



# Construction Science, BS

BS-COSC

## Program Description

Please fill in the fields below. Refer to the [Academic Assessment Guidelines](#) manual for more information.

### 1 Discipline-specific purpose and focus of program(s) (Be sure to address ALL academic programs/credentials included in this assessment plan):

The Construction Science Department undergraduate program will maintain a strong general, relevant, current, comprehensive, and broad based undergraduate degree program, founded in construction fundamentals applicable to all sectors of the industry and responsive to the ever evolving industry and industry trends.

\*

### 2 Geographic location of delivery:

Texas A&M University

\*

### 3 Mode of delivery:

Face-to-Face

\*

### 4 Format of delivery:

Synchronous

## Internal Feedback on Program Description

### 1 Program Description Feedback:

## OIEE Feedback on Program Description

### 1 Program Description Feedback:

**2/16/22 Final Comments:** Issues mentioned below were addressed. This is a really strong assessment plan. Nice job on the report.

**1/19/22 OIEE Overall Comments:** Please review the blue feedback throughout this report, but please see below for areas where revisions are necessary:

- Findings: These should be disaggregated by location throughout this report (CS and McAllen). IF there are not yet any McAllen students at the point in the program where assessment data is collected, that should be clearly stated in the measure descriptions.
- Data-Informed Action: None of the actions in this report constitute a content-based change. As a reminder, only one action is required. Refer to pgs. 23-24 of Academic Guidelines Manual (linked in the Program Description header) for guidance.

---

In the Geographic Location of Delivery section, please also list McAllen as a geographic location of delivery (in future reports as this one is now locked down).

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

**1** Learning Outcomes, Measures, and Targets: When selecting Relevant Associations under Outcomes, please remember to keep selections as closely aligned to the student learning outcome as possible. If multiple sets of associations are listed please select the appropriate association from each set.

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

Students will analyze professional decisions based on ethical principles

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

**1** Relevant Associations

Selected Outcomes:

- o CORE-PR - Personal responsibility
- o CORE-SR - Social responsibility
- o TAMU-S-EthicandSR - Ethical & Social Responsibility
- o TAMU-UG-PRandSR - Personal & Social Responsibility

## Internal Feedback on Outcomes

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

**2** Outcome is measurable:

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

4 Feedback on Outcomes:

- o CORE-PR - Personal responsibility
- o CORE-SR - Social responsibility
- o TAMU-S-EthicandSR - Ethical & Social Responsibility
- o TAMU-UG-PRandSR - Personal & Social Responsibility

Only associate with most relevant outcomes.

## OIEE Feedback on Outcomes

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

2 Outcome is measurable:

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

4 Feedback on Outcomes:

## Measures

1



**Measure Name:**

COSC 381 \_ Ethical Analysis Report \_ DA

**Data collection (what data are gathered, how it is gathered, and from/by who):**

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.

Although there were no McAllen students for this cycle, in the future this same measure will be used.

**Methodology or data analysis strategy:**

Data reported will be the average performance of all students on the ethics portion of the assignment rubric.

Data will be tallied and reported separately for College Station and McAllen students in the future. There were no students in McAllen for this cycle.

**Supporting Documentation:**

Select a document artifact attached to this form or add a new document. If uploading a document for the first time, please remember to select it from the dropdown menu below to attach it to this measure.

[COSC 381 - Team Ethics Report Instructions - Rubric.docx](#)

[COSC 381 - Team Ethics Report Instructions - Rubric.docx](#)

[AIC Code of Ethics\(1\).docx](#)

[Ethics Team Scenarios I to VI.docx](#)

**Internal Feedback on Measure**

**Measure is a direct measure of student learning and clearly aligns with the outcome:**

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):**

Yes

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

Yes

**Feedback on Measure:**

### OIEE Feedback on Measure

**Measure is a direct measure of student learning and clearly aligns with the outcome:**

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):**

Yes

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

Yes

**Feedback on Measure:**

### Targets

The target statement should include (1) a description of the standard (the minimally acceptable student performance) and (2) the proportion of students that are expected to meet the standard.

#### Target Description:

The cumulative class average of student scores for SLO 6 will be a 70% or higher class average score on the ethics portion of the rubrics.

Data will be tallied and reported separately for College Station and McAllen students in the future. There were no students in McAllen for this cycle.

#### Internal Feedback on Target



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

Yes

**Proportion of students expected to meet the standard is clearly stated:**

Yes

**Target clearly aligns with outcome and measure:**

Yes

**Feedback on Target:**

### OIEE Feedback on Target

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

Yes

**Proportion of students expected to meet the standard is clearly stated:**

Yes

**Target clearly aligns with outcome and measure:**

Yes

**Feedback on Target:**

### Findings

Using the dropdown feature below, indicate whether or not the target was met. If no students are enrolled, or if no data are reported, please select the appropriate option from the dropdown menu. Please remember to disaggregate results by program/degree credential and/or by mode of delivery.

**Target:**

Met

**Finding Description:**

During the fall 2020 semester, the cumulative class average was 71% on the assignment that assessed SLO6. Therefore the target was met. The results were not surprising, students were given a case study and asked to describe the ethical issue and who the acting parties were. Student responses did not always include all the acting parties.



Although there were no McAllen students for this cycle, in the future this same measure will be used.

**If applicable, provide a brief explanation as to why not data were collected/reported for this measure:**

**Supporting Documentation (Optional):**

Use this feature to upload any documents that further illustrate the findings for this measure.

No document was selected.

**Internal Feedback on Finding**

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

Yes

**Where appropriate, findings are disaggregated (e.g., by program, by mode of delivery, by geographic location):**

Not Applicable

**Feedback on Finding:**

**OIEE Feedback on Finding**

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

Yes

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

Yes



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

Yes

**Where appropriate, findings are disaggregated (e.g., by program, by mode of delivery, by geographic location):**

Not Applicable

**Feedback on Finding:**

Something that would make this even stronger is if the results were compared to previous years' findings. Contextualizing the results in this way allows the program faculty to see the achievement trend over time. Keep in mind for future reports.

## Data-Informed Actions

For each reported finding, the program should indicate how it is going to use/act on the finding. 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) will lead to improvements in the identified learning outcome. Please remember that although programs are only required to submit one data-informed action that meets all of the review criteria, something must be entered into each data-informed action text box. Please see the [Academic Assessment Guidelines](#) manual for more information.

### Data-Informed Action Description:

After discussing the findings with the undergraduate academic affairs committee it was determined that students may not completely understand the assignment. The assignment wording was adjusted in order to clarify the expectations and additional classtime was dedicated to review examples in order to help students complete the assignment successfully. The changes were implented during the spring 2021 semester.

For the 2021-2022 academic year, SLO 6 will be assessed in COSC 463 - Introduction to Construction Law. The committee determined that assessing SLO 6 would be better suited in COSC 463 - Introduction to Construction Law for a few reasons: 1) the law class delves deeper into construction ethics and various scenarios, 2) the course is small and students discuss various construction ethic issues and receive feedback from one another, 3) in previous years SLO 6 was assessed in this course as well.





### Internal Feedback on Data-Informed Action

Course of action described above is designed to improve/strengthen student learning:

Yes

Action includes specific implementation details (e.g., timeline, responsible party, etc.):

Yes

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

No

Feedback on Data-Informed Action:

Elaborate on why the changes you're making will improve student learning. I can infer a connection with revising the assignment. Can you describe why you think assessing this outcome in 463 will be a better option?

### OIEE Feedback on Data-Informed Action

Course of action described above is designed to improve/strengthen student learning:

Yes

Action includes specific implementation details (e.g., timeline, responsible party, etc.):

Yes

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

Yes

Feedback on Data-Informed Action:

**2/16/22 Update** - The details added here were helpful--particularly the bit about reviewing more examples in class. Also, sounds like a reasonable change to the assessment strategy!



1/19/22 - Although changing the assignment instructions may help the students understand the expectations more, it isn't clear how this action will ultimately improve their learning on the topic of ethics. It's more of an 'administrative' change versus a content-based action.

**Measure Name:**

SLO 6 \_ Senior Exit Survey \_ Confidence Level

**Data collection (what data are gathered, how it is gathered, and from/by who):**

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. One section of the exit survey will ask students to indicate their confidence levels to perform each of the 20 degree program student learning outcomes at the appropriate Bloom's Taxonomy level. One item (SLO #6) of this section asks students to indicate how confident they are in their ability analyze professional decisions based on ethical principles. Responses will utilize a four point Likert-type scale (4 = Very Confident; 3 = Confident; 2 = Somewhat Confident; 1 = Not Confident). Data collected and reported for the outcome reported here will come from student responses to item 6 (SLO #6) in the SLO section of senior exit survey.

Although there were no McAllen students for this cycle, in the future this same measure will be used.

**Methodology or data analysis strategy:**

The targeted performance criteria for SLO #6 *Students will be able to analyze professional decisions based on ethical principles* will be set at a minimum average score of student responses of 2.51, indicating students are, at minimum, "confident" in their ability analyze professional decisions based on ethical principles. The cut points will be: 0 - 1.5 = Not Confident; 1.51 - 2.50 = Somewhat Confident; 2.51 - 3.50 = Confident; and 3.51 - 4.0 = Very Confident.

Data will be tallied and reported separately for College Station and McAllen students in the future. There were no students in McAllen for this cycle.



**Supporting Documentation:**

Select a document artifact attached to this form or add a new document. If uploading a document for the first time, please remember to select it from the dropdown menu below to attach it to this measure.

[Senior Exit Survey Questionnaire \\_ Fall 2018.pdf](#)

**Internal Feedback on Measure**

**Measure is a direct measure of student learning and clearly aligns with the outcome:**

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):**

Yes

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

Yes

**Feedback on Measure:**

**OIEE Feedback on Measure**

**Measure is a direct measure of student learning and clearly aligns with the outcome:**

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

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

Yes

**Feedback on Measure:**

Good supplemental, indirect evidence.

**Targets**

The target statement should include (1) a description of the standard (the minimally acceptable student performance) and (2) the proportion of students that are expected to meet the standard.

**Target Description:**

For the student learning outcome "*Analyze professional decisions based on ethical principles*" the cumulative mean score of all student responses will be a minimum score of 2.51 or higher indicating students are, at minimum, "confident" analyzing professional decisions based on ethical principles.

**Internal Feedback on Target**

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

Yes

**Proportion of students expected to meet the standard is clearly stated:**

Yes

**Target clearly aligns with outcome and measure:**

Yes

**Feedback on Target:**

**OIEE Feedback on Target**

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

Yes

**Proportion of students expected to meet the standard is clearly stated:**

Yes

**Target clearly aligns with outcome and measure:**

Yes

**Feedback on Target:**



## Findings

Using the dropdown feature below, indicate whether or not the target was met. If no students are enrolled, or if no data are reported, please select the appropriate option from the dropdown menu. Please remember to disaggregate results by program/degree credential and/or by mode of delivery.

### Target:

Met

### Finding Description:

The average score of cumulative student responses for the fall 2020 semester was 3.71, which indicates that students are, at a minimum, "confident" analyzing professional decisions based on ethical principles.

Data will be tallied and reported separately for College Station and McAllen students in the future. There were no students in McAllen for this cycle.

If applicable, provide a brief explanation as to why not data were collected/reported for this measure:

### Supporting Documentation (Optional):

Use this feature to upload any documents that further illustrate the findings for this measure.

No document was selected.

## Internal Feedback on Finding

Findings align with the measure and target as described:

Yes

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

Yes

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

No

Where appropriate, findings are disaggregated (e.g., by program, by mode of delivery, by geographic location):



Not Applicable

**Feedback on Finding:**

Elaborate on the findings statements. Assessment is most useful when the current findings are contextualized in some way, particularly with past findings. Can you identify a trend in the data as far as this outcome is concerned? Is this finding meaningful to the UG committee?

**OIEE Feedback on Finding**

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

No

**Where appropriate, findings are disaggregated (e.g., by program, by mode of delivery, by geographic location):**

Not Applicable

**Feedback on Finding:**

Indirect evidence is really valuable to include because it gives you a look at the other side of the coin. I agree with Katie's feedback above that this information would be really valuable to look at compared with the overall historical trend.

**Data-Informed Actions**

For each reported finding, the program should indicate how it is going to use/act on the finding. 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) will lead to improvements in the identified learning outcome. Please remember that although programs are only required to submit one data-

informed action that meets all of the review criteria, something must be entered into each data-informed action text box. Please see the [Academic Assessment Guidelines](#) manual for more information.

**Data-Informed Action Description:**

In an effort to ensure that all undergraduate students who graduate from the Construction Science program are confident in their ability to analyze professional decisions based upon ethical principles, the undergraduate academic affairs committee and faculty will continue to reinforce construction ethics in numerous courses.

**Internal Feedback on Data-Informed Action**

**Course of action described above is designed to improve/strengthen student learning:**

Yes

**Action includes specific implementation details (e.g., timeline, responsible party, etc.):**

No

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

Not Applicable

**Feedback on Data-Informed Action:**

**OIEE Feedback on Data-Informed Action**

**Course of action described above is designed to improve/strengthen student learning:**

Not Applicable

**Action includes specific implementation details (e.g., timeline, responsible party, etc.):**

Not Applicable

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

Not Applicable

**Feedback on Data-Informed Action:**



### 3 BS-COSC-OCOMM - Oral Communications

Create oral presentations appropriate to the construction discipline

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

### 1 Relevant Associations

Selected Outcomes:

- o CORE-OCOMM - Communication skills (Oral)
- 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 Feedback on Outcomes:

same as above-select outcomes most closely associated with yours.

- o CORE-WCOMM - Communication skills (Written)
- o TAMU-S-COMM - Communication
- o TAMU-UG-COMM - Communicate effectively

## OIEE Feedback on Outcomes





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

- 2 Outcome is measurable:

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

- 4 Feedback on Outcomes:

## Measures

1

**Measure Name:**

COSC 440 \_ Student Oral Presentation \_ SLO 2 \_ DA

**Data collection (what data are gathered, how it is gathered, and from/by who):**

Direct assessment will occur for SLO 2 using an assignment from COSC courses 440, 441, 442, 443, and/or 446 (Capstone). The assessment instruments will be administered by course instructors in class to students as part of the regular course curriculum.

Although there were no McAllen students for this cycle, in the future this same measure will be used.

**Methodology or data analysis strategy:**

Data reported will be the average performance of all students on the assignment.

Data will be tallied and reported separately for College Station and McAllen students in the future. There were no students in McAllen for this cycle.

### Supporting Documentation:

Select a document artifact attached to this form or add a new document. If uploading a document for the first time, please remember to select it from the dropdown menu below to attach it to this measure.

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

### Internal Feedback on Measure

**Measure is a direct measure of student learning and clearly aligns with the outcome:**

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):**

Yes

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

Yes

**Feedback on Measure:**

I'm not sure about whether this assignment clearly aligns with the communication outcome. From this rubric, I can see the connection to the outcome (Create oral presentations appropriate to the construction discipline) in terms of construction content, but are students evaluated at all on their communication skills? I think of appropriate content as just one piece of communication.

### OIEE Feedback on Measure

**Measure is a direct measure of student learning and clearly aligns with the outcome:**

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

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

Yes

**Feedback on Measure:**

A number of courses are listed in the measure description but the attached rubric is specific to only one course. Is a different rubric used for each course? This may be something to clarify in the future.

## Targets

The target statement should include (1) a description of the standard (the minimally acceptable student performance) and (2) the proportion of students that are expected to meet the standard.

**Target Description:**

The cumulative class average of student scores for SLO 2 will be a 70% or higher class average score on the assessment instrument.

### Internal Feedback on Target

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

Yes

**Proportion of students expected to meet the standard is clearly stated:**

Yes

**Target clearly aligns with outcome and measure:**

Yes

**Feedback on Target:**

### OIEE Feedback on Target

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

Yes

**Proportion of students expected to meet the standard is clearly stated:**

Not Applicable



**Target clearly aligns with outcome and measure:**

No

**Feedback on Target:**

It's fine to report an overall average, but the PLO is specific to oral communication so the results for the **Presenter** criterion should also be reported separately.

**Findings**

Using the dropdown feature below, indicate whether or not the target was met. If no students are enrolled, or if no data are reported, please select the appropriate option from the dropdown menu. Please remember to disaggregate results by program/degree credential and/or by mode of delivery.

**Target:**

Met

**Finding Description:**

During the fall 2020 semester, the cumulative class average was 82% on the assignment that assessed SLO2. Therefore the target was met. This assignment requires the construction students to collaborate with mechanical engineering students, come up with construction approach to the project that the mechanical engineering students are designing, and present their approach to the engineering students for feedback.

Data will be tallied and reported separately for College Station and McAllen students in the future. There were no students in McAllen for this cycle.

**If applicable, provide a brief explanation as to why not data were collected/reported for this measure:**

**Supporting Documentation (Optional):**

Use this feature to upload any documents that further illustrate the findings for this measure.

No document was selected.

**Internal Feedback on Finding**

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



Yes

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

Yes

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

No

**Where appropriate, findings are disaggregated (e.g., by program, by mode of delivery, by geographic location):**

Not Applicable

**Feedback on Finding:**

**Elaborate on the findings statements. Assessment is most useful when the current findings are contextualized in some way, particularly with past findings. Can you identify a trend in the data as far as this outcome is concerned? Is this finding meaningful to the UG committee?**

#### OIEE Feedback on Finding

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

No

**Where appropriate, findings are disaggregated (e.g., by program, by mode of delivery, by geographic location):**

Not Applicable

**Feedback on Finding:**

[Feedback under the first finding applies here as well.](#)



## Data-Informed Actions

For each reported finding, the program should indicate how it is going to use/act on the finding. 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) will lead to improvements in the identified learning outcome. Please remember that although programs are only required to submit one data-informed action that meets all of the review criteria, something must be entered into each data-informed action text box. Please see the [Academic Assessment Guidelines](#) manual for more information.

### Data-Informed Action Description:

The program will continue monitoring student achievement on SLO 2.

#### Internal Feedback on Data-Informed Action

**Course of action described above is designed to improve/strengthen student learning:**

Not Applicable

**Action includes specific implementation details (e.g., timeline, responsible party, etc.):**

Not Applicable

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

Not Applicable

**Feedback on Data-Informed Action:**

#### OIEE Feedback on Data-Informed Action

**Course of action described above is designed to improve/strengthen student learning:**

Not Applicable

**Action includes specific implementation details (e.g., timeline, responsible party, etc.):**

Not Applicable

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

Not Applicable



**Feedback on Data-Informed Action:**

**Measure Name:**

SLO 2 \_ Senior Exit Survey \_ Confidence Level

**Data collection (what data are gathered, how it is gathered, and from/by who):**

As an indirect assessment of the student learning outcomes, an online exit survey will be administered to all COSC students as part of their Capstone course in students last semester of coursework prior to graduation. The exit survey solicits students' opinion 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).

Although there were no McAllen students for this cycle, in the future this same measure will be used.

**Methodology or data analysis strategy:**

For each student learning outcome, the targeted performance criteria will be set at a minimum average score of cumulative student responses of 2.51, indicating students are, at minimum, "confident" in their ability for SLO 2 to create oral presentations appropriate to the construction discipline. The cut points will be: 0 - 1.5 = Not Confident; 1.51 - 2.50 = Somewhat Confident; 2.51 - 3.50 = Confident; and 3.51 - 4.0 = Very Confident.

Data will be tallied and reported separately for College Station and McAllen students in the future. There were no students in McAllen for this cycle.

**Supporting Documentation:**

Select a document artifact attached to this form or add a new document. If uploading a document for the first time, please remember to select it from the dropdown menu below to attach it to this measure.

### Internal Feedback on Measure

**Measure is a direct measure of student learning and clearly aligns with the outcome:**

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):**

Yes

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

Yes

**Feedback on Measure:**

### OIEE Feedback on Measure

**Measure is a direct measure of student learning and clearly aligns with the outcome:**

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

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

Yes

**Feedback on Measure:**

### Targets





The target statement should include (1) a description of the standard (the minimally acceptable student performance) and (2) the proportion of students that are expected to meet the standard.

### Target Description:

For the student learning outcome "*Create oral presentations appropriate to the construction discipline*" 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:**

Yes

**Proportion of students expected to meet the standard is clearly stated:**

Yes

**Target clearly aligns with outcome and measure:**

Yes

**Feedback on Target:**

### OIEE Feedback on Target

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

Yes

**Proportion of students expected to meet the standard is clearly stated:**

Yes

**Target clearly aligns with outcome and measure:**

Yes

**Feedback on Target:**

### Findings



Using the dropdown feature below, indicate whether or not the target was met. If no students are enrolled, or if no data are reported, please select the appropriate option from the dropdown menu. Please remember to disaggregate results by program/degree credential and/or by mode of delivery.

**Target:**

Met

**Finding Description:**

The average score of cumulative student responses for the fall 2020 semester was 3.81, which indicates that students are, at a minimum, "confident" in their ability for SLO 2 to create oral presentations appropriate to the construction discipline.

Data will be tallied and reported separately for College Station and McAllen students in the future. There were no students in McAllen for this cycle.

**If applicable, provide a brief explanation as to why not data were collected/reported for this measure:**

**Supporting Documentation (Optional):**

Use this feature to upload any documents that further illustrate the findings for this measure.

No document was selected.

**Internal Feedback on Finding**

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

No

**Where appropriate, findings are disaggregated (e.g., by program, by mode of delivery, by geographic location):**

Not Applicable



**Feedback on Finding:**

Elaborate on the findings statements. Assessment is most useful when the current findings are contextualized in some way, particularly with past findings. Can you identify a trend in the data as far as this outcome is concerned? Is this finding meaningful to the UG committee?

**OIEE Feedback on Finding**

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

No

**Where appropriate, findings are disaggregated (e.g., by program, by mode of delivery, by geographic location):**

Not Applicable

**Feedback on Finding:**

**Data-Informed Actions**

For each reported finding, the program should indicate how it is going to use/act on the finding. 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) will lead to improvements in the identified learning outcome. Please remember that although programs are only required to submit one data-informed action that meets all of the review criteria, something must be entered into each data-informed action text box. Please see the [Academic Assessment Guidelines](#) manual for more information.

**Data-Informed Action Description:**

In an effort to ensure that all undergraduate students who graduate from the Construction Science program are confident in their ability to create oral presentations appropriate to the

construction discipline, the undergraduate academic affairs committee and faculty will continue to reinforce construction oral presentations in numerous course across the curriculum.

### Internal Feedback on Data-Informed Action

Course of action described above is designed to improve/strengthen student learning:

Not Applicable

Action includes specific implementation details (e.g., timeline, responsible party, etc.):

Not Applicable

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

Not Applicable

Feedback on Data-Informed Action:

### OIEE Feedback on Data-Informed Action

Course of action described above is designed to improve/strengthen student learning:

Not Applicable

Action includes specific implementation details (e.g., timeline, responsible party, etc.):

Not Applicable

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

Not Applicable

Feedback on Data-Informed Action:

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

Create written communications appropriate to the construction discipline

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



## 1 Relevant Associations

Selected Outcomes:

- CORE-WCOMM - Communication skills (Written)
- 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:

### 2 Outcome is measurable:

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

### 4 Feedback on Outcomes:

- CORE-WCOMM - Communication skills (Written)
- TAMU-S-COMM - Communication
- TAMU-UG-COMM - Communicate effectively
- 

## OIEE Feedback on Outcomes

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

### 2 Outcome is measurable:

Yes ▼

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

Yes ▼

4 Feedback on Outcomes:

## Measures

1

**Measure Name:**

SLO 1 \_ Written Communication \_ DA

**Data collection (what data are gathered, how it is gathered, and from/by who):**

Direct assessment will occur for SLO 1 using a combination of assignments (in whole or in part) from COSC 494 (Internship). The assessment instruments will be administered by course instructors in class to students as part of the regular course curriculum.

Although there were no McAllen students for this cycle, in the future this same measure will be used.

**Methodology or data analysis strategy:**

Data reported will be the average performance of all students on the assignment.

Data will be tallied and reported separately for College Station and McAllen students in the future. There were no students in McAllen for this cycle.

**Supporting Documentation:**

Select a document artifact attached to this form or add a new document. If uploading a document for the first time, please remember to select it from the dropdown menu below to attach it to this measure.

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

### Internal Feedback on Measure

**Measure is a direct measure of student learning and clearly aligns with the outcome:**

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):**

Yes

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

Yes

**Feedback on Measure:**

### OIEE Feedback on Measure

**Measure is a direct measure of student learning and clearly aligns with the outcome:**

Yes

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

No

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

No

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

No

**Feedback on Measure:**

[See previous comments on data collection and methodology.](#)

[It would be helpful to see the scoring guidelines \(rubric\).](#)



## Targets

The target statement should include (1) a description of the standard (the minimally acceptable student performance) and (2) the proportion of students that are expected to meet the standard.

### Target Description:

The cumulative class average of student scores for SLO 1 will be a 70% or higher class average score on the assessment instrument.

### Internal Feedback on Target

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

Yes

**Proportion of students expected to meet the standard is clearly stated:**

Yes

**Target clearly aligns with outcome and measure:**

Yes

**Feedback on Target:**

### OIEE Feedback on Target

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

Yes

**Proportion of students expected to meet the standard is clearly stated:**

Yes

**Target clearly aligns with outcome and measure:**

Yes

**Feedback on Target:**

### Findings





Using the dropdown feature below, indicate whether or not the target was met. If no students are enrolled, or if no data are reported, please select the appropriate option from the dropdown menu. Please remember to disaggregate results by program/degree credential and/or by mode of delivery.

**Target:**

Met

**Finding Description:**

During the fall 2020 semester, the cumulative class average was 93% on the assignment that assessed SLO1. Therefore the target was met. Students were responsible for creating memorandums that addressed their internship progress toward specific objectives agreed upon on the students individual internship agreement.

Data will be tallied and reported separately for College Station and McAllen students in the future. There were no students in McAllen for this cycle.

**If applicable, provide a brief explanation as to why not data were collected/reported for this measure:**

**Supporting Documentation (Optional):**

Use this feature to upload any documents that further illustrate the findings for this measure.

No document was selected.

**Internal Feedback on Finding**

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

No

**Where appropriate, findings are disaggregated (e.g., by program, by mode of delivery, by geographic location):**



Not Applicable

**Feedback on Finding:**

Elaborate on the findings statements. Assessment is most useful when the current findings are contextualized in some way, particularly with past findings. Can you identify a trend in the data as far as this outcome is concerned? Is this finding meaningful to the UG committee?

**OIEE Feedback on Finding**

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

No

**Where appropriate, findings are disaggregated (e.g., by program, by mode of delivery, by geographic location):**

Not Applicable

**Feedback on Finding:**

[See comments for other findings.](#)

**Data-Informed Actions**

For each reported finding, the program should indicate how it is going to use/act on the finding. 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) will lead to improvements in the identified learning outcome. Please remember that although programs are only required to submit one data-informed action that meets all of the review criteria, something must be entered into each data-informed action text box. Please see the [Academic Assessment Guidelines](#) manual for more information.

**Data-Informed Action Description:**



The program will continue monitoring student achievement on SLO 1.

### Internal Feedback on Data-Informed Action

**Course of action described above is designed to improve/strengthen student learning:**

Not Applicable

**Action includes specific implementation details (e.g., timeline, responsible party, etc.):**

Not Applicable

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

Not Applicable

**Feedback on Data-Informed Action:**

### OIEE Feedback on Data-Informed Action

**Course of action described above is designed to improve/strengthen student learning:**

Not Applicable

**Action includes specific implementation details (e.g., timeline, responsible party, etc.):**

Not Applicable

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

Not Applicable

**Feedback on Data-Informed Action:**

**Measure Name:**

SLO 1 \_ Senior Exit Survey \_ Confidence Level



**Data collection (what data are gathered, how it is gathered, and from/by who):**

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).

Although there were no McAllen students for this cycle, in the future this same measure will be used.

**Methodology or data analysis strategy:**

For each student learning outcome, the targeted performance criteria will be set at a minimum average score of student responses of 2.51, indicating students are, at minimum, “confident” in their ability to create written communications appropriate to the construction discipline.. The cut points will be: 0 - 1.5 = Not Confident; 1.51 - 2.50 = Somewhat Confident; 2.51 - 3.50 = Confident; and 3.51 - 4.0 = Very Confident.

Data will be tallied and reported separately for College Station and McAllen students in the future. There were no students in McAllen for this cycle.

**Supporting Documentation:**

Select a document artifact attached to this form or add a new document. If uploading a document for the first time, please remember to select it from the dropdown menu below to attach it to this measure.

[Senior Exit Survey Questionnaire \\_ Fall 2018.pdf](#)

**Internal Feedback on Measure**

**Measure is a direct measure of student learning and clearly aligns with the outcome:**

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):**



Yes

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

Yes

**Feedback on Measure:**

### OIEE Feedback on Measure

**Measure is a direct measure of student learning and clearly aligns with the outcome:**

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

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

Yes

**Feedback on Measure:**

### Targets

The target statement should include (1) a description of the standard (the minimally acceptable student performance) and (2) the proportion of students that are expected to meet the standard.

#### Target Description:

For the student learning outcome "Create written communications appropriate to the construction discipline" 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 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:**

Yes



**Proportion of students expected to meet the standard is clearly stated:**

Yes

**Target clearly aligns with outcome and measure:**

Yes

**Feedback on Target:**

### OIEE Feedback on Target

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

Yes

**Proportion of students expected to meet the standard is clearly stated:**

Yes

**Target clearly aligns with outcome and measure:**

Yes

**Feedback on Target:**

### Findings

Using the dropdown feature below, indicate whether or not the target was met. If no students are enrolled, or if no data are reported, please select the appropriate option from the dropdown menu. Please remember to disaggregate results by program/degree credential and/or by mode of delivery.

**Target:**

Met

**Finding Description:**

The average score of cumulative student responses for the fall 2020 semester was 3.41, which indicates that students are, at a minimum, "confident" in their ability for SLO 1 to create written communications appropriate to the construction discipline presentations appropriate to the construction discipline.

Data will be tallied and reported separately for College Station and McAllen students in the future. There were no students in McAllen for this cycle.



If applicable, provide a brief explanation as to why not data were collected/reported for this measure:

**Supporting Documentation (Optional):**

Use this feature to upload any documents that further illustrate the findings for this measure.

No document was selected.

**Internal Feedback on Finding**

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

No

**Where appropriate, findings are disaggregated (e.g., by program, by mode of delivery, by geographic location):**

Not Applicable

**Feedback on Finding:**

Elaborate on the findings statements. Assessment is most useful when the current findings are contextualized in some way, particularly with past findings. Can you identify a trend in the data as far as this outcome is concerned? Is this finding meaningful to the UG committee?

**OIEE Feedback on Finding**

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

No

**Where appropriate, findings are disaggregated (e.g., by program, by mode of delivery, by geographic location):**

Not Applicable

**Feedback on Finding:**

## Data-Informed Actions

For each reported finding, the program should indicate how it is going to use/act on the finding. 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) will lead to improvements in the identified learning outcome. Please remember that although programs are only required to submit one data-informed action that meets all of the review criteria, something must be entered into each data-informed action text box. Please see the [Academic Assessment Guidelines](#) manual for more information.

### Data-Informed Action Description:

In an effort to ensure that all undergraduate students who graduate from the Construction Science program are confident in their ability to create written communication appropriate to the construction discipline, the undergraduate academic affairs committee and faculty will continue to reinforce construction written communication in numerous courses across the curriculum.

### Internal Feedback on Data-Informed Action

**Course of action described above is designed to improve/strengthen student learning:**

Not Applicable

**Action includes specific implementation details (e.g., timeline, responsible party, etc.):**

Not Applicable

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

Not Applicable





**Feedback on Data-Informed Action:**

**OIEE Feedback on Data-Informed Action**

**Course of action described above is designed to improve/strengthen student learning:**

Not Applicable

**Action includes specific implementation details (e.g., timeline, responsible party, etc.):**

Not Applicable

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

Not Applicable

**Feedback on Data-Informed Action:**

## Department Approver Comments

### 1 Department Approver Overall Feedback

- The most frequent comment was to elaborate on the findings for improving student learning outcomes. I recommend being concise, but also showing a summary of the onward trajectory of continuous improvement conducted by the UG curriculum committee. This group is tireless and caring in their evaluation and synchronicity for improving our courses.

CLOSE AND EXIT