

Completed

3 GOALS 5 OUTCOMES 9 MEASURES 57 TARGETS 55 FINDINGS 7 ATTACHMENTS

TMU Mission Statement

The mission of Truett McConnell University is to equip students to fulfill the Great Commission by fostering a Christian worldview through a Biblically-centered education in a family friendly environment.

Program Purpose Statement

The general education program provides students with a variety of courses, which will provide a broad basis for understanding the world from different perspectives, an understanding of the Christian worldview, and the communication skills (writing and speaking) and the reasoning skills (analytical and quantitative) necessary to continue on in their major fields of study.

1 Program Goal Communication

The students' ability to communicate as well as their perception of that ability will improve after exposure to a variety of disciplines.

1.1 Student Learning Outcome Written Communication

The students will demonstrate an ability to communicate effectively in written form relative to content; organization; logical support; communication; and grammar, punctuation, and spelling.

Action Plan

Action Plan for 2021-2022: See Action Item(s) below.

Budget Source	Amount	Due	Status
	\$0.00	5/26/2022	In Progress

Action Item 1	Created	Due	Status
Action Plan for 2017-2018: Based on the 2016-2017 assessment of our core English courses using the Written Communication rubric, the English faculty will be focusing on basic grammar and usage practice and review in our EN 101: Composition and EN 102: Literature &	7/23/2019	5/31/2018	Complete

Composition courses. We will also reiterate the importance of diction choice, clarity of ideas, and cohesion and coherence in our students' various essay assignments. One way we will present these expectations in the classroom is to provide students with a handout that clearly states the differences between high-school writing expectations and undergraduate-level expectations, including the seven most common mistakes in Freshmen essays, maintaining a professional tone, organization, and unacceptable clichés and vague vocabulary choices.

Action Item 2	Created	Due	Status
<p>Action Plan for 2018-2019: Written Communication Rubric and Student Impressions--Core Assessment Written Communication 2017-2018 – In English 101, the faculty has focused on mechanics of writing. However, there are still areas such as logical thinking and grammar that need to be addressed. Because our online classroom now has a tool (TutorMe) whereby students can upload their writing for spell checking, grammar, and formatting, this is not as big an issue as before. The faculty encourages those who are struggling to access this tool through Bright Space. This tool can be helpful to ESL students, especially, but the faculty needs to make students aware of this resource. One goal is to get upper level bilingual students to tutor the freshmen ESL students. Faculty members also are handing out worksheets and in-class exercises to help correct mechanical issues. In English 102 Composition and Literature, the analytical skills of the students are a focus for the English faculty. Presenting students with prose, poetry, and drama as</p>	7/23/2019	5/31/2019	Complete

literature and then assigning techniques of analysis of each genre, seems to help students look past the literature into analysis of character, setting, style and structure. The students, generally, understand the difference between a book report and an analysis. However, more emphasis can be made on interpretative skills in order to measure their skills effectively.

Action Item 3	Created	Due	Status
<p>Action Plan for 2019-2020: Written Communication (Rubric and Student Impressions) --While the overall Target for Written Communication was met for 2018-2019, it is noted that in EN 101 Students continue to show weaknesses in grammar and mechanics and also are sometimes poor in syntax and diction. Handouts that address these problems will continue to be given to the students for reference. Students will be highly encouraged to take the initiative to apply the information. Students will also be encouraged to use the tutoring they know is available to them from Mrs. Pelletier. The instructor is also available to students who seek help.</p>	7/23/2019	5/31/2020	Complete

Action Item 4	Created	Due	Status
<p>Action Plan for 2020-2021: Written Communication (Rubric and Student Impressions) -- The target using the Written Communication VALUE Rubric for the 2019-2020 academic year was to 1) establish a baseline of student achievement; and 2) have 75% achieve a 3 or 4 avg. score on the rubric. Our findings indicated that 71.7% of students, both on-campus and online, averaged a score of a 3 or 4. The category with the lowest scores was "Control of Syntax and Mechanics" with</p>	2/18/2020	5/27/2021	Complete

59% of students scoring a 3 or 4. To improve scores in this category, faculty will continue to devote class time, handouts, and assignments to grammar, usage, and mechanics review. Students will also be reminded of the online and on-campus tutoring available to them. Under the category "Sources and Evidence," 64% of students scored a 3 or 4. To see improvement in this area, faculty will reiterate the importance of providing textual evidence for argumentative support and create assignments to show students what are and are not acceptable academic sources. We will also discuss giving credit to sources and why citations are required for avoiding plagiarism.

Action Item 5	Created	Due	Status
<p>Action Plan for 2021-2022: Written Communication (Rubric and Student Impressions) -Students showed an overall understanding of purpose and how to implement rhetorical skills in developing their essays. They also demonstrated an adequate knowledge of the rhetorical context of the assigned task and they successfully used relevant and engaging content to support their argumentation. This information also shows that students need improvement in the areas of recognizing and employing credible academic sources, especially when it comes to the explosion of unreliable digital sources that we've seen in the last decade or so. Lastly, this information shows that students need additional class time and exercises devoted to syntax, mechanics, and grammar usage. The English faculty will be addressing our students' lack of establishing purpose and employing credible sources in research and literary analyses. We will also be addressing the need</p>	4/12/2021	5/26/2022	Planned

for more control and understanding of MLA and APA style formatting, grammar usage, and mechanics. The English faculty will emphasize for students the importance of establishing purpose and employing logic in argumentation and literary analysis. We will also develop a plan for ensuring that our online and dual enrollment off-campus instructors employ these same techniques for improving our students' written communication skills. Faculty will also provide style guide exercises and sample essays for reviewing MLA and APA standards and formatting in EN 101 and 102. Prewriting exercises and revisions will focus on developing logical support and employing relevant and timely evidence from credible academic sources in student essays. Faculty will use the written communication rubric (and possibly their own rubric) in grading the Final Essays of both EN 101 and EN 102. We will also cover these topics on exams throughout both courses.

1.1.1 **Measure**

Written Communication Rubric

The Written Communication VALUE Rubric is both an internal and external assessment that is used to assess written communication in the core. Internally, all core courses will use this assessment every semester. Externally, every third year the university will submit samples to be reviewed by outside readers. These external assessments will help calibrate our on campus use of the rubrics and will help validate student learning. This written communication instrument measures the students' effective use of the following: Content and Purpose for Writing; Content Development, Genre and Disciplinary Conventions, Sources and Evidence, and Control of Syntax and Mechanics. Numeric ratings are assigned to each indicator as follows: Level 0: A rating of 0 is assigned if benchmark performance is not demonstrated. Level 1 Benchmark: A rating of 1 is assigned if the indicator is minimally demonstrated. Level 2 Milestone: A rating of 2 is assigned if the indicator is partially demonstrated. Level 3 Milestone: A rating of 3 is assigned if the indicator is consistently demonstrated. Level 4 Capstone: A rating of 4 is assigned if the indicator is skillfully demonstrated.

1.1.1.1 Target

2017-2018 Written Communication Rubric Not Met

TARGET	The written communication achievement target using the written communication rubric for academic year 2017-2018 is to exceed the average score from the previous year on a scale of 0-4. The average score for 2016-2017 was 3.09.
FINDINGS	The average score for 2017-2018 was 2.35.
ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS	A drop of .74 resulted in the target not being met. The individual indicators that contributed to the overall findings were--Content: 2.4; Organization: 2.48; Logical Support: 2.39; Communication: 2.35; and Grammar, Punctuation, and Spelling: 2.13.

1.1.1.2 Target

2018-2019 Written Communication Rubric Met

TARGET	The written communication achievement target using the written communication rubric for academic year 2018-2019 is to exceed the average score from the previous year on a scale of 0-4. The average score for 2017-2018 was 2.35.
FINDINGS	This year the overall average score was 2.98; On campus: 2.81; Online: NA; Dual Enrollment 2.79; Dual Enrollment Online 3.20;
ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS	An increase of .61 resulted in the target being met. The individual indicators that contributed to the overall findings were: University Average Overall: 2.98 Context and Purpose: 3.10 Context Development: 2.99 Genre and Disciplinary Conventions: 2.97 Sources and Evidence: 2.99 Control of Syntax and Mechanics: 2.87 On Campus Overall: 2.81 Context and Purpose: 2.95 Context Development: 2.83 Genre and Disciplinary Conventions: 2.82 Sources and Evidence: 2.82

Control of Syntax and Mechanics: 2.66

On Line Overall: NO DATA

Context and Purpose

Context Development:

Genre and Disciplinary Conventions:

Sources and Evidence:

Control of Syntax and Mechanics:

Dual Enrollment Overall 2.79

Context and Purpose: 3.01

Context Development: 2.78

Genre and Disciplinary Conventions: 2.74

Sources and Evidence: 2.64

Control of Syntax and Mechanics 2.79:

Online Dual Enrollment Overall: 3.20

Context and Purpose: 3.25

Context Development: 3.23

Genre and Disciplinary Conventions: 3.20

Sources and Evidence: 3.29

Control of Syntax and Mechanics 3.04;#13;#10;

1.1.1.3 Target

2019-2020 Written Communication Rubric Met

TARGET

The target using the Written Communication VALUE Rubric for this academic year is 1) to establish a baseline of student achievement; and 2) to have 75% achieve a 3 or 4 avg. score on the rubric.

FINDINGS

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

This year we are establishing baseline with the new rubric and therefore do not have meaningful comparisons with previous years The individual indicators that contributed to the overall findings were:

University Average Overall: 2.98

Context and Purpose: 3.10
Context Development: 2.99
Genre and Disciplinary Conventions: 2.97
Sources and Evidence: 2.99
Control of Syntax and Mechanics: 2.87

On Campus Overall: 2.81
Context and Purpose: 2.95
Context Development: 2.83
Genre and Disciplinary Conventions: 2.82
Sources and Evidence: 2.82
Control of Syntax and Mechanics: 2.66

On Line Overall: NO DATA
Context and Purpose
Context Development:
Genre and Disciplinary Conventions:
Sources and Evidence:
Control of Syntax and Mechanics:

Dual Enrollment Overall 2.79
Context and Purpose: 3.01
Context Development: 2.78
Genre and Disciplinary Conventions: 2.74
Sources and Evidence: 2.64
Control of Syntax and Mechanics 2.79:

Online Dual Enrollment Overall: 3.20
Context and Purpose: 3.25
Context Development: 3.23
Genre and Disciplinary Conventions: 3.20
Sources and Evidence: 3.29
Control of Syntax and Mechanics 3.04:

1.1.1.4

Target2020-2021 Written Communication Rubric **Met**

TARGET	The target using the Written Communication VALUE Rubric for this academic year is to meet or exceed last year's overall score of 2.98.
FINDINGS	This year the overall average score was 2.98.
ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS	<p>This year TMU exceeded last campus average of 2.98 with a 3.09 average:</p> <p>University Average Overall: 3.09</p> <p>Context and Purpose: 3.01</p> <p>Context Development: 3.04</p> <p>Genre and Disciplinary Conventions: 3.06</p> <p>Sources and Evidence: 3.0</p> <p>Control of Syntax and Mechanics: 3.02</p> <p>On Campus Overall: 2.43</p> <p>Context and Purpose: 2.29</p> <p>Context Development: 2.29</p> <p>Genre and Disciplinary Conventions: 2.236</p> <p>Sources and Evidence: 2.50</p> <p>Control of Syntax and Mechanics: 2.71</p> <p>On Line Overall: 3.04</p> <p>Context and Purpose: 2.93</p> <p>Context Development: 3.10</p> <p>Genre and Disciplinary Conventions: 3.17</p> <p>Sources and Evidence: 3.57</p> <p>Control of Syntax and Mechanics: 3.45</p> <p>Dual Enrollment Overall: 3.53</p> <p>Context and Purpose: 3.57</p> <p>Context Development: 3.47</p> <p>Genre and Disciplinary Conventions: 3.57</p> <p>Sources and Evidence: 3.57</p> <p>Control of Syntax and Mechanics: 3.45</p>

Online Dual Enrollment Overall: 2.97
Context and Purpose: 3.0
Context Development: 2.98
Genre and Disciplinary Conventions: 2.96
Sources and Evidence: 2.96
Control of Syntax and Mechanics 2.94

1.1.2 Measure
Student Impressions Survey

The Student Survey is conducted by Student Services to assess student satisfaction with the university and their views about the various activities at TMU. Included in this survey are ten questions asking about the core curriculum's contribution to their learning. Two deal specifically with student learning outcomes in written communication. One component of this survey ask the following, "Please respond to the statement below: The general education requirements (core curriculum) have contributed to my ability: "to write clearly and effectively." "to minimize grammatical, punctuation, and spelling mistakes."

1.1.2.1 Target
2017-2018 Student Impressions Survey: Writing Clearly and Effectively **Met**

TARGET	The target for this academic year is to meet or exceed the percentage of students who answered "agree" or "strongly agree."
FINDINGS	Last year's score: 70%. This year's score: 72.06%.
ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS	Students' impression of their learning outcomes in regard to writing clearly and effectively increase by 2.06%.

1.1.2.2 Target
2017-2018 Student Impressions Survey: Grammatical, Punctuation, and Spelling **Met**

TARGET	The target for this academic year is to meet or exceed the percentage of students who answered "agree" or "strongly agree."
FINDINGS	Last year's score: 71.54%. This year's score: 77.2%.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

Students' impression of their learning outcomes in regard to correctly use grammar, punctuation, and spelling increased by 5.66%.

1.1.2.3

Target

2018-2019 Student Impressions Survey: Writing Clearly and Effectively

Not Met

TARGET

The target for this academic year is to meet or exceed the percentage of students who answered "agree" or "strongly agree."

FINDINGS

Last year's score: 72%. This year's score: 58%.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

Students' impression of their learning outcomes in regard to correctly use grammar, punctuation, and spelling decreased by 14%.

1.1.2.4

Target

2018-2019 Student Impressions Survey: Grammatical, Punctuation, and Spelling

Not Met

TARGET

The target for this academic year is to meet or exceed the percentage of students who answered "agree" or "strongly agree."

FINDINGS

Last year's score: 77%. This year's score: 58%.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

Students' impression of their learning outcomes in regard to correctly using grammar, punctuation, and spelling decreased by 19%.

1.1.2.5

Target

2019-2020 Student Impressions Survey: Grammatical, Punctuation, and Spelling

Not Reported this Period

TARGET

The target for this academic year is to meet or exceed the percentage of students who answered "agree" or "strongly agree."

FINDINGS

Last score year's score: 58%. Due to Covid-19, the Student Impressions Survey was not given.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

Due to Covid-19, the Student Impressions Survey was not given.

1.1.2.6 Target

2020-2021 Student Impressions Survey: Writing Clearly and Effectively **Met**

TARGET The goal for this academic year is to meet or exceed the percentage of students who answered "agree" or "strongly agree" on the 2018-2019 Student Impressions Survey. Last year's score was 58%.

FINDINGS Last year's score: 58%. This year's score: 73.79%.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS The students' perception that the core curriculum is contributing to their ability increased 15.79%.

1.1.2.7 Target

2020-2021 Student Impressions Survey: Minimize Grammatical, Punctuation, and Spelling Mistakes **Met**

TARGET The goal for this academic year is to meet or exceed the percentage of students who answered "agree" or "strongly agree" on the 2018-2019 Student Impressions Survey. That score was 58%.

FINDINGS 2018-2019 score: 58%. 2020-2021 score: 67.59%.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS The students' perception that the core curriculum is contributing to their ability increased 9.58%.

1.2 Student Learning Outcome

Oral Communication

The students will demonstrate an ability to effectively communicate orally relative to topic; support; organization; verbal skills; and non-verbal skills.

Action Plan

Action Plan for 2021-2022: See Action Item(s) below.

Budget Source	Amount	Due	Status
	\$0.00	5/26/2022	Planned

Action Item 1	Created	Due	Status
Action Plan for 2017-2018: Oral Communication	7/23/2019	5/31/2018	Complete
? Closing the Loop ? 2016/2017 Academic Year			

? TMU There were two courses that were used to assess oral communication for the 2016/2017 academic year. BU105 ? Leadership and Public Speaking (one section) and PY220 ? Human Growth and Development (two sections). The two sections for PY220 were taught by different instructors so there were three different faculty involved in the assessment process. As previously stated in the oral communication assessment from the 2015/2016 academic year, the implementation and interpretation of the rubric was addressed and consideration was given to the lack of exposure to the actual elements of the rubric as it related to the student. Two of the courses did not instruct the learner in the specific aspects that were to be evaluated. Two of the courses evaluated from a group dynamic with the group choosing the best spokesperson for their oral presentation. In light of the recommendations, the following changes were implemented. 1. Each instructor worked from the exact same rubric and introduced these elements to the student prior to evaluation. 2. The PY220 courses used a different group assignment for each course to provide a broader look at the assessment. 3. PY220 assigned each member of the group an oral component, to allow for individual assessing, which provided a clearer picture for improvement. 4. Two or more sections of BU105 was not provided, even though the evaluation of the assessment indicated this change. During the 2016/2017 school year, three of the four recommendations were administered and the data indicates some variance from the previous year. After discussing, it was concluded that the lack of

evaluation in the two PY220 courses still impacts the data, but that this variation still provides an important assessment of oral communication. Even though additional sections of BU105 were not offered during this school year, the data demonstrates a consistent improvement in the student's progression. The following recommendations were made to provide a truer picture as it relates to the assessing of oral communication for the 2017/2018 academic year. 1. Each instructor will continue to work from the exact same rubric and introduce these elements to the student prior to evaluation. 2. The PY220 courses will continue to evaluate a student's ability to communicate orally, even though there is not a benchmark to which the evaluation can be compared. 3. Three sections of BU105 will be evaluated so that proper oral assessment may be acquired.

Action Item 2	Created	Due	Status
<p>Action Plan for 2018-2019: Oral Communication--Two core courses were assigned to assess oral communication for the 2017/2018 academic year. The section offerings for BU105 (Leadership and Public Speaking) were increased, which provided four different sections of data that was compiled. PY220 (Human Growth and Development) had five different sections. The data for PY220 was not submitted, so the oral communication loop closure assessment was limited to one course and four sections. In light of the results, the following changes are suggested for implementation. 1. The rubric used over the past several years, to assess oral communication, is still an effective tool to measure outcomes, and should continue to be</p>	7/23/2019	5/31/2019	Complete

used. 2. Oral communication may not be the best measurement for the PY 220 courses. A decision must be made regarding the courses continued involvement in this area of assessment. The core committee, along with the Psychology department, must determine if the assessment area is still an acceptable match for the PY 220 course. 3. After two years of implementation suggestions, related to additional sections for the BU105 course, four sections were offered for the 2017/2018 year. These additional sections provide a greater opportunity to more accurately provide oral communication assessment. The university should continue offering at least four sections. As stated earlier, during the 2017/2018 school year, the recommendations for BU 105 were administered and the data indicates some variance from the previous year. The lack of evaluation in the four PY220 courses impacted the data, and this variation impacted the importance of assessing oral communication. The following recommendations were made to provide a truer picture as it relates to the assessing of oral communication for the 2018/2019 academic year. 1. Instructors will continue to work from the same rubric and introduce these elements to the student prior to evaluation. 2. The PY220 fall courses should evaluate a student's ability to communicate orally. Once a decision is made by the core committee regarding the reevaluation of the PY 220 offerings, the spring courses may be assessed differently. 3. Five sections of BU105 will be evaluated so proper oral assessment may be acquired.

Action Item 3	Created	Due	Status
Action Plan for 2019-2020: Oral	7/23/2019	5/31/2020	Complete

Communication --1. Continue using the same rubric across the board. Data comparison was easier due to this coordinated effort. 2. Continue offering multiple sections of BU105 (Leadership and Public Speaking). This should expose the students early to basic presentation concepts, which are not specifically addressed in PY220 or BI101. 3. Since PY220 and BI101 are not teaching public speaking, a demonstration through video may be necessary to help the student know what elements to focus on. 4. Since dual enrolled scores were lower, there may be a need to provide them with a feedback element as they prepare for their presentations. This may fill the void of peer-to-peer discussions that occur outside the classroom for on-ground students.

Action Item 4

Action Plan for 2020-2021: Oral

Created

2/18/2020

Due

5/27/2021

Status

Complete

Communication - Closing the Loop - The following recommendations were made to provide a truer picture as it relates to the assessing of oral communication for the 2019/20 academic year. The key outtakes from these changes are as follows: 1. Instructors continue to use the same Value Communication rubric. 2. Although the PY220 courses do not teach public speaking, the inclusion of oral data continues to provide a broader scope of the core focus. 3. Multiple sections of BU105 were evaluated and this strengthened the desire for proper evaluation. Two core courses were utilized in assessing oral communication for the 2019/2020 academic year. Data was collected from BU105 (Leadership and Public Speaking) and PY220 (Human Growth and Development). The oral communication assessment was administered

in ten sections for data collection. The data compiled indicated that the students met the school goal of 3.0. On campus students performed at a level of 3.17, while the dual enrolled students exceeded the goal, with a 3.87 average score. In light of the results, the following changes are suggested for implementation.

1. The Value rubric used is still an effective tool to measure outcomes, and should continue to be used.
2. Since public speaking is not specially taught in PY220, there is a need for the instructor to provide an example(s) of desired rubric outcomes. Instructors are encouraged to clearly explain expectations and spend time preparing students for the oral aspect of the presentation. (This is vital for PY220 course, since it is not a public speaking course)
3. Continue offering multiple sections for BU105, in order to expose the student to an early understanding of oral communication.
4. Dual enrollment students scored significantly higher than on-line and on ground students. It appears there may be an issue with implementation and scoring of the assessment. This will be addressed within the business school, in order clean up any data inconsistencies.
5. Due to some submissions being forced into an electronic mode, the scores in the delivery section may have been impacted. Additional attention will be given to cross-training students as it relates to in person vs. video delivered presentations. Instructors will be encouraged to evaluate as close to the rubric, regardless of the delivery system.

Action Item 5	Created	Due	Status
Action Plan for 2021-2022: Oral	4/12/2021	5/26/2022	Planned

Communication - The following recommendations were made to provide a truer picture as it relates to the assessing of oral communication for the 2020/21 academic year. The key outtakes from these changes are as follows: 1. Instructors continue use the same Value Communication rubric. 2. Although the PY220 courses do not teach public speaking, the inclusion of oral data continues to provide a broader scope of the core focus. 3. The lack of data from dual enrollment impacted the overall evaluation. Two core courses were utilized in assessing oral communication for the 2019/2020 academic year. Data was collected from BU105 (Leadership and Public Speaking) and PY220 (Human Growth and Development). The oral communication assessment was administered in seven sections for data collection. The data compiled indicated that the students met the school goal of 3.0. On campus students performed at a level of 3.04, which is down from 3.17 from last year. Since the delivery method for on ground, during the spring of 2020, was modified due to Covid, the data will need to be evaluated over a three-year period. In light of the results, the following changes are suggested for implementation. 1. The Value rubric used is still an effective tool to measure outcomes, and should continue to be used. 2. As stated last year, PY220 does not teach oral communication as part of the course objectives. An oral presentation is used to evaluate the student's oral communication ability, but instructors should continue to provide an example of the proper form of an oral speech. This should include feedback on how the student can incorporate the simple

techniques within their presentation and the example should utilize the key components of the Value Rubric. 3. Continue offering multiple sections for BU105, in order to expose the student to an early understanding of oral communication. 4. Dual enrollment students scored significantly higher last year, but no data was submitted this academic year. Monitoring of the scoring assessment will continue to be addressed to make sure there are less data inconsistencies. 5. In BU105, the Value Rubric components will be utilized in the early grading of pre-speech work, in order for the student to have a better understanding of the final oral speech evaluation.

1.2.1 Measure

Oral Communication Rubric

The Oral Communication VALUE Rubric is both an internal and external assessment that is used to assess written communication in the core. Internally, all core courses will use this assessment every semester. Externally, every third year the university will submit samples to be reviewed by outside readers. These external assessments will help calibrate our on campus use of the rubrics and will help validate student learning. This oral communication instrument measures the students' effective use of the following: Explanation of Issues, Evidence, Influence of context and assumptions, Student's position (perspective, thesis / hypothesis), Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences). Numeric ratings are assigned to each indicator as follows: Level 0: A rating of 0 is assigned if benchmark performance is not demonstrated. Level 1 Benchmark: A rating of 1 is assigned if the indicator is minimally demonstrated. Level 2 Milestone: A rating of 2 is assigned if the indicator is partially demonstrated. Level 3 Milestone: A rating of 3 is assigned if the indicator is consistently demonstrated. Level 4 Capstone: A rating of 4 is assigned if the indicator is skillfully demonstrated.

1.2.1.1 Target

2017-2018 Oral Communication Rubric **Not Met**

TARGET

The oral communication achievement target using the oral communication rubric for academic year 2017-2018 is to exceed the average score from the previous year

on a scale of 0-4. The average score for 2016-2017 was 3.14.

FINDINGS The average score for 2017-2018 was 3.0.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS A slight drop in scores of 0.14 resulted in the target not being met. The individual indicators that contributed to the overall findings were--Content: 3.44; Support: 3.04; Organization: 3.04; Verbal: 3.15; Non-Verbal: 2.32.

1.2.1.2 Target

2018-2019 Oral Communication Rubric Met

TARGET The oral communication achievement target using the oral communication rubric for this academic year is to exceed the average score from the previous year's assessment.

FINDINGS The average score for 2018-2019 was 3.01.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS A slight increase in scores of 0.01 resulted in the target being met. The individual indicators that contributed to the overall findings were:

On Campus

Content: 3.24

Support: 3.12

Organization: 3.12

Verbal: 2.98

Non-Verbal: 2.98

Online

Content: 2.51

Support: 2.57

Organization: 2.71

Verbal: 2.69

Non-Verbal: 2.98

University Average

Content: 3.14

Support: 3.05

Organization: 3.02

Verbal: 2.89

Non-Verbal: 2.98

1.2.1.3 Target

2019-2020 Oral Communication Rubric **Met**

TARGET	The target using the Oral Communication VALUE Rubric for this academic year is 1) to establish a baseline of student achievement; and 2) to have 75% achieve a 3 or 4 avg. score on the rubric.
FINDINGS	This year the overall average score was 3.07 On campus: 2.95 Online: 3.42 Dual Enrollment 3.81
ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS	<p>This year we are establishing baseline with the new rubric and therefore do not have meaningful comparisons with previous years. The individual indicators that contributed to the overall findings were:</p> <p>On Campus: 2.95 Organization: 3.02 Language: 3.21 Delivery: 2.87 Supporting material: 2.90 Central Message: 2.76</p> <p>Online: 3.42 Organization: 3.53 Language: 3.63 Delivery: 3.53 Supporting material: 3.06 Central Message: : 3.35</p> <p>Dual Enrollment: 3.81 Organization: 3.81 Language: 3.81 Delivery: 3.81 Supporting material: 3.81 Central Message: 3.81</p> <p>University Averages: 3.07</p>

Organization: 3.13
Language: 3.29
Delivery: 3.0
Supporting material: 3.01
Central Message: 2.91

1.2.1.4 Target

2020-2021 Oral Communication Rubric **Not Met**

TARGET The target using the Oral Communication VALUE Rubric for this academic year is to meet or exceed last year's overall score of 3.07.

FINDINGS This year the overall average score was 3.04

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS This year we TMU fell below the target of 3.07 and achieved a 3.04 overall average on the oral communication rubric.

University Average: 3.04
Organization: 3.10
Language: 3.17
Delivery: 2.98
Supporting material: 3.06
Central Message: 2.91

On Campus: 2.92
Organization: 2.98
Language: 3.06
Delivery: 2.87
Supporting material: 2.92
Central Message: : 2.74

Online: No Data Submitted
Organization:
Language:
Delivery:
Supporting material:

Central Message:

Dual Enrollment: No Data Submitted

Organization:

Language:

Delivery:

Supporting material:

Central Message:

Dual Enrollment Online: 3.61

Organization: 3.65

Language: 3.65

Delivery: 3.33

Supporting material: 3..65

Central Message: 3.65

2

Program Goal

Critical Thinking

The students' ability to think critically as well as their perception of that ability will improve after exposure to a variety of disciplines.

2.1

Student Learning Outcome

Analytical Critical Thinking

The students will demonstrate an ability to effectively use analytical critical thinking skills relative to objectivity; use of evidence; alternative positions; valid argumentation; organization; and originality.

Action Plan

Action Plan for 2021-2022: See Action Item(s) below.

Budget Source	Amount	Due	Status
	\$0.00	5/26/2022	Planned

Action Item 1	Created	Due	Status
Action Plan for 2017-2018: Critical Thinking Analytical: 2016-2017 Discuss how faculty	7/23/2019	5/31/2018	Complete

should interpret the rubric and implement it in a consistent manner. ? In an attempt to gain consistency of rubric utilization and interpretation within each course that is taught by multiple instructors, these instructors should coordinate their efforts with the Degree Program Coordinator for their area. This should be done at the beginning of each semester in which data is to be collected. Describe the specific measures that will be implemented in each course to improve the areas where goals were not met. ? In HI 201 American History I the overall average for the complete Critical Thinking Analytical rubric (2.28) was lower than the average result for all of the rubrics (2.3). These student efforts were lower than the average in Objectivity, Use of Evidence, Valid Argumentation, and Organization. Scores were higher than the average in Originality. In 2017-2018, analytical critical thinking will be assessed with a different essay question on the final exams. A significant amount of class time will be devoted to helping the students to understand the essay assignment and all of its features. ? One instructor of BI 101 required his students to write a paper that was more personalized for each student. Based upon his experiences with the assignment and the utilization of this rubric, in 2017-2018 he will be changing the assignment from one featuring the students' majors to one focused upon bioethics to better fit the needs of analytical critical thinking assessment ? Another BI 101 professor writes: ? Measures implemented this year to improve will include having a deadline for handing in rough drafts so feedback can be given to all students before handing in final paper. The

specific measures on the analytical rubric make up the bioethics paper rubric I give to students. I have no issues with the rubric measurements and because of required rough draft checks, each rubric measurement will be evaluated on the student rough draft, and appropriate feedback given, so they can improve their analysis for the final draft.? Explain how last year?s action plan affected student learning. ? One instructor of BI 101 writes: ?Last year?s action plan to model and debate ethics issues in class improved student outcomes in my class. Also, more students handed in rough drafts to get feedback than usual and that also improved scores.?

Action Item 2	Created	Due	Status
<p>Action Plan for 2018-2019: Analytical Critical Thinking --While the external assessment (The CAT test) and the student perception survey showed improvement in student learning outcomes. The Critical Thinking Analytic Rubric Report indicated a decline. Examining the individual indicators on the critical thinking analytic rubric report for 2017-18 indicates that every indicator declined from the previous year. Objectivity fell from 2.44 to 2.05. Use of evidence fell from 2.46 to 2.18. Valid Argumentation fell from 2.32 to 2.05. Alternative Positions fell from 2.50 to 1.87. Organization fell from 2.52 to 2.37. Originality fell from 2.59 to 2.34. To work towards improving outcomes in critical thinking, the following steps will be taken by faculty members in the core courses. In PH 210, Logic and Critical thinking, Pelletier will be adding study guides and handouts to the online classroom and doing more in-class practice exercises which will require the students to</p>	7/23/2019	5/31/2019	Complete

practice valid argumentation. He will also add material to the class on the need for objectivity and the necessity of understanding an opponent's position from their point of view. As a whole, the biology department will be revising the assignment used in BI to better fit the assessment of critical thinking. In BI 101, Hennigan will distribute a model paper demonstrating sound thinking regarding bioethical issues. He also plans on distributing a detailed rubric and using 2-3 days in class time modeling a debate on an ethics topic. He will emphasize that the modeled debate will be similar to how they approach the paper. In BI 101, Fabich was happy with the improvements his students made last year and will continue to implement those improvements. In HI 101, Justus sees that his students can think critically, but will work on improving student learning outcomes in regard to critical thinking by discussing the context of the question that he will use for assessing his students. He will give particular emphasis to developing and applying the proper standards by which to answer the question.

Action Item 3	Created	Due	Status
Action Plan for 2019-2020: Analytical Critical Thinking (Rubric, CAT, and Student Impressions) --While the Critical Thinking Analytic Rubric Report indicated an increase, the external assessment (The CAT test) and the student perception survey showed dramatic declines in student learning outcomes. To work towards improving outcomes in critical thinking, the following steps will be taken by faculty members in the core courses. Course Changes Logic and Critical Thinking, As planned, Pelletier added	7/23/2019	5/31/2020	Complete

study guides and handouts to the online classroom and did more in-class practice exercises. These helped the students do better on some of the quizzes and exams although some students became very passive learners; e.g., not taking notes. This year to help with creative thinking which is a component of 5 of 6 questions where the seniors did significantly worse than the national average on the CAT, Pelletier will add several lectures on finding alternative explanations, and interpretations of data, as well as identifying additional information needed to evaluate an hypothesis.

Biology: It was proposed last spring that students write a critical analysis of a bioethical issue and compare and contrast arguments for and against it. The department proposed that a written example for students to study would be given to help them understand the nature of the paper. That example was not given, instead they tried to model the debate during class sessions. Next semester, students will be given the same assignment and then given an example paper of an ethics question, critically analyzed, (they will not be able to choose this example for their topic). It is hypothesized that if given a tangible and written example of a critically thought out ethics debate, students might do better, than by watching it verbally modeled in class.

American National Government: To facilitate greater oversight of the online program and adjunct faculty and to help maintain consistency in assessment, J. Marie Griffin-Taylor will implement an online classroom, known as a Faculty Learning Community Create and implement an online classroom, known as a Faculty Learning Community for PO 101. All individuals teaching

this course, whether online, dual enrollment, or on-campus will be required to participate. This will help ensure all faculty have access to the same material, and will permit the exchange of ideas and creation of standards to guarantee all faculty teach according to university standards. Furthermore, by developing this faculty learning community, the faculty enjoy greater buy-in to the program while enhancing assessment participation. If this pilot program works, it may be implemented with other classes that have a high number of online sections or adjuncts teaching it.

Program Notes and Changes Closing the Loop on the CAT Assessment: The results of the CAT were delivered in the summer after the closing the loop meeting at the end of the school year. They will be assessed during the faculty workshop at the beginning of the next school year.

New Rubrics: The team reviewing student-learning outcomes in regard to critical thinking also voted to use the VALUE institute rubrics. This rubrics will give some added precision in the scoring process, better inter-rater reliability, and an external assessment when the rubrics are scored by external assessors.

Analysis of the Student Perceptions Survey: Because all measures of the core curriculum on the Student Perceptions Survey fell dramatically and simultaneously while the core faculty and classes essentially remained the same, the general perception is that some outside factors other than the material in the core classes may have contributed to the decline in the perception of student learning. To understand the reasoning behind those responses, a group of faculty and staff will hold focus groups to gain understanding as to why

students responded the way they did.

Action Item 4	Created	Due	Status
Action Plan for 2019-2020: Analytical Critical Thinking (Rubric, CAT, and Student Impressions) - For a detailed description please see the attached General Education--Critical Thinking--Action Plan 2020-2021	2/18/2020	5/27/2021	Complete

Action Item 5	Created	Due	Status
Action Plan for 2021-2022: Analytical Critical Thinking (Rubric, CAT, and Student Impressions) - The various indicators show mixed results. On the positive side, our rubric scores show an overall increase in critical thinking capability. On the mostly positive side, our students' responses to the Student Impression Survey was positive overall but with some mixed indicators. Two areas showed significant increases, one area showed an insignificant increase of .33%, and a fourth area fell slightly by 1%. More concerning is that like other schools during the COVID pandemic, our lower division students saw a decline in critical thinking on the CAT exam and fell below the national average. The upper division students remain below the national average but only fell by .01%. To work towards improving critical thinking the following proposals have been made by the faculty teaching courses which emphasize critical thinking skills. The deficiencies in student learning in regard to critical thinking and plans to remediate them were given by the following faculty members. Nicole Stott in BI 101 I think one of the major areas that students show a need for improvement is in their communication of another viewpoint. Many students were able to assess the issue and provide evidence (Biblical	4/12/2021	5/26/2022	Planned

or otherwise) to support the issue at hand, but many didn't emphasis/address another perspective. Some students provided a defense of their own perspective without necessarily considering an opposing view point. To address this issue, I recommend providing an opposing viewpoint and then require students to respond to that viewpoint and state how their viewpoint differs. Tom Hennigan in BI 101 How well students can critically think about the ethics (pros and cons) for specific biological issues we face today. There seems to be a slight improvement overall from previous assessments, so I will continue to hand out an example argument for a bioethics issue, so students have an idea of what is expected by them. I will also model in class and have them debate one another in class. Work ethic and lack of skills necessary to critically think (e.g. careful reading and comprehension in the content area.) Give out a brief reading that ties into content area and take class time to read and model how to analyze the information. Paul Diby in BI 101 A small percentage of students needs improvement in their understanding of holistic concepts. I will develop PowerPoint slides that will connect dots and will help those students with ideas in a holistic manner A small percent of student performed poor in Critical Thinking. More writing assignments Andrew Fabich in BI 101 Evaluating evidence Incorporate discussion boards about use of evidence. Ability to evaluate evidence from all angles without bias. I did this for the current semester, but I'm wanting to see if the improvements in scores were because of the class or because of me incorporating the discussion boards, talking

through rubrics during lecture, and giving feedback on various assignments. As close to exactly the same as last semester as possible in terms of what was used. This time, though, I plan to give them this kind of information earlier in the course and make it happen more frequently as reminders. Andrea Brant in BI 101 Students have shown a need to improve their skills in researching and synthesizing data from views that are different from their own. I propose to spend more time focusing on critical thinking activities and presenting alternate viewpoints. Gee Brantley BI 101 Students in BI 101 have shown an inability to properly discern the difference between mitosis/meiosis and applying that knowledge into the concepts of Mendelian Genetics. I will devise an assignment to better assess the students' knowledge and draw a connection between the two incorporating modules and hands on learning. David Crum in HI 201 Students need to rely on their class resources. This is a struggle for the first assignment. By assignment 3 this clearly changed. Students continued to improve relying on class resources. Students need to be encouraged to properly cite and rely on their class resources. For this class, they must bring in their textbook and class lectures. Katherine Gamble in HI 201 Some students continue to struggle with including specific factual evidence in their historic writing. They often want to say how they feel, rather than utilizing what the information shows. I have worked to train students to underline each piece of specific factual evidence in their work. In the past I have not required it, however, I will look towards requiring it on future writing

assignments. Brian Chmielewski in HI 201 Reading a document and placing in context the contents of said document. Give them a speech and have them analyze not just what the speech is about, but place it within the greater context of the country at that time. Michael Justus in HI 201 The results show that one area of weakness is in the use of evidence. When the course is taught in the future, I will emphasize the importance of evidence and its proper selection. Nicole Bowen in PO 101 Helping students to more fully explain the reasons WHY things happen to move beyond simple statements of fact. Short writing practice weekly to help students take a position statement or thesis and explain WHY that statement is true. Students have a difficult time retaining facts about key foundation documents for American Government. We will create a notecard box for foundational documents and court cases. Samuel Pelletier in PH 210 In an assignment asking for the students either to challenge or to defend an argument, they have difficulty examining the premises in those arguments and determining how those premises logically entail or fail to entail the conclusions asserted by the author. I will provide more examples in class of similar arguments and have the class critique the premises and show how they do or do not entail the conclusion.

2.1.1 **Measure** Analytical Critical Thinking Rubric

The Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric is both an internal and external assessment that is used to assess written communication in the core. Internally, all core courses will use this assessment every semester. Externally, every third year the university will submit samples to be reviewed by outside readers. These external assessments will help calibrate our on campus

use of the rubrics and will help validate student learning. This critical thinking instrument measures the students' effective use of the following: Explanation of Issues, Evidence, Influence of context and assumptions, Student's position (perspective, thesis / hypothesis), Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences). Numeric ratings are assigned to each indicator as follows: Level 0: A rating of 0 is assigned if benchmark performance is not demonstrated. Level 1 Benchmark: A rating of 1 is assigned if the indicator is minimally demonstrated. Level 2 Milestone: A rating of 2 is assigned if the indicator is partially demonstrated. Level 3 Milestone: A rating of 3 is assigned if the indicator is consistently demonstrated. Level 4 Capstone: A rating of 4 is assigned if the indicator is skillfully demonstrated.

2.1.1.1 Target

2018-2019 Analytic Critical Thinking Rubric **Met**

TARGET	The analytical critical thinking target using the analytical communication rubric for academic year 2018- 2019 is to exceed the average score from the previous year's assessment on a scale of 0 - 4. The average score for 2017-2018 was 2.12.
FINDINGS	The overall rubric score for analytical critical thinking for 2018-2019 was 2.49.
ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS	<p>An increase of .37 led to the target being met. The individual indicators that contributed to this score were:</p> <p>University Average</p> <p>Objectivity: 2.52</p> <p>Use of Evidence: 2.63</p> <p>Alternative Positions: 2.05</p> <p>Valid Argumentation: 2.56</p> <p>Organization: 2.65</p> <p>Originality: 2.49</p> <p>On Campus</p> <p>Objectivity: 2.44</p> <p>Use of Evidence: 2.57</p> <p>Alternative Positions: 1.82</p> <p>Valid Argumentation: 2.48</p> <p>Organization: 2.60</p> <p>Originality: 2.38</p> <p>Online</p>

Objectivity: 3.59
 Use of Evidence: 3.43
 Alternative Positions: 3.55
 Valid Argumentation: 3.41
 Organization: 3.38
 Originality: 3.45
 Dual Enrollment
 Objectivity: 2.07
 Use of Evidence: 2.2
 Alternative Positions: N/A
 Valid Argumentation: 2.33
 Organization: 2.53
 Originality: 2.4
 Online Dual Enrollment
 Objectivity: 2.62
 Use of Evidence: 3.78
 Alternative Positions: 3.78
 Valid Argumentation: 3.78
 Organization: 3.78
 Originality: 3.78

2.1.1.2 Target
 2017-2018 Analytic Critical Thinking Rubric **Not Met**

TARGET	The analytical critical thinking target using the analytical communication rubric for academic year 2017- 2018 is to exceed the average score from the previous year’s assessment on a scale of 0 - 4. The average score for 2016-2017 was 2.47.
FINDINGS	The overall rubric score for analytical critical thinking for 2017-2018 was 2.12.
ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS	A drop of .35 led to the target not being met. The individual indicators that contributed to this score were Objectivity: 2.05; Use of Evidence: 2.18; Alternative Positions: 1.87; Organization 2.37; and Originality: 2.24.

2.1.1.3 Target
 2019-2020 Analytical Critical Thinking Rubric **Met**

TARGET The target using the Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric for 2019-20 is 1) to establish a baseline of student achievement; and 2) to have 75% achieve a 3 or 4 avg. score on the rubric.

FINDINGS

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS This year we are establishing baseline with the new rubric and therefore do not have meaningful comparisons with previous years. The individual indicators that contributed to the overall findings were:

University Average Overall: 3.03
Explanation of Issues: 3.13
Selecting and Using Evidence: 3.03
Influence of Context and Assumptions: 2.95
Valid Argumentation: 3.08
Students Position: 2.98

On Campus Overall: 2.87
Explanation of Issues: 3.02
Selecting and Using Evidence: 2.85
Influence of Context and Assumptions: 2.75
Valid Argumentation: 2.92
Students Position: 2.83

On Line Overall: 2.55
Explanation of Issues: 2.84
Selecting and Using Evidence: 2.57
Influence of Context and Assumptions: 2.18
Valid Argumentation: 3.09
Students Position: 2.09

Dual Enrollment Overall 3.08
Explanation of Issues: 2.98
Selecting and Using Evidence: 3.16
Influence of Context and Assumptions: 2.98
Valid Argumentation: 3.17
Students Position: 3.11

Online Dual Enrollment Overall: 3.29
 Explanation of Issues: 3.32
 Selecting and Using Evidence: 3.28
 Influence of Context and Assumptions: 3.29
 Valid Argumentation: 3.27
 Students Position: 3.27

2.1.1.4 Target
 2020-2021 Analytical Critical Thinking Rubric **Met**

TARGET The target using the Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric for this academic year is to meet or exceed last year’s overall score of 3.03.

FINDINGS The overall rubric score for analytical critical thinking was 3.10

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS This Year TMU exceeded their goal of 3.03 with an overall rubric average of 3.10

University Average Overall: 3.10
 Explanation of Issues: 3.10
 Selecting and Using Evidence: 3.07
 Influence of Context and Assumptions: 3.02
 Valid Argumentation: 3.15
 Students Position: 3.17

On Campus Overall: 2.85
 Explanation of Issues: 2.91
 Selecting and Using Evidence: 2.83
 Influence of Context and Assumptions: 2.73
 Valid Argumentation: 2.89
 Students Position: 2.88

On Line Overall: 2.91
 Explanation of Issues: 3.13
 Selecting and Using Evidence: 3.07
 Influence of Context and Assumptions: 2.80
 Valid Argumentation: 2.73

Students Position: 2.80

Dual Enrollment Overall 3.04

Explanation of Issues: 3.03

Selecting and Using Evidence: 3.

Influence of Context and Assumptions: 3.04

Valid Argumentation: 3.07

Students Position: 3.03

Online Dual Enrollment Overall: 3.7

Explanation of Issues: 3.58

Selecting and Using Evidence: 3.63

Influence of Context and Assumptions: 3.65

Valid Argumentation: 3.75

Students Position: 3.88

Phillips State Prison Overall: 2.38

Explanation of Issues: 2.35

Selecting and Using Evidence: 2.47

Influence of Context and Assumptions: 1.59

Valid Argumentation: 2.59

Students Position: 2.88

2.1.2 Measure

Student Impressions Survey

The Student Survey is conducted by Student Services to assess student satisfaction with the university and their views about the various activities at TMU. Included in this survey are ten questions asking about the core curriculum's contribution to their learning. Five questions deal specifically with student learning outcomes in analytic critical thinking (some overlap the areas of oral and written communication. One component of this survey asks the following, "Please respond to the statement below: The general education requirements (core curriculum) have contributed to my ability: "to understand complex ideas." "to identify fallacies in oral and written communication." "to organize ideas in a logical and compelling manner." "to analyze and critique written and oral communication." "to think critically."

2.1.2.1 Target

2017-2018 Student Impressions Survey: To Understand Complex Ideas **Met**

TARGET The target for this academic year is to meet or exceed the percentage of students who answered "agree" or "strongly agree."

FINDINGS Last year's score: 74.27%. This year's score: 86.78%.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS The students' perception that the core curriculum is contributing to their ability to understand complex ideas has increased from the previous academic year.

2.1.2.2 Target

2017-2018 Student Impressions Survey: Analyze and Understand Other Worldviews **Met**

TARGET The goal for this academic year is to meet or exceed the percentage of students who answered "agree" or "strongly agree."

FINDINGS Last year's score: 71.54%. This year's score: 80%.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS The students' perception that the core curriculum is contributing to their ability to organize ideas in a logical and compelling manner has increased from the previous academic year.

2.1.2.3 Target

2017-2018 Student Impressions Survey: To Identify Fallacies in Oral and Written Communication **Met**

TARGET The target for this academic year is to meet or exceed the percentage of students who answered "agree" or "strongly agree."

FINDINGS Last year's score: 62.79%. This year's score: 77.94%.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS The students' perception that the core curriculum is contributing to their ability to identify fallacies in oral and written communication has increased from the previous academic year.

2.1.2.4 Target

2017-2018 Student Impressions Survey: To Analyze and Critique Written and Oral Communication **Met**

TARGET	The goal for this academic year is to meet or exceed the percentage of students who answered "agree" or "strongly agree."
FINDINGS	Last year's score: 73.85%. This year's score: 79.41%.
ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS	The students' perception that the core curriculum is contributing to analyze and critique written and oral communication has increased from the previous academic year.

2.1.2.5 Target
2017-2018 Student Impressions Survey: To Think Critically Met

TARGET	The goal for this academic year is to meet or exceed the percentage of students who answered "agree" or "strongly agree."
FINDINGS	Last year's score: 79.23%. This year's score: 85.29%.
ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS	The students' perception that the core curriculum is contributing to their ability to think critically has increased from the previous academic year.

2.1.2.6 Target
2018-2019 Student Impressions Survey: To Understand Complex Ideas Not Met

TARGET	The target for this academic year is to meet or exceed the percentage of students who answered "agree" or "strongly agree."
FINDINGS	Last year's score: 74%. This year's score: 60%.
ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS	The students' perception that the core curriculum is contributing to their ability in this area dropped 14%.

2.1.2.7 Target
2018-2019 Student Impressions Survey: To Organize Ideas in a Logical and Compelling Manner Not Met

TARGET	The goal for this academic year is to meet or exceed the percentage of students who answered "agree" or "strongly agree."
FINDINGS	Last year's score: 80%. This year's score: 62%.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

The students' perception that the core curriculum is contributing to their ability in this area dropped 16%.

2.1.2.8

Target

2018-2019 Student Impressions Survey: To Identify Fallacies in Oral and Written Communication **Not Met**

TARGET

The target for this academic year is to meet or exceed the percentage of students who answered "agree" or "strongly agree."

FINDINGS

Last year's score: 78%. This year's score: 59%.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

The students' perception that the core curriculum is contributing to their ability in this area dropped 19%.

2.1.2.9

Target

2018-2019 Student Impressions Survey: To Analyze and Critique Written and Oral Communication **Not Met**

TARGET

The goal for this academic year is to meet or exceed the percentage of students who answered "agree" or "strongly agree."

FINDINGS

Last year's score: 79%. This year's score: 58%.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

The students' perception that the core curriculum is contributing to their ability in this area dropped 21%.

2.1.2.10

Target

2018-2019 Student Impressions Survey: To Think Critically **Not Met**

TARGET

The goal for this academic year is to meet or exceed the percentage of students who answered "agree" or "strongly agree."

FINDINGS

Last year's score: 85%. This year's score: 69%.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

The students' perception that the core curriculum is contributing to their ability in this area dropped 16%.

2.1.2.11 Target2019-2020 Student Impressions Survey: To Think Critically **Not Reported this Period**

TARGET	The goal for this academic year is to meet or exceed the percentage of students who answered "agree" or "strongly agree."
FINDINGS	Last year's score: 69%. This year's score: Due to Covid-19 the Student Impressions Survey was not given.
ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS	No findings to analyze.

2.1.2.12 Target2020-2021 Student Impressions Survey: To Understand Complex Ideas **Met**

TARGET	The goal for this academic year is to meet or exceed the percentage of students who answered "agree" or "strongly agree" on the 2018-2019 Student Impressions Survey 60%.
FINDINGS	Last year's score: 60%. This year's score: 73.79%.
ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS	The students' perception that the core curriculum is contributing to their ability in this area rose 13.79%.

2.1.2.13 Target2020-2021 Student Impressions Survey: Identify Fallacies in Oral and Written Communication **Not Met**

TARGET	The goal for this academic year is to meet or exceed the percentage of students who answered "agree" or "strongly agree" on the 2018-2019 Student Impressions Survey 59%.
FINDINGS	2018-2019 score: 59%. 2020-2021 score: 57.24%.
ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS	The students' perception that the core curriculum is contributing to their ability in this area dropped 1.76%.

2.1.2.14 Target2020-2021 Student Impressions Survey: Organize Ideas in a Logical and Compelling Manner **Met**

TARGET	The goal for this academic year is to meet or exceed the percentage of students who answered "agree" or "strongly agree" on the 2018-2019 Student Impressions Survey 62%.
FINDINGS	2018-2019 score: 62%. 2020-2021 score: 68.28%.
ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS	The students' perception that the core curriculum is contributing to their ability in this area rose 6.28%.

2.1.2.15 Target
2020-2021 Student Impressions Survey: Analyze and Critique Written and Oral Communication **Met**

TARGET	The goal for this academic year is to meet or exceed the percentage of students who answered "agree" or "strongly agree" on the 2018-2019 Student Impressions Survey 62%.
FINDINGS	2018-2019 score: 58%. 2020-2021 score: 69.66%.
ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS	The students' perception that the core curriculum is contributing to their ability in this area rose 11.66%.

2.1.2.16 Target
2020-2021 Student Impressions Survey: Think Critically **Not Met**

TARGET	The goal for this academic year is to meet or exceed the percentage of students who answered "agree" or "strongly agree" on the 2018-2019 Student Impressions Survey 69%.
FINDINGS	2018-2019 score: 69%. 2020-2021 score: 67.59%.
ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS	The students' perception that the core curriculum is contributing to their ability in this area dropped 1.14%.

2.1.3 Measure
Critical-Thinking Assessment Test

The Critical-thinking Assessment Test (CAT) is an external assessment administered to lower division students (mainly freshmen with some sophomores) and to seniors. It is used to assess the educational goal of analytical critical thinking. The CAT is valid and reliable and

consists of 15 questions, with the majority requiring short-answer essay responses to evaluate 12 skill areas. (See the list below). The skill areas assessed by the CAT instrument correspond to the higher order cognitive skills in Bloom’s Taxonomy (comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation). Student responses to the essay questions provide a better understanding of students’ thought processes and their ability to think critically and creatively when confronted with real-world problems. The problems presented on the test are intrinsically interesting to students. Skill Areas Assessed by the CAT Instrument: 1. Separate factual information from inferences that might be used to interpret those facts. 2. Identify inappropriate conclusions. 3. Understand the limitations of correlational data. 4. Identify evidence that might support or contradict a hypothesis. 5. Identify new information that is needed to draw conclusions. 6. Separate relevant from irrelevant information when solving a problem. 7. Learn and understand complex relationships in an unfamiliar domain. 8. Interpret numerical relationships in graphs and separate those relationships from inferences. 9. Use mathematical skills in the context of solving a larger real-world problem. 10. Analyze and integrate information from separate sources to solve a complex problem. 11. Recognize how new information might change the solution to a problem. 12. Communicate critical analyses and problem solutions effectively. There are a total of 38 possible points that a student can receive on the CAT. The CAT instrument directly involves faculty in the assessment process thereby allowing faculty to see their students’ weaknesses and understand areas that need improvement. A detailed scoring guide helps insure good scoring reliability.

2.1.3.1

Target

2017-2018 CAT Test Partially Met

TARGET	The analytical critical thinking achievement target using the CAT this year is to exceed the avg score from last year’s assessment and to exceed the national average
FINDINGS	For 2017-2018, the upper division average score was 18.54; and the lower division average was 14.34.
ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS	The lower division students (those that are in the core classes) improved their scores and exceeded the national average of 13.66. Upper division students exceeded the previous year’s scores but did not meet the national average of 19.04.

2.1.3.2 Target

2018-2019 CAT Test **Not Met**

TARGET	The analytical critical thinking achievement target using the CAT for 2018-2019 is to exceed the avg score from last year's assessment and to exceed the national avg. The avg score for 2017-2018 was 14.34 for lower division students and 18.54 for seniors.
FINDINGS	For 2018-2019, the upper division average score was 15.43; and the lower division average was 14.26.
ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS	The lower division students (those that are in the core classes) had their scores drop this year but they still exceeded the national average of 13.66. Upper division students fell significantly below the previous year's scores and did not meet the national average of 19.04.

2.1.3.3 Target

2019-2020 CAT Test **Not Reported this Period**

TARGET	The analytical critical thinking achievement target using the CAT for this academic year is to exceed the avg score from last year's assessment and to exceed the national avg.
FINDINGS	Due to Covid-19, the CAT test was not given.
ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS	

2.1.3.4 Target

2020-2021 CAT Test **Not Met**

TARGET	Exceed the average score from the 2018-2019 assessment and to exceed the national average. For 2018-2019, the upper division average score was 15.43; and the lower division average score was 14.26.
FINDINGS	For 2018-2019, the upper division average score was 15.42; and the lower division average was 12.46.
ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS	The lower division students (those that are in the core classes) had their scores drop this year They also fell below the national average.

Upper division students fell just below the previous year's scores and did not meet the national average of 17.64

2.2 Student Learning Outcome
Quantitative Critical Thinking

The students will demonstrate an ability to effectively apply quantitative critical thinking strategies relative to problem analysis; data usage; graph and chart analysis; terminology and notations; and calculation errors.

Action Plan

Action Plan for 2021-2022: See Action Item(s) below.

Budget Source	Amount	Due	Status
	\$0.00	5/26/2022	Planned

Action Item 1	Created	Due	Status
Action Plan for 2017-2018: In general, quantitative critical thinking improved significantly from the 2015/2016 to the 2016/2017 academic year; however, several specific aspects of critical thinking are still significant shortcomings within the academic population. Specifically, calculation errors were present in approximately 20% of the sample population. Furthermore, graph and chart analysis was also limited and approximately 17% of the sample population exhibited a deficiency in analysis ability. Problem analysis, data usage, and terminology and notation were effectively handled (90% or greater proficiency) within the academic population. The most recent action plan recommended a four-pronged approach to improving quantitative critical thinking at the institution including increased exposure to quantitative critical thinking experiences, implementation of Accuplacer for placement in math courses,	7/23/2019	5/31/2018	Complete

increased access to math tutoring, and use of full time advisors. Progress in implementation has been made in each of these areas and, after a single year of data, appear to have had marked effects on student quantitative critical thinking abilities. The most paramount effect, the use of Accuplacer for math placement, has changed the approach many students are required to take in math courses leading to a higher ability to think quantitatively in courses the require such attributes. During the 2017/2018 academic year, campus-wide (on campus, MOWR, and online) implementation of Accuplacer will continue, which will allow all students to be effectively served in their education based on their mathematic and arithmetic proficiency and needs. In addition, during the 2017/2018 academic year, students will be partnered with academic advisors and with individual faculty throughout the year. Partnering every student with an academic advisor and a faculty mentor will sufficiently improve accountability in classroom attendance and allow students to have more individualized mentorship which is anticipated to improve desire to learn and improve the academic environment.

Action Item 2	Created	Due	Status
Action Plan for 2018-2019: Quantitative Critical Thinking --In general, quantitative critical thinking remained approximately the same from the 2016/2017 to the 2017/2018 academic year; however, several specific aspects of critical thinking continue to exhibit significant shortcomings within the academic population. Specifically, calculation errors were present in approximately 17% of the sample population. During the 2017/2018 academic year, proper	7/23/2019	5/31/2019	Complete

usage of terminology and notation decreased compared to the previous assessment period. Graph and chart analysis remained deficient. Problem analysis and data usage were effectively handled (90% or greater proficiency) within the academic population. The most recent action plan recommended a four-pronged approach to improving quantitative critical thinking at the institution including increased exposure to quantitative critical thinking experiences, implementation of Accuplacer for placement in math courses, increased access to math tutoring, and use of full time advisors. Progress in implementation has been made in each of these areas and, after a single year of data, appear to have had marked effects on student quantitative critical thinking abilities. The most paramount effect, the use of Accuplacer for math placement, has changed the approach many students are required to take in math courses leading to a higher ability to think quantitatively in courses that require such attributes. As each prong of the action plan becomes more fully implemented and addition yearly data is collected, it is apparent that the improvements made in quantitative critical thinking since the 2015/2016 academic year have been consistent and appear to be sustainable. Although not specifically part of the general education core courses, math coursework is included in the majority of all degree programs (BA in Music Education does not require college level math). Inclusion of math courses in most degree programs continues to play an important role in development of higher level critical thinking skills within the university's student body that are reflected on this assessment tool. During

the 2018/2019 academic year, campus-wide (on campus, dual enrollment, and online) implementation of Accuplacer will continue once again. This placement exam will continue to allow students to be well-served and effectively placed in appropriate math courses. The goal is to achieve 100% coverage of all students entering TMU regardless of program (on campus, dual enrollment, or online). As an additional component of this year's action plan, the Pilgram Marpeck School of STEM will evaluate the possibility to use Accuplacer testing to re-test senior students to allow comparisons of quantitative critical thinking skills between incoming students and outgoing students.

Action Item 3	Created	Due	Status
<p>Action Plan for 2019-2020: Quantitative Critical Thinking --Quantitative critical thinking scores decreased from the 2017/2018 to the 2018/2019 academic year and the target for improvement was not met. Several specific aspects of critical thinking continue to exhibit significant shortcomings within the tested academic population. Calculation errors were present in approximately 29% of the sample population. Errors in analysis of the problem occurred in 25% of the population. Errors in graph and chart analysis occurred in 23% of the sample population. Correct data usage and correct terminology and nomenclature usage were of lesser concerns (7% and 18% error rate, respectively). In order to address these shortcomings and errors in the three most critical areas of quantitative critical thinking it is important to recognize that the skills that were lacking all related to mathematical and algebraic information processing. This problem</p>	7/23/2019	5/31/2020	Complete

is not a symptom of failure in a single course within the general education core, but is a symptom of limited course content and learning related to quantitative skills within the general education core and most degree programs as a whole. It is also important to address that the entire quantitative critical thinking data set is comprised of data collected from two one-credit courses. In order to improve quantitative critical think skills in the student body at Truett McConnell University, more extensive revisions to the general education core to bolster a more equal distribution of courses within each key area of interest (quantitative critical thinking, analytical critical thinking, Christian worldview, oral communication, and written communication) may be beneficial. The most recent action plan recommended a four-pronged approach to improving quantitative critical thinking at the institution including increased exposure to quantitative critical thinking experiences, implementation of Accuplacer for placement in math courses, increased access to math tutoring, and use of full time advisors. Progress in implementation has been made in each of these areas. Significant improvements were apparent in the 2017/2018 dataset, but after two year of data, the marked effects on student quantitative critical thinking abilities seems to have reversed substantially. It is interesting to note that the most paramount effect, the use of Accuplacer for math placement, had changed the approach many students were required to take in math courses leading to a higher ability to think quantitatively in courses that require such attributes. The number of student being

required to take Accuplacer dropped during the 2018/2019 admissions period due to higher numbers of students entering the university with previous university level math experience via dual enrollment programs. With lower percentages of students completing Accuplacer, prior to matriculation it is increasingly difficult to assess the action plan currently used. Increasing baseline testing of critical thinking via Accuplacer could be very beneficial to address shortcomings in quantitative critical thinking. 2018/2019 Action Plan Continued use of the four-pronged action plan for quantitative critical thinking (now in its third year) will be beneficial as TMU addresses its shortcomings related to this assessment item. In addition, increasing Accuplacer testing in all students would be very beneficial. The STEM program will assess additional ways to implement Accuplacer in order to capture data from more students regardless of previous university math experience or other barriers to completion.

Action Item 4	Created	Due	Status
<p>Action Plan for 2020-2021: Quantitative Critical Thinking During the 2019/2020 academic year the new Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric was used for the first time and was intended to establish baseline data. Unfortunately, after use of the tool to collect real data from real students during the 2019/2020 academic year it became apparent that the current artifacts used for this assessment process are not well aligned to the VALUE rubric. It was also noted that data collection is increasingly difficult and prone to sampling error especially in the online version of the two courses used to assess quantitative literacy: ES 101 Physical Wellbeing</p>	2/18/2020	5/27/2021	Complete

I and ES 102 Physical Wellbeing II. Based on the data presented for the 2019/2020 academic year, the average score on the overall assessment dropped from 3.15 (measured on a previous Quantitative Critical Thinking Rubric) during the 2018/2019 academic year to 2.97 (on the current Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric) during the 2019/2020 academic year. Students only exceeded the 75% threshold by achieving a 3 or a 4 on one section of the 2019/2020 VALUE rubric (interpretation); all other sections were below threshold and the number of students achieving a 3 or a 4 was 69.3%. Neither target was met during the 2019/2020 academic year. The most recent action plan during the 2019/2020 academic year, the continuation of a four-pronged strategy appears to not be having the intended positive effects to improve both student success on developing quantitative literacy and increasing assessment data collection from valid sources. A very different action plan is needed to bolster quantitative literacy and to improve the data available to assess this facet of the general education core curriculum. 2020/2021 Action Plan The focus of the 2020/2021 action plan to improve quantitative literacy will employ the following three projects with the goal of full implementation for the 2021/2022 academic year. 1. Redevelop two artifacts used to assess quantitative literacy that are assigned to all students completing their Physical Wellbeing course work. 2. Incorporate both artifacts in all versions (on campus and online) of the Physical Wellbeing course 3. Develop a proposal to require all students to complete Accuplacer tests at the beginning (during

the enrollment process or early during the freshman year) and at the end (during their senior year, prior to graduation) of a student academic career in a fashion similar to the CAT test used to address analytical critical thinking. As a new approach to collecting and assessing quantitative literacy data unfolds, special attention will be given to strategies that will achieve a high level of inter-rater reliability between various faculty and graders involved in the process of preparing quantitative literacy data for assessment.

Action Item 5	Created	Due	Status
<p>Action Plan for 2021-2022: Quantitative Critical Thinking - During the 2020/2021 academic year the Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric was used to collect a second year of data from the students enrolled in ES 101/ES 102 Physical wellbeing I & II. With an updated process to collect the needed data (note: 2019/2020 data was difficult to obtain on the VALUE rubric), the data collection process was much improved and helped to spawn the creation of a new assessment artifact (see 2020/2021 action plan) for use during the 2021/2022 academic year. It is anticipated that the new assessment artifact will further improve data collection and data reliability in future assessment cycles. Based on the data presented for the 2020/2021 academic year, the overall average score across all utilized sections of the rubric dropped from 2.97 during the 2019/2020 academic year to 2.77 during the 2020/2021 academic year for on campus ES 101/ES 102 sections. The average score for online sections was 2.57 (2020/2021 was the first-year online data was successfully collected). Students did not exceed the 75%</p>	4/12/2021	5/26/2022	Planned

threshold by achieving a 3 or a 4 on any section of the 2020/2021 VALUE rubric; all sections were below threshold and averaged 60.7% (range: 48.8% to 66.8%) of student scoring a 3 or 4 on the assessment. This was down from 69.3% during the 2019/2020 academic year. Neither target was met during the 2020/2021 academic year. The most recent action plan (2020/2021 academic year) will be discontinued in order to address a recent overhaul of the ES 101/ES 102 curriculum. This overhaul was approved in spring 2021 and implemented during the fall 2021 semester. The ES 101/ES 102 sequence was consolidated into a two (2) credit ES 100 Physical Wellbeing course and a new comprehensive assessment artifact was created to assess quantitative literacy. The new artifact will be used to collect data from students in both the on-campus and online versions of this course. One of the key improvements made in the on-campus course with the consolidation is the reinstatement of face-to-face lectures. In the past, this course (including on-campus sections of the course) used a hybrid approach in which student were provided on demand access to a pre-canned online lecture course with face-to-face contact only for the activity labs where very little instruction occurred. The use of a traditional face-to-face course mode for all aspects of the on-campus course, including the lecture component, is expected to improve student procurement of skills related to quantitative literacy. 2021/2022 Action Plan The focus of the 2021/2022 action plan to improve quantitative literacy will be to collect students' competency data utilizing the new procedures,

based on the new assessment artifact, and with traditional face-to-face lecture modality in the on-campus courses. The new assessment artifact and the new data collection procedures will be utilized to assess quantitative literacy competence from the online version of the course. The 2021/2022 action plan will also include further development of a proposal to require all students to complete Accuplacer tests at the beginning (during the enrollment process or early during the freshman year) and at the end (during their senior year, prior to graduation) of a student academic career in a fashion similar to the CAT test used to address analytical critical thinking. This proposal would provide the opportunity to cultivate more data regarding TMU students' quantitative literacy from beginning to the end of their academic careers. Lastly, as the new approach to collecting and assessing quantitative literacy data unfolds, special attention will be given to strategies that will achieve a high level of inter-rater reliability between various faculty and graders involved in the process of preparing quantitative literacy data for assessment.

2.2.1 Measure

Quantitative Literacy Rubric

The Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric is both an internal and external assessment that is used to assess written communication in the core. Internally, all core courses will use this assessment every semester. Externally, every third year the university will submit samples to be reviewed by outside readers. These external assessments will help calibrate our on campus use of the rubrics and will help validate student learning. This quantitative literacy instrument measures the students' effective use of the following: Interpretation, Representation, Calculation, Application / Analysis, Assumptions, Communication. Numeric ratings are assigned to each indicator as follows: Level 0: A rating of 0 is assigned if benchmark performance is not demonstrated. Level 1 Benchmark: A rating of 1 is assigned if

the indicator is minimally demonstrated. Level 2 Milestone: A rating of 2 is assigned if the indicator is partially demonstrated. Level 3 Milestone: A rating of 3 is assigned if the indicator is consistently demonstrated. Level 4 Capstone: A rating of 4 is assigned if the indicator is skillfully demonstrated.

2.2.1.1 Target
2017-2018 Quantitative Literacy Rubric

TARGET The quantitative critical thinking target using the quantitative communication rubric for academic year 2017- 2018 is to exceed the average score from the previous year's assessment on a scale of 0 - 4. The average score for 2016-2017 was 3.39.

FINDINGS The rubric average for 2017-2018 was 3.34

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS A slight drop of .05 resulted in the target not being met. The individual indicators that contributed to this finding were--Problem Analysis: 3.33; Data Usage: 3.66; Graph and Chart Analysis: 3.33; Terminology and Notations: 3.17 and Calculation Errors: 3.21.

2.2.1.2 Target
2018-2019 Quantitative Critical Thinking Rubric **Not Met**

TARGET The quantitative critical thinking achievement target using the quantitative critical thinking rubric for academic year 2018- 2019 is to exceed the average score from the previous year's assessment on a scale of 1-4. The avg. score for 2017-2018 was 3.34.

FINDINGS The rubric average for 2018-2019 was 3.15

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS A slight drop of .19 resulted in the target not being met. The individual indicators that contributed to this finding were:
Problem Analysis: 3.0
Data Usage: 3.55
Graph and Chart Analysis: 3.14
Terminology and Notations: 3.12
Calculation Errors: 2.95

2.2.1.3 Target
2019-2020 Quantitative Critical Thinking Rubric **Met**

TARGET The target using the Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric for this academic year is 1)

to establish a baseline of student achievement; and 2) to have 75% achieve a 3 or 4 avg. score on the rubric.

FINDINGS

This year we are establishing baseline with the new rubric and therefore do not have meaningful comparisons with previous years The individual indicators that contributed to the overall findings were: University Average Overall: 2.97

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

This year we are establishing baseline with the new rubric and therefore do not have meaningful comparisons with previous years The individual indicators that contributed to the overall findings were:

University Average Overall: 2.97

Interpretation: 3.05

Representation: 2.97

Calculation: 3.05

Application and Analysis: 2.81

Assumptions: 2.99

On Campus Overall: 2.97

Interpretation: 3.05

Representation: 2.97

Calculation: 3.05

Application and Analysis: 2.81

Assumptions: 2.99

On Line Overall: No Data

Interpretation:

Representation:

Calculation:

Application and Analysis:

Assumptions:

Dual Enrollment Overall No Data

Interpretation:

Representation:

Calculation:

Application and Analysis:

Assumptions:

Online Dual Enrollment Overall: No Data

Interpretation:

Representation:

Calculation:

Application and Analysis:

Assumptions:

2.2.1.4 Target

2020-2021 Quantitative Literacy Rubric **Not Met**

TARGET

The target using the Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric for this academic year is to meet or exceed last year's overall score of 2.97.

FINDINGS

This year the university achieved a 2.72 overall average.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

This year we are establishing baseline with the new rubric and therefore do not have meaningful comparisons with previous years. The individual indicators that contributed to the overall findings were:

University Average Overall: 2.72

Interpretation: 2.77

Representation: 2.78

Calculation: 2.63

Application and Analysis: 2.40

Assumptions: 2.85

On Campus Overall: 2.77

Interpretation: 2.87

Representation: 2.87

Calculation: 2.67

Application and Analysis: 2.44

Assumptions: 3.01

On Line Overall: 2.57

Interpretation: 2.48
 Representation: 2.54
 Calculation: 2.52
 Application and Analysis: 2.38
 Assumptions: 3.01

3 Program Goal
 Christian Worldview

The student’s ability to understand, articulate, assess, and demonstrate a Christian worldview will improve after exposure to a variety of courses either that are taught from a Christian worldview perspective or that directly teach Christian worldview concepts.

3.1 Student Learning Outcome
 Christian Worldview

The students will demonstrate increased abilities to recognize and understand facts related to the Christian worldview, to communicate concepts related to the Christian worldview and its competitors; to assess and analyze both their own worldview and that of others; and to effectively apply and demonstrate the Christian worldview in practice.

Action Plan

Action Plan for 2021-2022: See Action Item(s) below.

Budget Source	Amount	Due	Status
	\$0.00	5/26/2022	Planned

Action Item 1	Created	Due	Status
Action Plan for 2017-2018: 1) MI 251 plans to add a Creation to Christ presentation to the class to work on application and demonstration. 2) FA 110 is planning to do a before and after exercise so the instructor can measure the impact of the class. 3) CS 101 and CS 322 are going to look at developing some question to understand the intersection of the information covered to culture so that we might be able to measure some application in	7/23/2019	5/31/2018	Complete

the 2018-2019 cycle.

Action Item 2	Created	Due	Status
<p>Action Plan for 2018-2019: Christian Worldview</p> <p>- Analysis of Findings 1) How should faculty interpret the rubric and implement it in a consistent manner? Faculty determined that the most significant challenge to the consistent interpretation and implementation of the rubric was a lack of specific definitive elements constituting a Christian Worldview. The faculty believe it necessary to rework the rubric itself in order for it to reflect specific measurable elements within a Christian Worldview. This should increase consistency among faculty by eliminating some of the subjectivity that might exist from one faculty member to the other in reference to worldview. 2) What specific measures will be implemented to improve areas not meeting goals. First, faculty have determined that reworking the rubric will allow more effective adjustment to the measures to more accurately measure the necessary elements of a CWV. Second, two specific adjustments have been suggested that will improve the measured categories. (1) The Christian Studies classes (CS101, CS322) have determined that Recognition and Understanding category can be improved by faculty determining specific content topics that more directly impact worldview and indicate in class how those topics impact a worldview. For example, the sufficiency of Scripture is a topic covered in both courses, and greatly impacts the development of a CWV. In reference to the Articulation category, those topics identified by the faculty can then be specifically included in measures. (2) The Music Appreciation class is</p>	7/23/2019	5/31/2019	Complete

now implementing an additional element that will improve student performance in both Assessment and Analysis and Application and Demonstration. The course introduces various worldviews throughout the semester. Faculty will include a class discussion that leads students to critique each worldview from a Christian worldview perspective. The skills required to be able to offer that critique would include both the ability to assess the presented worldview, and the application of a CWV for a baseline with which to measure the presented worldview. 3. The categories did not show significant improvement. Faculty determined that a lack of definitive elements of which to focus upon caused the plan to be less than effective. The plan for this cycle of reassessing and adjusting the rubric will allow for more definitive measures that can present a more accurate interpretation. 4. The goals were not met in any category. 5. Faculty have not determined any external measures that could be helpful in validating student learning for CWV rubric.

Action Item 3	Created	Due	Status
Action Plan for 2019-2020: Christian Worldview (Rubric and Student Impressions) --While this year has not produced a new rubric, conversations have been started that will hopefully result in a new rubric next year. The faculty felt that the lack of a clear definition of what TMU understands as constituting a Christian Worldview (CWV) resulted in a rubric that was too nebulous and therefore hard to evaluate consistently. Therefore, the production of a new rubric will begin with the Core Coordinator facilitating the Theology and Missions faculty going through the process of	7/23/2019	5/31/2020	Complete

defining a Christian Worldview, more accurately a Biblical Worldview, that then will be reviewed by the administration. Once a CWV is defined, a more specific rubric can be created. In addition, given that this rubric is evaluated by a wide variety of classes (from bible, to theology, to Fine Arts, to English, and this year even Biology), the reviewers suggested that some level of consistency would also be achieved by looking at the data one class at a time before looking at it as a global average. It is suggested, therefore, that after the Core Coordinator gets the data, that he calculate averages and standard deviation for individual courses. If the data from these courses has major variation, he will then contact the area dean who will then convene a meeting with the faculty responsible for all the sections of those courses and discuss with them what might have caused the variation in the data. This will help determine if this is a lack of understanding on how to evaluate the rubric or if this is truly due to variations in the student population. Due to the specificity of this goal, a mild discussion on the topic again did not provide any external measure to supplement our data on CWV in the future. Given the plan to change the rubric, due to issues with the current rubric, a detailed analysis of each category was not seen as beneficial at the present time. Overall, though, this rubric did meet its target within a reasonable margin of error. The fine arts class did implement last year's action plan in one section as a test run. This additional element will improve student performance in both Assessment and Analysis and Application and Demonstration. The course introduces various

worldviews throughout the semester. Faculty will include a class discussion that leads students to critique each worldview from a Christian worldview perspective. The skills required to be able to offer that critique would include both the ability to assess the presented worldview, and the application of a CWV for a baseline with which to measure the presented worldview. Since this element was deemed beneficial, it will be continued next year in all sections. This will provide more data that will allow us to evaluate better the long-term effectiveness of this approach. The Christian Studies classes will continue to find ways to help students understand the connection between topics like the sufficiency of scriptures and the Christian Worldview.

Action Item 4	Created	Due	Status
Action Plan for 2020-2021: Christian Worldview (Rubric and Student Impressions Survey) - No Plan Was Submitted.	2/18/2020	5/27/2021	Complete

Action Item 5	Created	Due	Status
Action Plan for 2021-2022: Christian Worldview (Rubric and Student Impressions Survey) - Christian Worldview Rubric Report 2020-2021 Areas of concern: CS 101, FA 110 CS 101 – R&U: (only assessing R&U for this course) On Campus: Disseau: 2.79, 2.79, 2.76, 2.65 Whitlock: 2.58 Alexander: 2.80 Newell: 1.83 Online: Disseau: 3.50 Copeland: 3.53, 3.44 1. First, Copeland, Newell, and Alexander entered scores in all four sections on the Rubric but we are only assessing R&U for this course. We will better communicate with faculty in future cycles on how to correctly complete the rubric assessments. The scores entered for Art. and A&D for CS 101 should be removed from this	4/12/2021	5/26/2022	Planned

present assessment. Art. Should remain since Whitlock's use of that category is logical for his course. 2. The On Campus average scores are consistent. It appears that Newell either had some students who struggled or he grades stricter than the other professors; it is more likely the latter. We will review the grading criteria for all professors for consistency. 3. The Online courses averaged higher than On Campus. The Online course is created and maintained by the Online Admin. The nature of online learning and assessment seems to produce higher average scores than On Campus courses. We will review the differences between the online and on campus courses for consistency in assignments and grading criteria. FA 110 – Assessing all four areas on the rubric On Campus: Lombard: 2.88, 2.82, 2.89, 2.81 Online: (both regular undergrad & dual enrollment) Brown: 3.20, 2.91, 2.61, 2.97 Purser: 3.01 1. (Note: I am new to the Core assessment area, I am not sure if they should be assessing all four sections on the Rubric. Perhaps that is something that could be better defined on future assessments for all of the core courses listed in our section.) 2. Brown's assessments appear correctly entered since they are not static across the sections of the rubric. The assessment seems to be producing consistent results across both dual enrollment and regular undergrad courses. 3. Lombard's assessments are static across all four sections of the rubric. Lombard maintains that these scores are correct based on the assignment graded in that it is common for students to score the same in all categories. We highlighted that the scores were consistently distributed across categories and students and

suggested a more precise assessment in the coming cycle. Perhaps a correction for this issue is to determine which categories on the rubric best assess that course. Perhaps assessing all four categories is unnecessary.

Additional Issues to Address: • Epling – CS 330 (two sections on campus) seems to have entered the same results across all four categories. We will better communicate with faculty in future cycles on how to correctly complete the rubric assessments.

Additional Conclusions: • MI 251 Online and On Campus are producing consistent, positive results. • CS 322 & 323 Online produced higher results (3.02, 3.43, 3.39, 3.91) than On Campus (2.60, 2.60).

The courses online and on campus are identical and were created by the same course developer. The only difference between online and on campus is instructors. It appears that Whitlock holds a stricter standard of grading on campus than professors online. We will monitor these scores in future cycles for consistency and any further attention needed. One possible explanation is that Whitlock's total enrollment is much larger than those online, which may lower class averages. This may also be seen in the number of students who scored a 1 or lower in those courses.

These represent students who did not pass the assignments assessed. • FA 200 consisted of a single course and produced good results (3.91).

Conclusions: Overall, we think the greatest need is to better inform faculty on how to properly use the rubric for grading. We also need to work towards greater consistency on grading between on campus and online courses. As for actions we can take to improve the outcomes, when looking at some scores it

appears that we are very successful. The scores that seem weak we believe is from inconsistent use of the rubric, which we will address in the upcoming cycle. We made significant changes in the last cycle to align on campus and online courses to the same standards and curriculum, and we need to monitor the results for an additional cycle to see if the changes we made are effective.

3.1.1 **Measure** Christian Worldview Rubric

The Christian Worldview Rubric is an internal assessment that is used to assess the Christian worldview component of the core. This Christian Worldview instrument measures each student’s ability in regard to the Christian worldview in regard to: Recognition and Understanding, Articulation, Assessment and Analysis, and Application and Demonstration. Numeric ratings are assigned to each indicator as follows: Level 0: A rating of 0 is assigned if the indicator is not demonstrated. Level 1: A rating of 1 is assigned if the indicator is minimally demonstrated. Level 2: A rating of 2 is assigned if the indicator is partially demonstrated. Level 3: A rating of 3 is assigned if the indicator is adequately demonstrated. Level 4: A rating of 4 is assigned if the indicator is effectively demonstrated.

3.1.1.1 **Target** 2017-2018 Christian Worldview Rubric Met

TARGET	The Christian Worldview achievement target using the Christian Worldview rubric for this year is to exceed the average score from the previous year’s assessment.
FINDINGS	Goal Met: The Oncampus score rose from 2.57 to 2.77. The online score was also measured this year and was a 2.95.
ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS	<p>On Campus: An increase of .20 resulted in the target being met. The individual indicators that contributed to the overall findings were--Recognition and Understanding 2.78; Articulation 2.79; Assessment and Analysis 2.74; Application and Demonstration 2.77.</p> <p>Online: Since this was the first time online scores were measured as separate from on Campus scores, no specific goals were made. The individual indicators that</p>

contributed to the overall findings were--Recognition and Understanding 2.73; Articulation 2.75; Assessment and Analysis 3.27; Application and Demonstration 3.05.

The findings show student learning outcomes in both programs were similar.

1) How should faculty interpret the rubric and implement it in a consistent manner?

Faculty determined that the most significant challenge to the consistent interpretation and implementation of the rubric was a lack of specific definitive elements constituting a Christian Worldview. The faculty believe it necessary to rework the rubric itself in order for it to reflect specific measurable elements within a Christian Worldview. This should increase consistency among faculty by eliminating some of the subjectivity that might exist from one faculty member to the other in reference to worldview.

2) What specific measures will be implemented to improve areas not meeting goals.

First, faculty have determined that reworking the rubric will allow more effective adjustment to the measures to more accurately measure the necessary elements of a CWV.

Second, two specific adjustments have been suggested that will improve the measured categories. (1) The Christian Studies classes (CS101, CS322) have determined that Recognition and Understanding category can be improved by faculty determining specific content topics that more directly impact worldview and indicate in class how those topics impact a worldview. For example, the sufficiency of Scripture is a topic covered in both courses, and greatly impacts the development of a CWV. In reference to the Articulation category, those topics identified by the faculty can then be specifically included in measures. (2) The Music Appreciation class is now implementing an additional element that will improve student performance in both Assessment and Analysis and Application and Demonstration. The course introduces various worldviews throughout the semester. Faculty will include a class discussion that leads students to critique each worldview from a Christian worldview perspective. The skills required to be able to offer that critique would include both the ability to assess the presented worldview, and the application

of a CWV for a baseline with which to measure the presented worldview.

3. The categories did not show significant improvement. Faculty determined that a lack of definitive elements of which to focus upon caused the plan to be less than effective. The plan for this cycle of reassessing and adjusting the rubric will allow for more definitive measures that can present a more accurate interpretation.

4. The goals were not met in any category.

5. Faculty have not determined any external measures that could be helpful in validating student learning for CWV rubric.

3.1.1.2 Target

2018-2019 Christian Worldview Rubric Partially Met

TARGET	To exceed the avg score from the previous year's assessment using the Christian Worldview Rubric. The avg score in 2017-2018 for on campus was 2.77 and online was 2.95 for an overall avg score of 2.86.
FINDINGS	Goal Partially Met: The on campus score rose from 2.77 to 2.88 while the online score fell to 2.80 resulting in an overall campus average of 2.87.
ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS	While the target was reached by the university at large and by the on campus courses, there was a decline in the online courses. The individual indicators that contributed to the overall findings were: University Average Recognition and Understanding: 2.88 Articulation: 2.79 Assessment and Analysis: 2.91 Application and Demonstration: 2.90 On Campus Recognition and Understanding: 2.88 Articulation: 2.78 Assessment and Analysis: 2.94 Application and Demonstration: 2.90 Online Recognition and Understanding: 2.84

Articulation: 2.80
Assessment and Analysis: 2.71
Application and Demonstration: 2.86

3.1.1.3 Target

2019-2020 Christian Worldview Rubric **Met**

TARGET The Christian Worldview achievement target using the Christian Worldview rubric for this year is to exceed the average score from the previous year's assessment.

FINDINGS Goal Met: 
On campus from 2.88 to 3.11 
Online from 2.80 to 3.44 
Dual Enrollment: NA to 3.01
Dual Enrollment Online: NA to 2.82

Campus Avg.: from 2.8. to 3.15

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS While the target was reached by the university at large and by the on campus courses, there was a decline in the online courses. The individual indicators that contributed to the overall findings were:

University Average: 3.15
Recognition and Understanding: 3.09
Articulation: 3.19
Assessment and Analysis: 3.12
Application and Demonstration: 3.19

On Campus: 3.11
Recognition and Understanding: 3.00
Articulation: 3.14
Assessment and Analysis: 3.10
Application and Demonstration: 3.19

Online: 3.44
Recognition and Understanding: 3.50
Articulation: 3.51
Assessment and Analysis: 3.34
Application and Demonstration: 3.40

Dual Enrollment: 3.01

Recognition and Understanding: 3.47
Articulation: 2.88
Assessment and Analysis: 2.65
Application and Demonstration: 3.06

Dual Enrollment Online: 2.82
Recognition and Understanding: 2.76
Articulation: 2.77
Assessment and Analysis: 2.77
Application and Demonstration: 2.97

3.1.1.4 Target

2020-2021 Christian Worldview Rubric **Not Met**

TARGET The target using the Christian Worldview Rubric for this academic year is to meet or exceed last year's overall score of 3.15.

FINDINGS This year the university achieved a 3.01 overall average on the Christian Worldview Rubric.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS While the target was reached by the university at large and by the on campus courses, there was a decline in the online courses. The individual indicators that contributed to the overall findings were:

University Average: 3.01
Recognition and Understanding: 2.96
Articulation: 2.99
Assessment and Analysis: 3.02
Application and Demonstration: 3.11

On Campus: 2.94
Recognition and Understanding: 2.86
Articulation: 2.86
Assessment and Analysis: 2.95
Application and Demonstration: 3.07

Online: 3.45

Recognition and Understanding: 3.50

Articulation: 3.50

Assessment and Analysis: 3.37

Application and Demonstration: 3.44

Dual Enrollment: 3.01

Recognition and Understanding: 3.47

Articulation: 2.88

Assessment and Analysis: 2.65

Application and Demonstration: 3.06

Dual Enrollment Online: 2.82

Recognition and Understanding: 2.76

Articulation: 2.77

Assessment and Analysis: 2.77

Application and Demonstration: 2.97

3.1.2 Measure

Student Impressions Survey

The Student Survey is conducted by Student Services to assess student satisfaction with the university and their views about the various activities at TMU. Included in this survey are ten questions asking about the core curriculum's contribution to their learning. Three questions deal specifically with student learning outcomes regarding Christian Worldview. One component of this survey ask the following, "Please respond to the statement below: The general education requirements (core curriculum) have contributed to my ability: "to analyze and understand the worldview of others." "to understand the biblical basis of the Christian worldview." "to understand how worldview influences music, art, literature, and culture."

3.1.2.1 Target

2017-2018 Student Impressions Survey: Analyze and Understand Other Worldviews

Met

TARGET

The goal for this academic year is to meet or exceed the percentage of students who answered "agree" or "strongly agree."

FINDINGS

Last year's score: 82.17%. This year's score: 83.09%.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

The students' perception that the core curriculum is contributing to their ability to understand complex ideas has increased from the previous academic year.

3.1.2.2 Target

2017-2018 Student Impressions Survey: Understand the Biblical Basis of the Christian Worldview **Not Met**

TARGET

The goal for this academic year is to meet or exceed the percentage of students who answered "agree" or "strongly agree."

FINDINGS

Last year's score: 93.07%. This year's score: 86.78%.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

The students' perception that the core curriculum is contributing to their ability to understand complex ideas has decreased from the previous academic year.

3.1.2.3 Target

2017-2018 Student Impressions Survey: Understand How Worldview Influences Music, Art, Literature, and Culture **Met**

TARGET

The goal for this academic year is to meet or exceed the percentage of students who answered "agree" or "strongly agree."

FINDINGS

Last year's score: 68.21%. This year's score: 71.64%.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

Last year's score: 68.21%. This year's score: 71.64%. to understand complex ideas has increased from the previous academic year.

3.1.2.4 Target

2018-2019 Student Impressions Survey: Analyze and Understand Other Worldviews **Not Met**

TARGET

The goal for this academic year is to meet or exceed the percentage of students who answered "agree" or "strongly agree."

FINDINGS

Last year's score: 83%. This year's score: 70%.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

The students' perception that the core curriculum is contributing to their ability decreased 13%.

3.1.2.5 Target
2018-2019 Student Impressions Survey: Understand the Biblical Basis of the Christian Worldview **Not Met**

TARGET The goal for this academic year is to meet or exceed the percentage of students who answered "agree" or "strongly agree."

FINDINGS Last year's score: 87%. This year's score: 80%.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS The students' perception that the core curriculum is contributing to their ability decreased 7%.

3.1.2.6 Target
2018-2019 Student Impressions Survey: Understand How Worldview Influences Music, Art, Literature, and Culture **Not Met**

TARGET The goal for this academic year is to meet or exceed the percentage of students who answered "agree" or "strongly agree."

FINDINGS Last year's score: 72.1%. This year's score: 56%.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS The students' perception that the core curriculum contributed to their ability in this area decreased 16%.

3.1.2.7 Target
2019-2020 Student Impressions Survey: Understand How Worldview Influences Music, Art, Literature, and Culture **Not Reported this Period**

TARGET The goal for this academic year is to meet or exceed the percentage of students who answered "agree" or "strongly agree."

FINDINGS Last year's score: 56%. This year's score: Due to Covid-19, the Student Impressions Survey was not given.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS No data to analyze

3.1.2.8 Target
2020-2021 Student Impressions Survey: Analyze and Understand the Worldview of Others **Met**

TARGET The goal for this academic year is to meet or exceed the percentage of students

who answered "agree" or "strongly agree" on the 2018-2019 Student Impressions Survey 70%.

FINDINGS 2018-2019 score: 70%. 2020-2021 score: 74.0%.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS The students' perception that the core curriculum is contributing to their ability increased 3.1%.

3.1.2.9 Target
2020-2021 Student Impressions Survey: Understand the Biblical Basis of the Christian Worldview **Not Met**

TARGET The goal for this academic year is to meet or exceed the percentage of students who answered "agree" or "strongly agree" on the 2018-2019 Student Impressions Survey 80%.

FINDINGS Last year's score: 80%. This year's score: 70.67%.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS The students' perception that the core curriculum is contributing to their ability decreased 9.66%.

3.1.2.10 Target
2020-2021 Student Impressions Survey: Understand how Worldview Influences Music, Art, Literature, and Culture **Met**

TARGET The goal for this academic year is to meet or exceed the percentage of students who answered "agree" or "strongly agree" on the 2018-2019 Student Impressions Survey 56%.

FINDINGS 2018-2019 score: 56%. 2020-2021 score: 64.67%.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS The students' perception that the core curriculum is contributing to their ability increased 8.14%.

Project Attachments (7)

Attachments	File Size
 CAT_Report_April_2021_Freshman_and_Sophomores.pdf	138KB
 CAT_Senior Data Report_April_2021.pdf	172KB
 Core Curriculum Assessment Presentation 2020-2021.pptx	859KB
 Core Curriculum Student Survey Data Analysis S2021.pdf	164KB
 Degree - Summary of Use of Results Form - Degree Program Assessment.pdf	92KB
 General Education - Critical Thinking Action Plan 2020-2021.pdf	28KB
 Truett_McConnell_University_CAT_Report_April_2021 (7).pdf	1MB