odds with one another. One purpose is to provide accountability that the course meets acceptable standards. This purpose encourages instructors to focus assessments on demonstrating that students exceed minimum standards; thus, the emphasis is on documenting the strengths of the course. The second purpose is to provide information that will help instructors improve the course in the future. This purpose encourages instructors to focus on possible limitations of the course. Whereas most instructors present are most interested in the second focus of assessment, they felt compelled to focus on the first to provide SACS with an accountability assessment. **The recommendation was that instructors should feel free to focus on assessing the aspects of the course that they have the most questions about and that they suspect may need improvement. That is, instructors should assess those things that may meaningfully help them improve rather than focusing on assessments that may make the course look good for outside accountability.***

   b. What proportion of instructors (roughly) used good vs. adequate vs. poor
       assessments (in terms of meaningfulness/usefulness)?

*The group concluded that a majority of the assessment reports had employed
adequate assessment procedures and that improvements were already being made
for the 07s assessment cycle.*

24. What are specific ways that assessments and criteria can be improved to be more
    meaningful/useful?
   a. Please generate specific guidelines if possible in terms of number, types,
       and substantive content of assessments/criteria.

*Not discussed because too few present had been able (due to technical problems)
to read through Fall 2006 assessment reports/plans.*

   b. What different approaches might be taken to assess this component of the
       core (e.g., outside of course evaluation/testing)?

*Buhrmester pointed out that instructors can include assessments for SACS that do
not feed into their scheme for awarding student grades. These types of
assessment can be done on a reasonable sub-sample of students or involve the
evaluation of the group rather than the individual. For example, instructors can
evaluate the level of class discussions by way of holistic ratings made by
instructors of the entire class; they need not be included in the scheme for
awarding student grades. Instructors can have students engage in writing
exercises that are not included in student grades; a sub-sample of the essays can
then be formally scored to evaluate students' higher-level thinking.*

25. How adequate and appropriate were instructor's "action plans" in terms of specifying
    meaningful ways to improve the course or assessment process?
   a. What proportion (roughly) of instructors did a good vs. adequate vs. poor
       job of specifying future actions to improve learning/assessment?

*The group concluded that the action plans discussed in reports were adequate-to-
good.*

   b. Please generate guidelines that instructors can use to improve action plans.

The group did not discuss this issue.

26. From a broader perspective, how might we as a university better facilitate students in
    achieving the Core Learning Objectives? For example, are there different courses
    that should be added to the Core? Should some be dropped?

The group spent considerable time delineating the constraints on science education at UTD.

*There was considerable dissatisfaction with the current instructional space dedicated to science education. It was pointed out there had been little new teaching laboratory space since 1990, despite the fact that need for lower-division science education had grown tremendously with the introduction of freshmen and sophomore students. Our current lab space is over taxed, being used six days a week all day and evening. Needs for chemistry teaching lab space is especially acute because our current sequence of pre-med courses requires students complete Chem I and II before taking basic biology courses. **In addition to lab space, more dedicated classrooms are needed for specific science courses.** For example, geography courses need dedicated rooms to house maps and chemistry rooms need periodic tables. Although the new science/math building promises better facilities, it does not appear to represent the addition of space needed.*

*There were concerns expressed about advising practices that allowed some students into courses without having completed pre-requisite courses. There were other concerns about junior-and senior-level students being allowed to enroll in freshmen-level courses (especially from the Management). **It was recommended that better lines of communications be opened up between instructors, program heads, and the Associate Deans (who direct advising in each school) to address these problems as they arise.***

*There was some discussion about problems inherent in the current practice of requiring pre-med students to complete Chem I and II prior to taking Bio I. Our current Bio I course focuses more narrowly on molecular biology than Bio I courses at other universities. The necessity of requiring Chem I and II as pre-requisites has created a system prone to delaying students completing pre-med requirements and at times in delaying graduation. **The Biology department is encouraged to consider other sequences of freshmen pre-med courses that do not require Chem I and II as pre-requisites.***

*The chemistry and physics instructors in attendance expressed frustration with deficiencies in freshmen math preparation. Both our Chem I and Phys I (algebra-based) courses require little more that mastery of high school algebra, but many students come in with not having exercised algebra skills for two years. Thus, the instructors are forced to spend considerable time refreshing and teaching basic algebra skills. **Two suggestions were made. First, students are required to pass an algebra screening test before enrolling in Chem I and Phys I. Second, that a free online self-paced algebra refresher module be made available to students that would serve as a refresher course that would be completed before re-taking a failed screening test.***

Overall, how good a job is UTD doing at assessing and evaluating this component of the Core? Grade as A, B, C, D or F.

The group consensus was B. While there is always room for improvement, the current assessment system is good.

27. Overall, how good a job is UTD doing at facilitating students in achieving the Core Learning Objectives for this component of the Core? Grade as A, B, C, D, F or X.

The group consensus was B. While there is always room for improvement, the current Science courses are doing a good job of achieving learning objectives within the constraints discussed above. Ongoing improvements in infrastructure should help improve science instruction in the future, but that true "A" level science instruction will require even more investment in teaching facilities and well-trained instructors.

Core Curriculum Component Report Card

Core Component: *040 Humanities*
Date of meeting: *April 19, 2007*
In attendance: *Duane Buhrmester (acting chair), Michael Wilson, and Tim Redman*
Report prepared by: *Duane Buhrmester*

The purpose of this meeting was to take stock of what was learned from the fall 2006 assessment of the 040 Humanities component of the Core Curriculum and to make recommendations for how to improve assessment and student learning in the future. The meeting lasted 110 minutes.

Elements of the "Report Card"

28. How much time did instructors invest in preparing the Course Assessment Plan, gathering and collating the assessment data (beyond normal grading), and preparing the Course Assessment Report?
    a. Please report the distribution of hours spent by the instructors that are present at the meeting. Less that 3 hrs; 3-6 hrs; 6-9 hrs; 9-12 hrs; 12-15 hrs; more than 15 hrs

    One instructor indicated that it took him 3-6 hours to complete the plan but that the time spent will be reduced after the initial learning phase.

    b. Please list aspects of the assessment process that were most time consuming and that need to be streamlined.

    This was not discussed because the one instructor present had not yet completed a report.

29. Are the assessments and success criteria that instructors used providing meaningful and useful evaluations of student and course success in achieving the Core Learning Objectives?

      a. Briefly describe good and bad examples of assessments.

Wilson observed that many instructors appear to be making the assessment task more complex than necessary. He suggested that we encourage instructors to simplify their assessments in ways that provided information that was useful for them in their efforts to improve the course.

      b. What proportion of instructors (roughly) used good vs. adequate vs. poor assessments (in terms of meaningfulness/usefulness)?

The group concluded that a majority of the assessment reports had employed good assessment procedures and that improvements were already being made for the 07s assessment cycle.

30. What are specific ways that assessments and criteria can be improved to be more meaningful/useful?
      a. Please generate specific guidelines if possible in terms of number, types, and substantive content of assessments/criteria.

The discussion shifted to assessing writing. Redman recounted his past experiences in using "holistic" methods of writing assessment. The group agreed that this appeared to be a potentially very useful approach to assessment that should be pursued in the future.

      b. What different approaches might be taken to assess this component of the core (e.g., outside of course evaluation/testing)?

Buhrmester had two concrete suggestions were discussed. ***Class discussions can be evaluated by holistic ratings made by instructors of the entire class; they need not be included in the scheme for awarding student grades. Instructors can have students engage in writing exercises that are not included in student grades; a sub-sample of the essays can then be formally scored to evaluate students' higher-level thinking.***

31. How adequate and appropriate were instructor's "action plans" in terms of specifying meaningful ways to improve the course or assessment process?
      a. What proportion (roughly) of instructors did a good vs. adequate vs. poor job of specifying future actions to improve learning/assessment?

The group concluded that the action plans discussed in reports were good.

      b. Please generate guidelines that instructors can use to improve action plans.

The group did not address this issue.

32. From a broader perspective, how might we as a university better facilitate students in achieving the Core Learning Objectives? For example, are there different courses that should be added to the Core? Should some be dropped?

> *Discussion focused on ways to improve student writing. The addition of a Rhetoric 1301 was explored, but no clear consensus was reached. There was greater interesting in fostering philosophy of "writing across the curriculum" at UTD. Redman suggested that students gain from writing more even if they do not get extensive feedback from faculty.* **There is a need to find ways to maximize student engagement in writing and discussion in large lecture courses. Apparently, other large universities are finding ways to engage students to a greater degree.**

33. Overall, how good a job is UTD doing at assessing and evaluating this component of the Core? Grade as A, B, C, D or F.

> *The group consensus was A/B. While there is always room for improvement, the current assessment system is good.*

34. Overall, how good a job is UTD doing at facilitating students in achieving the Core Learning Objectives for this component of the Core? Grade as A, B, C, D, F or X.

> *The group consensus was B. While there is always room for improvement, the current Government courses are doing a good job of achieving learning objectives.*

Core Curriculum Component Report Card

Core Component: *050 Fine Arts*
Date of meeting: *April 20, 2007*
In attendance: *Duane Buhrmester (acting chair), Michael Wilson, and Dianne Goode*
Report prepared by: *Duane Buhrmester*

The purpose of this meeting was to take stock of what was learned from the fall 2006 assessment of the 050 Fine Arts component of the Core Curriculum and to make recommendations for how to improve assessment and student learning in the future. The meeting lasted 40 minutes.

Elements of the "Report Card"

35. How much time did instructors invest in preparing the Course Assessment Plan, gathering and collating the assessment data (beyond normal grading), and preparing the Course Assessment Report?

     a. Please report the distribution of hours spent by the instructors that are present at the meeting. Less that 3 hrs; 3-6 hrs; 6-9 hrs; 9-12 hrs; 12-15 hrs; more than 15 hrs

One instructor indicated that it took him 9-12 hours to complete the plan but that the time spent will be reduced after the initial learning phase.

     b. Please list aspects of the assessment process that were most time consuming and that need to be streamlined.

The one instructor indicated that compiling individual-level scores was time-consuming. Buhrmester explained some different methods for reducing the time taking to compile findings.

36. Are the assessments and success criteria that instructors used providing meaningful and useful evaluations of student and course success in achieving the Core Learning Objectives?

     a. Briefly describe good and bad examples of assessments.

This was not discussed.

     b. What proportion of instructors (roughly) used good vs. adequate vs. poor assessments (in terms of meaningfulness/usefulness)?

The group concluded that a majority of the assessment reports had employed good assessment procedures and that improvements were already being made for the 07s assessment cycle.

37. What are specific ways that assessments and criteria can be improved to be more meaningful/useful?
     a. Please generate specific guidelines if possible in terms of number, types, and substantive content of assessments/criteria.

The group concluded that the current assessments and criteria were adequate to good.
     b. What different approaches might be taken to assess this component of the core (e.g., outside of course evaluation/testing)?

Buhrmester had two concrete suggestions were discussed. ***Class discussions can be evaluated by holistic ratings made by instructors of the entire class; they need not be included in the scheme for awarding student grades. Instructors can have students engage in writing exercises that are not included in student grades; a sub-sample of the essays can then be formally scored to evaluate students' higher-level thinking.***

38. How adequate and appropriate were instructor's "action plans" in terms of specifying meaningful ways to improve the course or assessment process?

      a. What proportion (roughly) of instructors did a good vs. adequate vs. poor job of specifying future actions to improve learning/assessment?

The group concluded that the action plans discussed in reports were good.

      b. Please generate guidelines that instructors can use to improve action plans.

The group did not address this issue.

39. From a broader perspective, how might we as a university better facilitate students in achieving the Core Learning Objectives? For example, are there different courses that should be added to the Core? Should some be dropped?

This was not discussed because the current offerings appear to be working well.

40. Overall, how good a job is UTD doing at assessing and evaluating this component of the Core? Grade as A, B, C, D or F.

The group consensus was A/B. While there is always room for improvement, the current assessment system is good.

41. Overall, how good a job is UTD doing at facilitating students in achieving the Core Learning Objectives for this component of the Core? Grade as A, B, C, D, F or X.

The group consensus was A/B. While there is always room for improvement, the current Government courses are doing a good job of achieving learning objectives.

Core Curriculum Component Report Card

Core Component: *060 History*
Date of meeting: *April 17, 2007*
In attendance: *Duane Buhrmester (acting chair), Michael Wilson, and David Edmunds*
Report prepared by: *Duane Buhrmester*

The purpose of this meeting was to take stock of what was learned from the fall 2006 assessment of the 060 Government component of the Core Curriculum and to make recommendations for how to improve assessment and student learning in the future. The meeting lasted 70 minutes.

Elements of the "Report Card"

42. How much time did instructors invest in preparing the Course Assessment Plan, gathering and collating the assessment data (beyond normal grading), and preparing the Course Assessment Report?

      a. Please report the distribution of hours spent by the instructors that are present at the meeting. Less that 3 hrs; 3-6 hrs; 6-9 hrs; 9-12 hrs; 12-15 hrs; more than 15 hrs

One instructor indicated that it took him 3-6 hours but that the time spent will be reduced after the initial learning phase.

      b. Please list aspects of the assessment process that were most time consuming and that need to be streamlined.

*The computation of the results accounted for a significant proportion of the time investment. It also took time to identify specific assessment items. The instruction relied primarily on assessments they were already using to evaluate student performance. **The general consensus was that if instructors identify assessments prior to grading, then they can fairly efficiently create separate entries in grade books that can be readily accessed at the end of the semester.***

It would also help if good examples of plans/reports were posted online for each component of the Core Curriculum. Buhrmester promised that this would be done starting this spring.

43. Are the assessments and success criteria that instructors used providing meaningful and useful evaluations of student and course success in achieving the Core Learning Objectives?

      a. Briefly describe good and bad examples of assessments.

There was discussion about whether the SACS assessments were valuable for improving courses. The task of assessment and evaluation had stimulated instructors to consider critically their course objectives, learning activities, and assessment methods and to plan future improvements in their courses. However, all instructors reported that this sort of end-of-semester taking stock had always been an integral part of their job as instructors and that the task of formally documenting this process had not significantly improved these efforts. There was discussion about ways to increase the usefulness of assessments for the improvement of instructions (as opposed for external accountability).

Wilson observed that many instructors appear to be making the assessment task more complex than necessary. He suggested that we encourage instructors to simplify their assessments in ways that provided information that was useful for them in their efforts to improve the course.

    b.   What proportion of instructors (roughly) used good vs. adequate vs. poor assessments (in terms of meaningfulness/usefulness)?

The group concluded that a majority of the assessment reports had employed good assessment procedures and that improvements were already being made for the 07s assessment cycle.

44. What are specific ways that assessments and criteria can be improved to be more meaningful/useful?
    a.   Please generate specific guidelines if possible in terms of number, types, and substantive content of assessments/criteria.

There was discussion of the merits and problems with different types of assessments. Class discussion was a useful method in small honor courses, but it had proved difficult in large lecture courses. Multiple-choice items were good for assessing comprehension of basic material, but proved less useful in assessing higher-level critical applications of knowledge. Essay questions were good for assessing higher-level thinking, but demanded too much grader time to be extensively used in large courses.

    b.   What different approaches might be taken to assess this component of the core (e.g., outside of course evaluation/testing)?

Buhrmester had two concrete suggestions were discussed. ***Class discussions can be evaluated by holistic ratings made by instructors of the entire class; they need not be included in the scheme for awarding student grades. Instructors can have students engage in writing exercises that are not included in student grades; a sub-sample of the essays can then be formally scored to evaluate students' higher-level thinking.***

45. How adequate and appropriate were instructor's "action plans" in terms of specifying meaningful ways to improve the course or assessment process?
    a.   What proportion (roughly) of instructors did a good vs. adequate vs. poor job of specifying future actions to improve learning/assessment?

The group concluded that the action plans discussed in reports were good.

    b.   Please generate guidelines that instructors can use to improve action plans.

The group did not address this issue.

46. From a broader perspective, how might we as a university better facilitate students in achieving the Core Learning Objectives? For example, are there different courses that should be added to the Core? Should some be dropped?

*Discussion focused on the goal of fostering among student the ability to engage in more well-informed critical thinking about government and political issues. Concern was expressed that the large size of course sections makes it very difficult to engage students in class discussion or to have them turn in much written analysis of issues. Some ideas about how to foster student engagement it large lecture courses were discussed. **There is a need to find ways to maximize student engagement in writing and discussion in large lecture courses. Apparently, other large universities are finding ways to engage students to a greater degree.***

47. Overall, how good a job is UTD doing at assessing and evaluating this component of the Core? Grade as A, B, C, D or F.

    The group consensus was A/B. While there is always room for improvement, the current assessment system is good.

48. Overall, how good a job is UTD doing at facilitating students in achieving the Core Learning Objectives for this component of the Core? Grade as A, B, C, D, F or X.

    The group consensus was B. While there is always room for improvement, the current Government courses are doing a good job of achieving learning objectives.

Core Curriculum Component Report Card

Core Component: *070 Government*
Date of meeting: *April 17, 2007*
In attendance: *Euel Elliot (acting chair), Duane Buhrmester, Brian Bearry, Douglas Dow, Billy Monroe, Millie D. Smith, and Marianne Stewart*
Report prepared by: *Duane Buhrmester*

The purpose of this meeting was to take stock of what was learned from the fall 2006 assessment of the 070 Government component of the Core Curriculum and to make recommendations for how to improve assessment and student learning in the future. The meeting lasted 70 minutes.

Elements of the "Report Card"

49. How much time did instructors invest in preparing the Course Assessment Plan, gathering and collating the assessment data (beyond normal grading), and preparing the Course Assessment Report?
    a. Please report the distribution of hours spent by the instructors that are present at the meeting. Less that 3 hrs; 3-6 hrs; 6-9 hrs; 9-12 hrs; 12-15 hrs; more than 15 hrs

Three of the four instructors present reported that it took them 3-6 hours, and one reported that it was about 3 hours. The consensus was that the time spent will be reduced after the initial learning phase.

      b. Please list aspects of the assessment process that were most time consuming and that need to be streamlined.

*The general consensus was that computation of the results accounted for a significant proportion of the time investment. It also took time to identify specific assessment items. All the instructors present relied primarily on assessments they were already using to evaluate student performance. The instructors shared with each other strategies for streamlining the amount of time/effort put into the assessment process. **The general consensus was that if instructors identify assessments prior to grading, then they can fairly efficiently create separate entries in grade books that can be readily accessed at the end of the semester.***

50. Are the assessments and success criteria that instructors used providing meaningful and useful evaluations of student and course success in achieving the Core Learning Objectives?

      a. Briefly describe good and bad examples of assessments.

There was considerable discussion about the value—or lack there of—of SACS-type assessments as a valuable tool for improving courses. One instructor noted that his assessment did not adequately capture what he was trying to accomplish in the class, especially the simplistic numerical results that end up being included in the report. The task of assessment and evaluation had stimulated instructors to consider critically their course objectives, learning activities, and assessment methods and to plan future improvements in their courses. However, all instructors reported that this sort of end-of-semester taking stock had always been an integral part of their job as instructors and that the task of formally documenting this process had not significantly improved these efforts. There was some discussion of how we might increase the benefits of the assessment process in the future (given that we are required to do so for external accreditation).

      b. What proportion of instructors (roughly) used good vs. adequate vs. poor assessments (in terms of meaningfulness/usefulness)?

The group concluded that a majority of the assessment reports had employed good assessment procedures and that improvements were already being made for the 07s assessment cycle.

51. What are specific ways that assessments and criteria can be improved to be more meaningful/useful?
      a. Please generate specific guidelines if possible in terms of number, types, and substantive content of assessments/criteria.

There was discussion of the merits and problems with different types of assessments. Class discussion was a useful method in small honor courses, but it had proved difficult in large lecture courses. Multiple-choice items were good for assessing comprehension of basic material, but proved less useful in assessing higher-level critical applications of knowledge. Essay questions were good for assessing higher-level thinking, but demanded too much grader time to be extensively used in large courses.

    b.   What different approaches might be taken to assess this component of the core (e.g., outside of course evaluation/testing)?

Two concrete suggestions were discussed. **First, class discussions can be evaluated by holistic ratings made by instructors of the entire class; they need not be included in the scheme for awarding student grades. Second, instructors can have students engage in writing exercises that are not included in student grades; a sub-sample of the essays can then be formally be scored to evaluate students' higher-level thinking.**

52. How adequate and appropriate were instructor's "action plans" in terms of specifying meaningful ways to improve the course or assessment process?
    a.   What proportion (roughly) of instructors did a good vs. adequate vs. poor job of specifying future actions to improve learning/assessment?

The group concluded that the action plans discussed in reports were adequate-to-good.

    b.   Please generate guidelines that instructors can use to improve action plans.

There was some frustration expressed by the structure of the current Assessment Report format that narrowly aligns action plans with specific learning objectives, assessments, and outcomes. The way the form is currently set up implicitly (if not explicitly) suggests actions should only be planned if a specific assessment did not meet expectations. Often instructors initiate improvement based on more holistic considerations that are not revealed by specific assessments. **The group suggested exploring the possibility of adding entry options to the Assessment Tool for "general considerations" and "other action plans" that are not aligned with specific learning objectives.**

53. From a broader perspective, how might we as a university better facilitate students in achieving the Core Learning Objectives? For example, are there different courses that should be added to the Core? Should some be dropped?

In light of the State mandated nature of the Government 070 requirements, the group concluded that no additions or deletions to the current offering are warranted.

54. Overall, how good a job is UTD doing at assessing and evaluating this component of the Core? Grade as A, B, C, D or F.

The group consensus was A/B. While there is always room for improvement, the current assessment system is good.

55. Overall, how good a job is UTD doing at facilitating students in achieving the Core Learning Objectives for this component of the Core? Grade as A, B, C, D, F or X.

The group consensus was A/B. While there is always room for improvement, the current Government courses are doing a good job of achieving learning objectives.

Core Curriculum Component Report Card

Core Component: *080 Social/Behavioral Science*
Date of meeting: *April 20, 2007*
In attendance: *Duane Buhrmester (acting chair), Euel Elliot, Kruti Dholakia, Shayla Holub, Erin Smith, Karen-Huxtable-Jester, Liz Salter, and Ralf Greenwald*
Report prepared by: *Duane Buhrmester*

The purpose of this meeting was to take stock of what was learned from the fall 2006 assessment of the 080 Social/Behavioral Science component of the Core Curriculum and to make recommendations for how to improve assessment and student learning in the future. The meeting lasted 70 minutes.

Elements of the "Report Card"

56. How much time did instructors invest in preparing the Course Assessment Plan, gathering and collating the assessment data (beyond normal grading), and preparing the Course Assessment Report?
    a. Please report the distribution of hours spent by the instructors that are present at the meeting. Less that 3 hrs; 3-6 hrs; 6-9 hrs; 9-12 hrs; 12-15 hrs; more than 15 hrs

    Three instructors present reported that it took them 3-6 hours, one reported9-12 hours, 2 12-15 hours and one reported greater than 15 hours per section. The consensus was that the time spent will be reduced after the initial learning phase. **Buhrmester suggested that a question asking about the amount of time invested in assessment per section/report should be added to the Assessment Tool.**

    b. Please list aspects of the assessment process that were most time consuming and that need to be streamlined.

A number of concerns and suggestions about the Assessment Tool were discussed. ***Everyone presented wanted a copy function added to the assessment tool that would allow them to roll forward their assessment plan from one semester to the next semester.*** *Buhrmester indicated that the AT already has this capability and that he would look into whether it could be made available to all users.*

Several instructors expressed frustration that they were unable to make changes on the first page of their assessment plan that would have more accurately reflected what they actually assessed (in contrast to what they tentatively thought they would assess at the outset of the course). The group did not see any reason why instructors should ever be locked out of being able to change their plan since it ultimately was of their making. ***Buhrmester promised he would look into keeping plans open for modification until the final report was submitted.*** *One instructor reported having problems with the alignment and numbering of rows in the table after requesting that the plan be re-opened.*

57. Are the assessments and success criteria that instructors used providing meaningful and useful evaluations of student and course success in achieving the Core Learning Objectives?

    a. Briefly describe good and bad examples of assessments.

    There was discussion of the merits and problems with different types of assessments. Class discussion was a useful method in small honor courses, but it had proved difficult in large lecture courses. Multiple-choice items were good for assessing comprehension of basic material, but proved less useful in assessing higher-level critical applications of knowledge. Essay questions were good for assessing higher-level thinking, but demanded too much grader time to be extensively used in large courses.

    b. What proportion of instructors (roughly) used good vs. adequate vs. poor assessments (in terms of meaningfulness/usefulness)?

    The group concluded that a majority of the assessment reports had employed adequate assessment procedures and that improvements were already being made for the 07s assessment cycle.

58. What are specific ways that assessments and criteria can be improved to be more meaningful/useful?
    a. Please generate specific guidelines if possible in terms of number, types, and substantive content of assessments/criteria.

    There was discussion of the time-consuming task of keeping track of and compiling score at the level of individual students. The criterion of "75% of students will correctly answer 75% of items" was especially problematic because it demanded computations for each student. Buhrmester noted that it was

unfortunate that this method on setting a success criterion had been used in examples. Other criterion are equally acceptable and far easier to compile, such as "students will average 75% correct" across a set of items. **Buhrmester said that the examples will be changed in the future.**

   b. What different approaches might be taken to assess this component of the core (e.g., outside of course evaluation/testing)?

Two concrete suggestions were discussed. **First, class discussions can be evaluated by holistic ratings made by instructors of the entire class; they need not be included in the scheme for awarding student grades. Second, instructors can have students engage in writing exercises that are not included in student grades; a sub-sample of the essays can then be formally be scored to evaluate students' higher-level thinking.**

59. How adequate and appropriate were instructor's "action plans" in terms of specifying meaningful ways to improve the course or assessment process?
   a. What proportion (roughly) of instructors did a good vs. adequate vs. poor job of specifying future actions to improve learning/assessment?

The group concluded that the action plans discussed in reports were adequate-to-good.

   b. Please generate guidelines that instructors can use to improve action plans.

There was some frustration expressed by the structure of the current Assessment Report format that narrowly aligns action plans with specific learning objectives, assessments, and outcomes. The way the form is currently set up implicitly (if not explicitly) suggests actions should only be planned if a specific assessment did not meet expectations. Often instructors initiate improvement based on more holistic considerations that are not revealed by specific assessments. **The group suggested exploring the possibility of adding entry options to the Assessment Tool for "general considerations" and "other action plans" that are not aligned with specific learning objectives.**

60. From a broader perspective, how might we as a university better facilitate students in achieving the Core Learning Objectives? For example, are there different courses that should be added to the Core? Should some be dropped?

The group concluded that by-and-large our current offerings were doing a good job of meeting the Core Curriculum learning objectives for Social and Behavioral Science. **There were some questions as to whether the Global Economy course really addresses the Soc/Behavior learning objectives.**

61. Overall, how good a job is UTD doing at assessing and evaluating this component of the Core? Grade as A, B, C, D or F.

The group consensus was B. While there is always room for improvement, the current assessment system is good.

62. Overall, how good a job is UTD doing at facilitating students in achieving the Core Learning Objectives for this component of the Core? Grade as A, B, C, D, F or X.

The group consensus was A/B. While there is always room for improvement, the current Soc/Behavioral courses are doing a good job of achieving learning objectives.