



# Construction Science, BS

 BS-COSC

## Mission of the Academic Program

- 1** Briefly state the purpose of the academic program(s) covered in the Assessment Plan/Report. The mission statement should (1) explicitly state the name and level of the program(s) covered; (2) be clear and concise; and, (3) summarize the purpose/value of the program. NOTE: If the program is offered at multiple locations and/or online, information regarding mode of delivery and/or geographic location(s) of the program(s) should be included as well.

The Construction Science Department is dedicated to education, discovery, development and application of knowledge in the field of construction while fulfilling the land grant mission of Texas AM University and enhancing the economic development of the State of Texas. Our mission of providing the highest quality Bachelor's of Science program is inseparable from our mission of developing new understanding through teaching, research and service. We prepare students to assume roles in leadership, responsibility, and service to society.

\*

## Internal Feedback on Mission of the Academic Program

- 1** The degree(s)/certificate is/are explicitly stated:

No ▼

- 2** Mission Statement is clear and concise:

Yes ▼

- 3** Mission Statement addresses the overall purpose of the program:

Yes ▼

- 4** Feedback on Mission Statement:

specify BS



## Feedback on Mission of the Academic Program by Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation (IE&E)

- 1 The degree(s)/certificate is/are explicitly stated:

No ▼

- 2 Mission Statement is clear and concise:

Yes ▼

- 3 Mission Statement addresses the overall purpose of the program:

Yes ▼

- 4 Feedback on Mission Statement:

[This mission statement is for the department, not the BS program.](#)

[January 11, 2021 Update - this comment has been addressed.](#)

**As stated in the feedback provided by the liaison below, a data-informed action is required. Please review the feedback provided, revise, and resubmit.**

## Assessment Plan (Outcomes, Measures, and Targets)

- 1 Associations, Measures, and Targets

2 **BS-COSC-ETHICS - Ethical Analysis**

Construction science students will analyze professional decisions based on ethical principles

### Relevant Associations

- 1 Please select the University and/or System-level learning outcome(s) that most closely align(s) with the program learning outcome above. Undergraduate programs/certificates should select relevant associations from the University baccalaureate outcomes (TAMU-UG) and from the EmpowerU outcomes (TAMU-S). Combined assessment plans that include both masters-level and doctoral-level programs should select from both sets of University-level outcomes (TAMU-Masters, TAMU-Doctoral).

Selected Outcomes:



- o TAMU-S-Ethical and SR - Ethical & Social Responsibility
- o TAMU-UG-PR and SR - Personal & Social Responsibility

## Internal Feedback on Outcomes

- 1 Outcome is clearly written, reflecting what students are expected to learn upon completion of the program:

Yes ▼

- 2 Outcome is measurable

Yes ▼

- 3 Outcome is mapped appropriately to university-level outcome(s):

Yes ▼

- 4 Outcome reflects program expectation/graduation requirement rather than student learning:

Yes ▼

- 5 Feedback on Outcomes:

## Feedback on Outcomes by Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation (IE&E)

- 1 Outcome is clearly written, reflecting what students are expected to learn upon completion of the program:

Yes ▼

- 2 Outcome is measurable



Yes ▼

3 Outcome is mapped appropriately to university-level outcome(s):

Yes ▼

4 Outcome reflects program expectation/graduation requirement rather than student learning:

No ▼

5 Feedback on Outcomes:

## Related Measures

1

### Measure Name:

COSC 381 \_ Ethical Analysis Report \_ DA

### Measure Description:

Direct assessment will occur for SLO 6 using an assignment from COSC 381 (Professional Ethics in Construction). The assessment instrument will be administered by course instructors in class to students as part of the regular course curriculum. Data reported will be class-level average performance on the ethics portion of the assignment rubric. Cycle 2 \_ Reported once every three years.

### Supporting Documentation:

Supporting Documentation would include referenced documents such as scoring/grading rubrics, surveys, assignment descriptions, etc.

No document was selected.



## Internal Feedback on Measure

Measure is a direct measure of student learning:

Yes

Data collection is clear (i.e., where the data are coming from):

Yes

Methodological processes are clear (i.e., how the data are to be evaluated and reported):

No

Measure clearly aligns with the outcome as defined:

Yes

All referenced rubrics/surveys are attached or sufficiently described:

No

Feedback on Measure:

## Feedback on Measure by Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation (IE&E)

Measure is a direct measure of student learning:

yes

Data collection is clear (i.e., where the data are coming from):

yes

Methodological processes are clear (i.e., how the data are to be evaluated and reported):

no

Measure clearly aligns with the outcome as defined:

yes

All referenced rubrics/surveys are attached or sufficiently described:

No

Feedback on Measure:

Is the measure the entire assignment? Or the section of the assignment dealing with ethics?

Given the nature of the assignment, and the point totals for other factors such as formatting, the measure should be specific about what is being considered.



Also, make sure to physically link the appropriate document to the measure using the dropdown menu above. The supporting documents are visible, but nothing is connected to specifically this measure.

## Targets

For each measure, provide a description of the standard (the minimally acceptable student performance) as well as the target (the minimum proportion of students the faculty aspire to have meet the standard in order to be confident that the program is meeting the outcome).

### Target Description:

The target for SLO 6 will be a 70% or higher class average score on the ethics portion of the rubric. In order to set a target score during initial data collection of new SLO data collection system and establishment of baseline date, 70% was deemed appropriate as minimum target for the cumulative score for the ethics portion of the assignment as students must have a grade of "C" (70) or better in order to qualify for graduation from the program. Baseline data will be evaluated after at least 3 years' of data collection have occurred in order to determine if adjustment of new targets is warranted based on trend data and ,if so, the new appropriate minimum targets will be determined.

### Internal Feedback on Target

**Standard (the minimally acceptable performance) is clearly presented and justified:**

Yes

**Target is specific (the proportion that needs to meet the standard):**

Yes

**The target clearly aligns with the measure as described:**

Yes

**Feedback on Target:**

### Feedback on Target by Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation (IE&E)

**Standard (the minimally acceptable performance) is clearly presented and justified:**

yes

**Target is specific (the proportion that needs to meet the standard):**



yes

The target clearly aligns with the measure as described:

Feedback on Target:

Does this 70% refer only to the criteria on the rubric for ethics (i.e., excludes points for following formatting instructions, etc.)? The the target that the cumulative average for that part of the assignment be over 70%? Or the assignment overall?

## Findings

When reporting findings, indicate whether or not a given target was MET, PARTIALLY MET, or NOT MET. Also include a brief discussion regarding the meaning/value of the findings for purposes of continuous improvement. IF findings are not being reported in a given cycle for a particular measure, include a brief explanation as to why not.

### Finding Description:

Students' cumulative average scores for SLO 6, *Analyze professional decisions based on ethical principles* during AY 2019/20 was 91.0 ( $n = 158$ ). Therefore the target of 70% or greater SLO cumulative average was met.

Target:

Met

### Internal Feedback on Finding

Findings align with the measure and target as described:

Yes

Findings include a brief discussion regarding the meaning/value of results for purposes of continuous improvement:

No

Target status indicator (i.e., Met, Partially Met, Not Met, Not Reported This Cycle) is used appropriately:

Yes

Where appropriate, findings are disaggregated for each program reflected in the assessment plan:

Yes

Feedback on Finding:



## Feedback on Finding by Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation (IE&E)

Findings align with the measure and target as described:

Yes

Findings include a brief discussion regarding the meaning/value of results for purposes of continuous improvement:

No

Target status indicator (i.e., Met, Partially Met, Not Met, Not Reported This Cycle) is used appropriately:

Yes

Where appropriate, findings are disaggregated for each program reflected in the assessment plan:

Feedback on Finding:

## Data-informed Actions

For each of the findings reported, the program should indicate how it is going to use/act on the assessment findings in the upcoming academic year. A brief summary of the proposed action(s) should be provided, including a tentative timeline for implementation and the party or group responsible for carrying out the action(s). Also include a rationale for why program faculty believe the action(s) should lead to improvements in the identified outcome. IF no actions are being taken based on a given finding, a brief statement of explanation should be provided.

### Data-informed Action Description:

*SLO 6 Analyze professional decisions based on ethical principles met both the direct and indirect assessment targets established by the program. The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee reviewed the data and findings. Because the targets were met, action was not deemed necessary at this time. The program will continue to collect appropriate data during AY 20/21 and monitor student performance on SLO 6. In addition to continuing normal data collection and monitoring protocols for SLO 6 in COSC 381, during AY20/21 The program will also collect the percentage of students achieving a score of 70% or better on the ethics portion of the assignment in COSC 381, and also collect the COSC 381 instructors' observations/feedback as to what students understand, what students do not understand, and conclusions supported by data. This information will be used by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee to determine strengths to be maintained, additional courses, content, and/or teaching strategies which should*



*be utilized to address identified weaknesses in students' ability to analyze professional decisions based on ethical principles.*

### Internal Feedback on Data-informed Action

Data-informed Action outlines a specific course of action designed to improve/strengthen student learning:

Yes

Data-informed Action description addresses why the program believes the action will lead to improvements in learning:

Yes

Data-informed Action includes a timeline:

Yes

Data-informed Action identifies a responsible party or group:

Yes

Feedback on Data-informed Action:

### Feedback on Data-informed Action by Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation (IE&E)

Data-informed Action outlines a specific course of action designed to improve/strengthen student learning:

Data-informed Action description addresses why the program believes the action will lead to improvements in learning:

Data-informed Action includes a timeline:

Data-informed Action identifies a responsible party or group:

Feedback on Data-informed Action:

This is a really good strategy to gain more insight about students' ability relative to ethics and the assignments used to measure the outcome. However, this ultimately sounds like the action is to collect more data, which does not fulfill the institutional requirement for a data informed action. There may be an opportunity to expand this to include a more content-based curricular or programmatic response. Please consider this, revise, and resubmit.



**Measure Name:**

SLO 6 \_ Senior Exit Survey \_ Confidence Level

**Measure Description:**

As an indirect assessment of the student learning outcomes, an exit survey will be administered to all COSC students immediately prior to their graduation, soliciting their opinions with respect to their educational experiences at TAMU. Students will be asked to indicate how confident they are in their ability to apply each of the student learning outcomes. Responses will utilize a four point Likert-type scale (4 = Very Confident; 3 = Confident; 2 = Somewhat Confident; 1 = Not Confident).

**Supporting Documentation:**

Supporting Documentation would include referenced documents such as scoring/grading rubrics, surveys, assignment descriptions, etc.

No document was selected.

**Internal Feedback on Measure**

**Measure is a direct measure of student learning:**

No

**Data collection is clear (i.e., where the data are coming from):**

Yes

**Methodological processes are clear (i.e., how the data are to be evaluated and reported):**

Yes

**Measure clearly aligns with the outcome as defined:**

Yes

**All referenced rubrics/surveys are attached or sufficiently described:**

No

**Feedback on Measure:**

for some reason your documents don't appear to be selected--maybe you just need to choose them from the dropdown under Supporting Documents?



## Feedback on Measure by Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation (IE&E)

**Measure is a direct measure of student learning:**

no

**Data collection is clear (i.e., where the data are coming from):**

yes

**Methodological processes are clear (i.e., how the data are to be evaluated and reported):**

yes

**Measure clearly aligns with the outcome as defined:**

yes

**All referenced rubrics/surveys are attached or sufficiently described:**

yes

**Feedback on Measure:**

## Targets

For each measure, provide a description of the standard (the minimally acceptable student performance) as well as the target (the minimum proportion of students the faculty aspire to have meet the standard in order to be confident that the program is meeting the outcome).

### Target Description:

For the student learning outcome SLO 6 *Analyze professional decisions based on ethical principles* students' average score will be a minimum score of 2.51 or higher indicating students are, at minimum, "confident" *Analyzing professional decisions based on ethical principles*, as students graduating from the program should be confident applying the knowledge and skills gained from their degree program in their future careers.

### Internal Feedback on Target

**Standard (the minimally acceptable performance) is clearly presented and justified:**

Yes

**Target is specific (the proportion that needs to meet the standard):**

Yes



The target clearly aligns with the measure as described:

Yes

Feedback on Target:

### Feedback on Target by Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation (IE&E)

Standard (the minimally acceptable performance) is clearly presented and justified:

yes

Target is specific (the proportion that needs to meet the standard):

yes

The target clearly aligns with the measure as described:

yes

Feedback on Target:

While the target says, "For each student learning outcome students' average score will be a minimum score of 2.51 or higher indicating students are, at minimum, "confident" applying individual student learning outcomes..." is it just the ethics outcome that will be reported here? Be specific.

## Findings

When reporting findings, indicate whether or not a given target was MET, PARTIALLY MET, or NOT MET. Also include a brief discussion regarding the meaning/value of the findings for purposes of continuous improvement. IF findings are not being reported in a given cycle for a particular measure, include a brief explanation as to why not.

### Finding Description:

During the 2019/20 academic year, the Fall 2019, Spring 2020, and Summer 2020 Senior Exit Surveys had 102, 129, and 38 respondents, respectively, a for a total of 269 respondents. Students responded to the question: "As a result of your COSC degree program, how confident do you feel in your ability to analyze professional decisions based on ethical principles?" The average score for AY 2019/20 was 3.69 (Very Confident) meeting the target of minimum means score of 2.51. The scale used was: Very Confident = 3.51 – 4.00; Confident = 2.51 – 3.50; Somewhat Confident = 1.51 – 2.50; Not Confident = 1.00 – 1.50.

Target:



### Internal Feedback on Finding

Findings align with the measure and target as described:

Yes

Findings include a brief discussion regarding the meaning/value of results for purposes of continuous improvement:

No

Target status indicator (i.e., Met, Partially Met, Not Met, Not Reported This Cycle) is used appropriately:

Yes

Where appropriate, findings are disaggregated for each program reflected in the assessment plan:

Yes

Feedback on Finding:

### Feedback on Finding by Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation (IE&E)

Findings align with the measure and target as described:

Yes

Findings include a brief discussion regarding the meaning/value of results for purposes of continuous improvement:

No

Target status indicator (i.e., Met, Partially Met, Not Met, Not Reported This Cycle) is used appropriately:

Yes

Where appropriate, findings are disaggregated for each program reflected in the assessment plan:

Feedback on Finding:

### Data-informed Actions



For each of the findings reported, the program should indicate how it is going to use/act on the assessment findings in the upcoming academic year. A brief summary of the proposed action(s) should be provided, including a tentative timeline for implementation and the party or group responsible for carrying out the action(s). Also include a rationale for why program faculty believe the action(s) should lead to improvements in the identified outcome. IF no actions are being taken based on a given finding, a brief statement of explanation should be provided.

#### **Data-informed Action Description:**

*SLO 6 Analyze professional decisions based on ethical principles met both the direct and indirect assessment targets established by the program. The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee reviewed the data and findings. Because the targets were met, action was not deemed necessary at this time. The program will continue to collect appropriate data during AY 20/21 and monitor student performance on SLO 6. In addition to continuing normal data collection and monitoring protocols for SLO 6 in COSC 381, during AY20/21 The program will also collect the percentage of students achieving a score of 70% or better on the ethics portion of the assignment in COSC 381, and also collect the COSC 381 instructors' observations/feedback as to what students understand, what students do not understand, and conclusions supported by data. This information will be used by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee to determine strengths to be maintained, additional courses, content, and/or teaching strategies which should be utilized to address identified weaknesses in students' ability to analyze professional decisions based on ethical principles.*

#### **Internal Feedback on Data-informed Action**

**Data-informed Action outlines a specific course of action designed to improve/strengthen student learning:**

Yes

**Data-informed Action description addresses why the program believes the action will lead to improvements in learning:**

Yes

**Data-informed Action includes a timeline:**

Yes

**Data-informed Action identifies a responsible party or group:**

Yes

**Feedback on Data-informed Action:**

**Feedback on Data-informed Action by Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation (IE&E)**



Data-informed Action outlines a specific course of action designed to improve/strengthen student learning:

Data-informed Action description addresses why the program believes the action will lead to improvements in learning:

Data-informed Action includes a timeline:

Data-informed Action identifies a responsible party or group:

Feedback on Data-informed Action:

**3 BS-COSC-OCOMM - Oral Communications**

Construction science students will create oral presentations appropriate to the construction discipline

## Relevant Associations

- 1 Please select the University and/or System-level learning outcome(s) that most closely align(s) with the program learning outcome above. Undergraduate programs/certificates should select relevant associations from the University baccalaureate outcomes (TAMU-UG) and from the EmpowerU outcomes (TAMU-S). Combined assessment plans that include both masters-level and doctoral-level programs should select from both sets of University-level outcomes (TAMU-Masters, TAMU-Doctoral).

Selected Outcomes:

- TAMU-S-COMM - Communication
- TAMU-UG-COMM - Communicate effectively

## Internal Feedback on Outcomes

- 1 Outcome is clearly written, reflecting what students are expected to learn upon completion of the program:

Yes ▼

- 2 Outcome is measurable

Yes ▼



- 3 Outcome is mapped appropriately to university-level outcome(s):

Yes ▼

- 4 Outcome reflects program expectation/graduation requirement rather than student learning:

No ▼

- 5 Feedback on Outcomes:

### Feedback on Outcomes by Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation (IE&E)

- 1 Outcome is clearly written, reflecting what students are expected to learn upon completion of the program:

Yes ▼

- 2 Outcome is measurable

Yes ▼

- 3 Outcome is mapped appropriately to university-level outcome(s):

No ▼

- 4 Outcome reflects program expectation/graduation requirement rather than student learning:

No ▼

- 5 Feedback on Outcomes:



## Related Measures

1

### Measure Name:

COSC 440 \_ Student Oral Presentation \_ SLO 2

### Measure Description:

Direct assessment will occur for SLO 2 using a combination of assignment and project (in whole or in part) from COSC course 440, 441, 442, 443, or 446 (Capstone). The assessment instruments will be administered by course instructors in class to students as part of the regular course curriculum. Data reported will be a cumulative class-level average performance on the student presentation scores obtained from COSC 440, 441, 442, 443, and 446 on the assignment. The cumulative presentation score from each class will be combined and an average of the individual cumulative scores will be reported. Cycle 2 \_ Reported once every three years.

### Supporting Documentation:

Supporting Documentation would include referenced documents such as scoring/grading rubrics, surveys, assignment descriptions, etc.

[Oral Presentation Rubric.pdf](#)

[COSC 440 Presentation Judging Rubric.pdf](#)

### Internal Feedback on Measure

Measure is a direct measure of student learning:

Yes

Data collection is clear (i.e., where the data are coming from):

Yes

Methodological processes are clear (i.e., how the data are to be evaluated and reported):

No



Measure clearly aligns with the outcome as defined:

Yes

All referenced rubrics/surveys are attached or sufficiently described:

No

Feedback on Measure:

### Feedback on Measure by Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation (IE&E)

Measure is a direct measure of student learning:

yes

Data collection is clear (i.e., where the data are coming from):

yes

Methodological processes are clear (i.e., how the data are to be evaluated and reported):

no

Measure clearly aligns with the outcome as defined:

yes

All referenced rubrics/surveys are attached or sufficiently described:

yes

Feedback on Measure:

It is not clear how these data are combined for program assessment purposes. More process explanation would be helpful.

**Update January 12, 2021 - This comment has been addressed.**

### Targets

For each measure, provide a description of the standard (the minimally acceptable student performance) as well as the target (the minimum proportion of students the faculty aspire to have meet the standard in order to be confident that the program is meeting the outcome).

#### Target Description:

Students cumulative average score for SLO 2 will be 70% or higher. In order to set a target score during initial data collection of new SLO data collection system and establishment of baseline date, 70% was deemed appropriate as minimum target as students must have a grade of "C" (70) or better in order to qualify for graduation from the program. Baseline data will be evaluated after



at least 3 years' of data collection have occurred in order to determine if adjustment of new targets is warranted based on trend data and ,if so, the new appropriate minimum targets will be determined..

### Internal Feedback on Target

**Standard (the minimally acceptable performance) is clearly presented and justified:**

Yes

**Target is specific (the proportion that needs to meet the standard):**

Yes

**The target clearly aligns with the measure as described:**

Yes

**Feedback on Target:**

### Feedback on Target by Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation (IE&E)

**Standard (the minimally acceptable performance) is clearly presented and justified:**

yes

**Target is specific (the proportion that needs to meet the standard):**

yes

**The target clearly aligns with the measure as described:**

yes

**Feedback on Target:**

### Findings

When reporting findings, indicate whether or not a given target was MET, PARTIALLY MET, or NOT MET. Also include a brief discussion regarding the meaning/value of the findings for purposes of continuous improvement. IF findings are not being reported in a given cycle for a particular measure, include a brief explanation as to why not.

**Finding Description:**



Students' AY 2019/20 cumulative average scores for SLO 2, *Create oral presentations appropriate to the construction discipline* was 88.24 ( $n = 106$ ). Therefore the target of 70% or greater SLO cumulative average was met.

**Target:**

Met

**Internal Feedback on Finding**

**Findings align with the measure and target as described:**

Yes

**Findings include a brief discussion regarding the meaning/value of results for purposes of continuous improvement:**

No

**Target status indicator (i.e., Met, Partially Met, Not Met, Not Reported This Cycle) is used appropriately:**

Yes

**Where appropriate, findings are disaggregated for each program reflected in the assessment plan:**

Yes

**Feedback on Finding:**

**Feedback on Finding by Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation (IE&E)**

**Findings align with the measure and target as described:**

Yes

**Findings include a brief discussion regarding the meaning/value of results for purposes of continuous improvement:**

No

**Target status indicator (i.e., Met, Partially Met, Not Met, Not Reported This Cycle) is used appropriately:**

Yes

**Where appropriate, findings are disaggregated for each program reflected in the assessment plan:**

**Feedback on Finding:**



## Data-informed Actions

For each of the findings reported, the program should indicate how it is going to use/act on the assessment findings in the upcoming academic year. A brief summary of the proposed action(s) should be provided, including a tentative timeline for implementation and the party or group responsible for carrying out the action(s). Also include a rationale for why program faculty believe the action(s) should lead to improvements in the identified outcome. IF no actions are being taken based on a given finding, a brief statement of explanation should be provided.

### Data-informed Action Description:

*SLO 2, Create oral presentations appropriate to the construction discipline met both the direct and indirect assessment targets established by the program. The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee reviewed the data and findings. Because the targets were met, action was not deemed necessary at this time. The program will continue to collect appropriate data during AY 20/21 and monitor student performance on SLO 2.*

### Internal Feedback on Data-informed Action

Data-informed Action outlines a specific course of action designed to improve/strengthen student learning:

Yes

Data-informed Action description addresses why the program believes the action will lead to improvements in learning:

Yes

Data-informed Action includes a timeline:

Yes

Data-informed Action identifies a responsible party or group:

Yes

Feedback on Data-informed Action:

### Feedback on Data-informed Action by Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation (IE&E)

Data-informed Action outlines a specific course of action designed to improve/strengthen student learning:



Data-informed Action description addresses why the program believes the action will lead to improvements in learning:

Data-informed Action includes a timeline:

Data-informed Action identifies a responsible party or group:

Feedback on Data-informed Action:

Measure Name:

SLO 2 \_ Senior Exit Survey \_ Confidence Level

Measure Description:

As an indirect assessment of the student learning outcomes, an exit survey will be administered to all COSC students immediately prior to their graduation, soliciting their opinions with respect to their educational experiences at TAMU. Students will be asked to indicate how confident they are in their ability to *create oral presentations appropriate to the construction discipline*. Responses will utilize a four point Likert-type scale (4 = Very Confident; 3 = Confident; 2 = Somewhat Confident; 1 = Not Confident).

Supporting Documentation:

Supporting Documentation would include referenced documents such as scoring/grading rubrics, surveys, assignment descriptions, etc.

No document was selected.

### Internal Feedback on Measure

Measure is a direct measure of student learning:

No

Data collection is clear (i.e., where the data are coming from):

Yes



**Methodological processes are clear (i.e., how the data are to be evaluated and reported):**

Yes

**Measure clearly aligns with the outcome as defined:**

Yes

**All referenced rubrics/surveys are attached or sufficiently described:**

No

**Feedback on Measure:**

### Feedback on Measure by Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation (IE&E)

**Measure is a direct measure of student learning:**

no

**Data collection is clear (i.e., where the data are coming from):**

yes

**Methodological processes are clear (i.e., how the data are to be evaluated and reported):**

yes

**Measure clearly aligns with the outcome as defined:**

yes

**All referenced rubrics/surveys are attached or sufficiently described:**

yes

**Feedback on Measure:**

### Targets

For each measure, provide a description of the standard (the minimally acceptable student performance) as well as the target (the minimum proportion of students the faculty aspire to have meet the standard in order to be confident that the program is meeting the outcome).

#### Target Description:

For each student learning outcome students' average score will be a minimum score of 2.51 or higher indicating students are, at minimum, "confident" *creating oral presentations appropriate*



to the construction discipline, as students graduating from the program should be confident applying the knowledge and skills gained from their degree program in their future careers.

### Internal Feedback on Target

Standard (the minimally acceptable performance) is clearly presented and justified:

Yes

Target is specific (the proportion that needs to meet the standard):

Yes

The target clearly aligns with the measure as described:

Yes

Feedback on Target:

### Feedback on Target by Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation (IE&E)

Standard (the minimally acceptable performance) is clearly presented and justified:

yes

Target is specific (the proportion that needs to meet the standard):

yes

The target clearly aligns with the measure as described:

yes

Feedback on Target:

### Findings

When reporting findings, indicate whether or not a given target was MET, PARTIALLY MET, or NOT MET. Also include a brief discussion regarding the meaning/value of the findings for purposes of continuous improvement. IF findings are not being reported in a given cycle for a particular measure, include a brief explanation as to why not.

Finding Description:



During the 2019/20 academic year, the Fall 2019, Spring 2020, and Summer 2020 Senior Exit Surveys had 102, 130, and 38 respondents, respectively, a for a total of 270 respondents. Students responded to the question: *"As a result of your COSC degree program, how confident do you feel in your ability to create oral presentations appropriate to the construction discipline?"* The average score for AY 2019/20 was 3.43 (Confident) meeting the target of minimum means score of 2.51. The scale used was: Very Confident = 3.51 – 4.00; Confident = 2.51 – 3.50; Somewhat Confident = 1.51 – 2.50; Not Confident = 1.00 – 1.50.

**Target:**

Met

**Internal Feedback on Finding**

**Findings align with the measure and target as described:**

Yes

**Findings include a brief discussion regarding the meaning/value of results for purposes of continuous improvement:**

No

**Target status indicator (i.e., Met, Partially Met, Not Met, Not Reported This Cycle) is used appropriately:**

Yes

**Where appropriate, findings are disaggregated for each program reflected in the assessment plan:**

Yes

**Feedback on Finding:**

**Feedback on Finding by Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation (IE&E)**

**Findings align with the measure and target as described:**

Yes

**Findings include a brief discussion regarding the meaning/value of results for purposes of continuous improvement:**

No

**Target status indicator (i.e., Met, Partially Met, Not Met, Not Reported This Cycle) is used appropriately:**

Yes



Where appropriate, findings are disaggregated for each program reflected in the assessment plan:

Feedback on Finding:

### Data-informed Actions

For each of the findings reported, the program should indicate how it is going to use/act on the assessment findings in the upcoming academic year. A brief summary of the proposed action(s) should be provided, including a tentative timeline for implementation and the party or group responsible for carrying out the action(s). Also include a rationale for why program faculty believe the action(s) should lead to improvements in the identified outcome. IF no actions are being taken based on a given finding, a brief statement of explanation should be provided.

#### Data-informed Action Description:

*SLO 2, Create oral presentations appropriate to the construction discipline met both the direct and indirect assessment targets established by the program. The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee reviewed the data and findings. Because the targets were met, action was not deemed necessary at this time. The program will continue to collect appropriate data during AY 20/21 and monitor student performance on SLO 2.*

#### Internal Feedback on Data-informed Action

Data-informed Action outlines a specific course of action designed to improve/strengthen student learning:

Yes

Data-informed Action description addresses why the program believes the action will lead to improvements in learning:

Yes

Data-informed Action includes a timeline:

Yes

Data-informed Action identifies a responsible party or group:

Yes

Feedback on Data-informed Action:

Feedback on Data-informed Action by Office of Institutional Effectiveness



## & Evaluation (IE&E)

Data-informed Action outlines a specific course of action designed to improve/strengthen student learning:

Data-informed Action description addresses why the program believes the action will lead to improvements in learning:

Data-informed Action includes a timeline:

Data-informed Action identifies a responsible party or group:

Feedback on Data-informed Action:

### 4 BS-COSC-WCOMM - Written Communications

Construction science students will create written communications appropriate to the construction discipline

## Relevant Associations

- 1 Please select the University and/or System-level learning outcome(s) that most closely align(s) with the program learning outcome above. Undergraduate programs/certificates should select relevant associations from the University baccalaureate outcomes (TAMU-UG) and from the EmpowerU outcomes (TAMU-S). Combined assessment plans that include both masters-level and doctoral-level programs should select from both sets of University-level outcomes (TAMU-Masters, TAMU-Doctoral).

Selected Outcomes:

- o TAMU-S-COMM - Communication
- o TAMU-UG-COMM - Communicate effectively

## Internal Feedback on Outcomes

- 1 Outcome is clearly written, reflecting what students are expected to learn upon completion of the program:

Yes ▼

- 2 Outcome is measurable



Yes ▼

- 3 Outcome is mapped appropriately to university-level outcome(s):

Yes ▼

- 4 Outcome reflects program expectation/graduation requirement rather than student learning:

No ▼

- 5 Feedback on Outcomes:

### Feedback on Outcomes by Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation (IE&E)

- 1 Outcome is clearly written, reflecting what students are expected to learn upon completion of the program:

Yes ▼

- 2 Outcome is measurable

Yes ▼

- 3 Outcome is mapped appropriately to university-level outcome(s):

No ▼

- 4 Outcome reflects program expectation/graduation requirement rather than student learning:

No ▼



## 5 Feedback on Outcomes:

Don't forget to map to the institutional learning outcomes.

Update January 12, 2021 - this comment has been addressed.

## Related Measures

1

### Measure Name:

SLO 1 Direct Assessment

### Measure Description:

Direct assessment will occur for SLO 1 using a combination of assignments from COSC 494 (Internship). The assessment instruments will be administered by course instructors in class to students as part of the regular course curriculum. Data reported will be class-level average performance on the assignments. The cumulative average score from each assignment will be combined and an average of the assignment scores will be reported. Cycle 2 \_ Reported once every three years.

### Supporting Documentation:

Supporting Documentation would include referenced documents such as scoring/grading rubrics, surveys, assignment descriptions, etc.

[COSC 494 Final Internship Report Outline Rubric.pdf](#)

[COSC 494 Progress Memorandum Report - Rubric.pdf](#)

### Internal Feedback on Measure

Measure is a direct measure of student learning:

Yes

Data collection is clear (i.e., where the data are coming from):

Yes

Methodological processes are clear (i.e., how the data are to be evaluated and reported):

No



**Measure clearly aligns with the outcome as defined:**

Yes

**All referenced rubrics/surveys are attached or sufficiently described:**

No

**Feedback on Measure:**

### Feedback on Measure by Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation (IE&E)

**Measure is a direct measure of student learning:**

yes

**Data collection is clear (i.e., where the data are coming from):**

yes

**Methodological processes are clear (i.e., how the data are to be evaluated and reported):**

no

**Measure clearly aligns with the outcome as defined:**

yes

**All referenced rubrics/surveys are attached or sufficiently described:**

no

**Feedback on Measure:**

The assignment is very clear, but it is not clear how it is evaluated for communication. Can more detail be provided about the evaluation process? If the average score of the assignment for all students is the measure, is there a way data can be reported that would provide more actionable information? The "rubrics" linked here are the assignment descriptions, not rubrics.

### Targets

For each measure, provide a description of the standard (the minimally acceptable student performance) as well as the target (the minimum proportion of students the faculty aspire to have meet the standard in order to be confident that the program is meeting the outcome).

#### Target Description:

Students cumulative average score for SLO 1 will be 70% or higher. In order to set a target score during initial data collection of new SLO data collection system and establishment of baseline date, 70% was deemed appropriate as minimum target as students must have a grade of "C" (70)



or better in order to qualify for graduation from the program. Baseline data will be evaluated after at least 3 years' of data collection have occurred in order to determine if adjustment of new targets is warranted based on trend data and ,if so, the new appropriate minimum targets will be determined.

### Internal Feedback on Target

**Standard (the minimally acceptable performance) is clearly presented and justified:**

Yes

**Target is specific (the proportion that needs to meet the standard):**

Yes

**The target clearly aligns with the measure as described:**

Yes

**Feedback on Target:**

### Feedback on Target by Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation (IE&E)

**Standard (the minimally acceptable performance) is clearly presented and justified:**

yes

**Target is specific (the proportion that needs to meet the standard):**

yes

**The target clearly aligns with the measure as described:**

yes

**Feedback on Target:**

### Findings

When reporting findings, indicate whether or not a given target was MET, PARTIALLY MET, or NOT MET. Also include a brief discussion regarding the meaning/value of the findings for purposes of continuous improvement. IF findings are not being reported in a given cycle for a particular measure, include a brief explanation as to why not.



**Finding Description:**

Students' AY 2019/20 cumulative average scores for SLO 1, *Create written communications appropriate to the construction discipline* was 91.5 ( $n = 194$ ). Therefore the target of 70% or greater SLO cumulative average was met.

**Target:**

Met

**Internal Feedback on Finding**

Findings align with the measure and target as described:

Yes

Findings include a brief discussion regarding the meaning/value of results for purposes of continuous improvement:

No

Target status indicator (i.e., Met, Partially Met, Not Met, Not Reported This Cycle) is used appropriately:

Yes

Where appropriate, findings are disaggregated for each program reflected in the assessment plan:

Yes

Feedback on Finding:

**Feedback on Finding by Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation (IE&E)**

Findings align with the measure and target as described:

Yes

Findings include a brief discussion regarding the meaning/value of results for purposes of continuous improvement:

No

Target status indicator (i.e., Met, Partially Met, Not Met, Not Reported This Cycle) is used appropriately:

Yes

Where appropriate, findings are disaggregated for each program reflected in the assessment plan:



## Data-informed Actions

For each of the findings reported, the program should indicate how it is going to use/act on the assessment findings in the upcoming academic year. A brief summary of the proposed action(s) should be provided, including a tentative timeline for implementation and the party or group responsible for carrying out the action(s). Also include a rationale for why program faculty believe the action(s) should lead to improvements in the identified outcome. IF no actions are being taken based on a given finding, a brief statement of explanation should be provided.

### Data-informed Action Description:

*SLO 1, Create written communications appropriate to the construction discipline met both the direct and indirect assessment targets established by the program. The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee reviewed the data and findings. Because the targets were met, action was not deemed necessary at this time. The program will continue to collect appropriate data during AY 20/21 and monitor student performance on SLO 1.*

## Internal Feedback on Data-informed Action

Data-informed Action outlines a specific course of action designed to improve/strengthen student learning:

Data-informed Action description addresses why the program believes the action will lead to improvements in learning:

Data-informed Action includes a timeline:

Data-informed Action identifies a responsible party or group:

Feedback on Data-informed Action:

You must have at least one outcome with a data informed action, even if you meet all your targets. Here is some info on how to write an action plan when all targets are met

Q: How do we write a data-informed action when all of the Targets are met? A: Met Targets are a sign that the program is functioning well and that the established learning outcomes are achievable. It does not mean, however, that all of the work is done and there is no further need for assessment or attention to continuous improvement. Therefore, the program should still consider how the collected data can inform continuous improvement efforts. Possible approaches include, but are not limited to: • Drilling down into the results further, perhaps by demographics,

course section, or some other dimension in an effort to identify possible gaps or disparities to address • Adjusting the Target\* \*If this is the strategy the program chooses to pursue it is critical to include a discussion of what the program will do in order to meet the new Target. This keeps the focus of the data-informed action on a curricular change rather than simply on updating the Target (which would be considered a change to the assessment strategy and should be documented in the Assessment Reflections & Closing the Loop Report).

### Feedback on Data-informed Action by Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation (IE&E)

Data-informed Action outlines a specific course of action designed to improve/strengthen student learning:

Data-informed Action description addresses why the program believes the action will lead to improvements in learning:

Data-informed Action includes a timeline:

Data-informed Action identifies a responsible party or group:

Feedback on Data-informed Action:

Measure Name:

SLO 1 \_ Senior Exit Survey \_ Confidence Level

Measure Description:

As an indirect assessment of the student learning outcomes, an exit survey will be administered to all COSC students immediately prior to their graduation, soliciting their opinions with respect to their educational experiences at TAMU. Students will be asked to indicate how confident they are in their ability to *create written communications appropriate to the construction discipline*. Responses will utilize a four point Likert-type scale (4 = Very Confident; 3 = Confident; 2 = Somewhat Confident; 1 = Not Confident).

Supporting Documentation:



Supporting Documentation would include referenced documents such as scoring/grading rubrics, surveys, assignment descriptions, etc.

No document was selected.

### Internal Feedback on Measure

**Measure is a direct measure of student learning:**

No

**Data collection is clear (i.e., where the data are coming from):**

Yes

**Methodological processes are clear (i.e., how the data are to be evaluated and reported):**

Yes

**Measure clearly aligns with the outcome as defined:**

Yes

**All referenced rubrics/surveys are attached or sufficiently described:**

No

**Feedback on Measure:**

### Feedback on Measure by Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation (IE&E)

**Measure is a direct measure of student learning:**

no

**Data collection is clear (i.e., where the data are coming from):**

yes

**Methodological processes are clear (i.e., how the data are to be evaluated and reported):**

yes

**Measure clearly aligns with the outcome as defined:**

yes

**All referenced rubrics/surveys are attached or sufficiently described:**

yes



## Feedback on Measure:

### Targets

For each measure, provide a description of the standard (the minimally acceptable student performance) as well as the target (the minimum proportion of students the faculty aspire to have meet the standard in order to be confident that the program is meeting the outcome).

#### Target Description:

For each student learning outcome students' average score will be a minimum score of 2.51 or higher indicating students are, at minimum, "confident" *Creating written communications appropriate to the construction disciplines*, as students graduating from the program should be confident applying the knowledge and skills gained from their degree program in their future careers.

#### Internal Feedback on Target

**Standard (the minimally acceptable performance) is clearly presented and justified:**

Yes

**Target is specific (the proportion that needs to meet the standard):**

Yes

**The target clearly aligns with the measure as described:**

Yes

**Feedback on Target:**

#### Feedback on Target by Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation (IE&E)

**Standard (the minimally acceptable performance) is clearly presented and justified:**

yes

**Target is specific (the proportion that needs to meet the standard):**

yes

**The target clearly aligns with the measure as described:**

yes



## Feedback on Target:

### Findings

When reporting findings, indicate whether or not a given target was MET, PARTIALLY MET, or NOT MET. Also include a brief discussion regarding the meaning/value of the findings for purposes of continuous improvement. IF findings are not being reported in a given cycle for a particular measure, include a brief explanation as to why not.

#### Finding Description:

During the 2019/20 academic year, the Fall 2019, Spring 2020, and Summer 2020 Senior Exit Surveys had 102, 130, and 38 respondents, respectively, a for a total of 270 respondents. Students responded to the question: *"As a result of your COSC degree program, how confident do you feel in your ability to create written communications appropriate to the construction discipline?"* The average score for AY 2019/20 was 3.48 (Confident) meeting the target of minimum mean score of 2.51. The scale used was: Very Confident = 3.51 – 4.00; Confident = 2.51 – 3.50; Somewhat Confident = 1.51 – 2.50; Not Confident = 1.00 – 1.50.

#### Target:

Met

### Internal Feedback on Finding

#### Findings align with the measure and target as described:

Yes

#### Findings include a brief discussion regarding the meaning/value of results for purposes of continuous improvement:

No

#### Target status indicator (i.e., Met, Partially Met, Not Met, Not Reported This Cycle) is used appropriately:

Yes

#### Where appropriate, findings are disaggregated for each program reflected in the assessment plan:

Yes

#### Feedback on Finding:



## Feedback on Finding by Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation (IE&E)

Findings align with the measure and target as described:

Yes

Findings include a brief discussion regarding the meaning/value of results for purposes of continuous improvement:

No

Target status indicator (i.e., Met, Partially Met, Not Met, Not Reported This Cycle) is used appropriately:

Yes

Where appropriate, findings are disaggregated for each program reflected in the assessment plan:

Feedback on Finding:

### Data-informed Actions

For each of the findings reported, the program should indicate how it is going to use/act on the assessment findings in the upcoming academic year. A brief summary of the proposed action(s) should be provided, including a tentative timeline for implementation and the party or group responsible for carrying out the action(s). Also include a rationale for why program faculty believe the action(s) should lead to improvements in the identified outcome. IF no actions are being taken based on a given finding, a brief statement of explanation should be provided.

#### Data-informed Action Description:

*SLO 1, Create written communications appropriate to the construction discipline met both the direct and indirect assessment targets established by the program. The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee reviewed the data and findings. Because the targets were met, action was not deemed necessary at this time. The program will continue to collect appropriate data during AY 20/21 and monitor student performance on SLO 1.*

### Internal Feedback on Data-informed Action

Data-informed Action outlines a specific course of action designed to improve/strengthen student learning:

Data-informed Action description addresses why the program believes the action will lead to improvements in learning:



**Data-informed Action includes a timeline:**

**Data-informed Action identifies a responsible party or group:**

**Feedback on Data-informed Action:**

You must have at least one outcome with a data informed action, even if you meet all your targets. Here is some info on how to write an action plan when all targets are met

Q: How do we write a data-informed action when all of the Targets are met? A: Met Targets are a sign that the program is functioning well and that the established learning outcomes are achievable. It does not mean, however, that all of the work is done and there is no further need for assessment or attention to continuous improvement. Therefore, the program should still consider how the collected data can inform continuous improvement efforts. Possible approaches include, but are not limited to: • Drilling down into the results further, perhaps by demographics, course section, or some other dimension in an effort to identify possible gaps or disparities to address • Adjusting the Target\* \*If this is the strategy the program chooses to pursue it is critical to include a discussion of what the program will do in order to meet the new Target. This keeps the focus of the data-informed action on a curricular change rather than simply on updating the Target (which would be considered a change to the assessment strategy and should be documented in the Assessment Reflections & Closing the Loop Report).

### **Feedback on Data-informed Action by Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Evaluation (IE&E)**

**Data-informed Action outlines a specific course of action designed to improve/strengthen student learning:**

**Data-informed Action description addresses why the program believes the action will lead to improvements in learning:**

**Data-informed Action includes a timeline:**

**Data-informed Action identifies a responsible party or group:**

**Feedback on Data-informed Action:**



## Approver Comments

### 1 Feedback on Measures and Targets:

Thank you for your thorough review, feedback, and even examples of how to be more successful. This is all much appreciated. Also, we will not forget to include mapping for institutional outcomes in addition to the SLOs and CLOs. Lastly, we will ensure that the targets and methods for achieving compliance are more clear and specific.

### 2 Feedback on Findings and Data-informed Action:

Thank you for your thorough review, feedback. We are confident that we are one of the strongest ACCE programs, but your recommendations will help us improve our approach for making data-informed actions from our improved process findings.

CLOSE AND EXIT

