

CORE ASSESSMENT REPORT TWU 2019-20

OBJECTIVES: EMPIRICAL & QUANTITATIVE SKILLS AND TEAMWORK

SUMMARY

Note: Due to Covid-19 pandemic spread in Spring 2020, we only sampled and rated artifacts from Fall term of this academic year. TWU, in accordance with Texas state directives, closed after spring break, and pivoted to an online form of teaching. Faculty were asked to change teaching modalities, assignments, and more to help accommodate students, resulting in large shifts in assigned work and student preparation to complete work. Artifacts submitted this semester would have been outliers, resulting in inaccurate intervention suggestions.

- Communications (Teamwork only)
- Mathematics (Empirical & Quantitative Skills only)
- Life & Physical Sciences (both Teamwork and Empirical & Quantitative Skills)
- Creative Arts (Teamwork only)
- Social & Behavioral Sciences (Empirical & Quantitative Skills only)

The objectives assessed in 2019-20 are defined by THECB as follows:

- **Empirical & Quantitative Skills (EQS)** - to include the manipulation and analysis of numerical data or observable facts resulting in formed conclusions;
- **Teamwork (TW)** - to include the ability to consider different points of view and to work effectively with others to support a shared purpose or goal.

Facets of each objective are captured through suites of narrower criteria. The objective of *Empirical & Quantitative Skills*, for instance, includes the criteria of Data Representation and Calculation. *Teamwork* includes Fosters Constructive Team Climate and Perspective Taking. These criteria are assessed by volunteer raters in organized sessions, who employ a modified VALUE rubric on a three-point scale, with a 1 representing an unmet standard, a 2 indicating a mixed or partial success, and a 3 indicating clear success. Our currently published goal is that 65% of students will meet at least level 2 for any criterion.

For *Empirical & Quantitative Skills*, 76.37% of students met that criterion for success.

- Regardless of student grade level, students did well on the objective, with results exceeding the 65% benchmark each year. Juniors did especially well, meeting the criteria at an 80% level.
- Both first-time-in-college (FTIC) and transfer student populations came in above goal, with 73.17% and 81.85% meeting the criteria for success. Similarly, full-time (75.94%) and part-time (78.53%) students showed strong mastery of the objective.
- Among *Empirical & Quantitative Skills* two criteria showed unusually high levels of student mastery: Evaluate Potential Solutions (89.80%) and Evidence Analysis (89.83%).
- We noted that Data Representation (89.23%) showed a very high level of mastery, but it was not one of the highly selected criteria.
- Data Interpretation (62.39%) stood out as the criteria with the lowest level of mastery, especially when compared to the overall success level for the objective. This was also the more often selected criteria by

faculty, and so looking at scaffolding and assignment design for this criteria would help assure the results are student mastery and not assignment design.

For *Teamwork*, 87.31% met the criterion for success.

- All grade levels from first-year to senior far surpassed the 65% benchmark for the *Teamwork* objective, with seniors scoring the lowest at 77.14% and the sophomores scoring highest at 92.26%.
- Again, both first-time-in-college (FTIC) and transfer student populations came in well above goal, and both full-time and part-time students did so, too.
- Among *Teamwork* criteria that were often rated and tended to have more robust reliability, the following criteria stood out as noteworthy strengths: Clarity of Peer Review (88.95%), Constructive Framing of Peer Review (87.42%), Fosters Constructive Team Climate (97.56%).
- **Teamwork** had a high number of criteria selected by faculty, but several criteria were rated very few times. For instance, Responds to Intercultural Experiences with Empathy received only four ratings and Follows Directions of Conductor, Captain, or Director had only three ratings submitted.
- Many *Teamwork* criteria were unratable in artifacts submitted by faculty. Raters must be able to see team member interactions directly or else assess 360-degree reflections or 360-degree peer reviews collected after group activities. For example anonymous peer reviews are ideal for this purpose, though not all faculty are able to submit these. Therefore, many of these criteria must be marked N/A. “N/A” ratings are higher for *Teamwork* than other objective assessed since our pilot. It is important to recognize that percentages in the above cases may skew high both because so many of these assessments are mediated by the perspectives of students writing about their experiences and because there may be a selection-bias effect when it comes to the kind of faculty who will think carefully, or talk to the assessment office beforehand, about what kind of assessment artifacts would be measurable in rating. While this is improving each year, instructor rotation can inflate the number of unratable artifacts in this area as new faculty teach in the core.
- Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks (33.33%) stood out as a relative weakness in this year. This objective had only 34 ratings recorded.
- We continue to believe that successful teamwork is strengthened by the improvement of student mastery in other objectives. For example, *Communication* (to explain oneself to others and comprehend their ideas), *Critical Thinking* (to process conflicting points of view within the team), *Personal Responsibility* (to set and meet obligations and timetables), and *Social Responsibility* (to consider broader contexts and societal impacts stemming from or influencing the group’s decisions) contribute to higher success and student satisfaction with collaborative endeavors. To the extent that we can improve student learning in the other areas, we believe we see improve in teamwork skills as well, perhaps explaining some of the high mastery scores.

CONTENTS

Summary.....	1
Recommendations.....	3
Interventions	4
Participants.....	5
Students.....	5
Participating Faculty	6

Core-Academy Raters	7
Tables of Results	7
Results by Student Classification	7
Results by Criterion.....	8
Results by College and Component Area.....	10
Comparisons with 2016-17	11
Reliability and Benchmark Criteria	11
Comparing Benchmark Criteria between 2015-16 and 2018-19	12
Contact Information	13

RECOMMENDATIONS

New recommendations will appear near the top of these lists in each report. Recommendations from previous reports may reappear later because they bear repeating or for the benefit of those new to the core community.

Foster academic integrity. When students take short cuts on readings and assignments, [they may miss out on the learning experiences faculty planned for them](#). Ensuring honest engagement may, conversely, [improve learning](#). Both of the resources just linked have suggestions for improving academic integrity without acting like police.

Set appropriate challenge levels. A heavy cognitive load impairs performance on all criteria, not just the one under stress. Give students a difficult analytical challenge and their grammar will suffer, too. We saw this sort of thing a lot in the assessed artifacts. First-year composition asked students to do something difficult: analyze two articles with competing opinions and make an argument for what value or principle was most driving the authors apart. A student’s organization scores for such an assignment will be lower than they would be for a class in which they were simply asked to summarize a textbook chapter, wherein the structure is already partly baked in. In some cases, a challenge may have been set too high. We saw several assignments that asked students to summarize, or in some cases even evaluate the methodology of, scientific articles from journals like *Nature*. Often students responded to this challenge by plagiarizing or patch-writing what the article said, a response well-predicted by [research on plagiarism](#). Conversely, too low a bar keeps students from improving. The ideal learning situation tends to be [challenging but scaffolded](#) in such a way that students can navigate through it with the help provided by the scaffolding. One way to do this is to break up a challenging task into discrete steps. Our raters were impressed with the Social Action Project assignment created for one of the Women’s Studies core courses (WS 2013). Students are asked to analyze a social problem and recommend a research-supported social action that might effect change, neither of which are easy. But the assignment has a common template, a form broken up into specific tasks and questions, and these walk students through the process of responding to the challenge.

Emphasize foundational criteria. It’s difficult to explain something without first comprehending it. It’s difficult to develop content that hasn’t been sufficiently researched or analyzed. Which is to say, some of the criteria on our rubric may be more deserving of emphasis than others, simply because growth in those areas is likely to have trickle-out effects to other criteria. Comprehension is one such criterion for *Communication*. Evidence Analysis is one for *Critical Thinking*.

Build background knowledge. [Research in educational psychology](#) emphasizes the critical relationship between background knowledge and reading comprehension, critical thinking, and evaluation. What you already know determines to large extent what you are ready to understand. Background knowledge not only includes specialized terminology or statistical concepts but also easy-to-overlook elements like the organizational structure of a typical peer-reviewed scientific article. (Students without this knowledge often misinterpret the opening literature review as a thesis-bearing introduction and will report as findings what was meant to be historical background.)

Take advantage of the “teaching effect” to build student background knowledge. Most faculty have experienced the phenomenon in which, by teaching a subject, they learn it better than they ever would have understood it if they had spent that same time continuing to study as a student. [Students experience this, too.](#) By giving students more opportunities to explain content, faculty can take advantage of this effect. One powerful method for encouraging student explanations is [Writing to Learn](#): short, informal written tasks, performed in-class or in preparation for class, which instead of being graded or commented on are instead, more often, used during group or class activities and perhaps recorded as credit/no-credit. (Writing to Learn combines powerfully with [Team-Based Learning](#) in-class activities.)

Make assignment expectations clear in written instructions. Even if expectations are transmitted orally, they should also be communicated in writing for reference. Assignments for which such information was scant often had weaker student performances.

Volunteer to rate artifacts. Many of the above observations stem from discussions that bloomed during rating sessions. Faculty participants often came away from their rating experiences with new ideas for assignments or plans to revise assignments. It is one thing to see how your own students react to your own course, and quite another to see how many students respond to many different kinds of requests. You get a sense of what all students seem to struggle with, and of what kinds of work students are capable of when they’re challenged but have the right kind of scaffolding.

INTERVENTIONS

Following the conclusion of our first three-year cycle, we started several small-scale interventions to improve scores, enumerated here.

1. Emphasizing **Writing across the Curriculum** and **Writing to Learn**
 - a. *Overall Strategy.* In an effort to improve core criteria in the Communication and Critical Thinking objectives primarily, but also in hopes of spillover effects to other kinds of learning, we have initiated several actions related to the concept of writing-to-learn. (See the “teaching effect” tip under Recommendations, above.)
 - b. *Book Distribution.* We distributed copies of John C. Bean’s landmark handbook on writing-to-learn instruction, *Engaging Ideas* (second edition) to all 194 faculty teaching core classes in Fall 2017, along with [a letter describing how its guidance can help faculty assign more high-impact writing activities without becoming overwhelmed by grading](#). We also distributed copies of the above books to members of the Undergraduate Council assessment committee.
 - c. *Reading and Writing across the Core criteria.* The Undergraduate Council’s assessment committee, with approval by the Undergraduate Council at large, identified twelve criteria on the core rubrics to serve as Reading and Writing across the Core criteria. These twelve now appear [at the tops of our core rubrics](#), and each is cross-listed in multiple assessment years. For instance, Evidence Analysis appears under both Critical Thinking and Empirical & Quantitative Skills. The

idea behind this cross-listing is to encourage greater emphasis on these criteria and to collect more data on student achievement with regard to them.

- d. *Writing Fellowships*. The assistant director of academic assessment's primary area of specialization outside of assessment is the teaching of writing across the curriculum. As such, he has launched a stipend-supported series of mentorships of core curriculum faculty interested in redesigning key assignments to provide students with better writing experiences while maintaining a grading workload that is reasonable. The initiative had five fellows in Summer 2018 and another six in Spring 2019. Participants have included coordinators for some of the largest programs in the core, including the First-Year Composition program and the First-Year (UNIV 1231) Seminars. For the AY 2018-19 year, students of fellows significantly outperformed students of non-fellow faculty on benchmark criteria associated with the *Communication* and *Critical Thinking* ($p < .001$, with a small effect size of $d = .30$). Fellowships have been placed on hold due to the pandemic and the budget crisis, but we hope to reinstate them as soon as feasible.
2. Renewing commitment to academic integrity.
 - a. TWU [research](#) suggests there is truth to the frequent admonishment by faculty that learners who cheat only cheat their own learning.
 - b. Accordingly, we have begun conversations with stakeholders across campus to study the state of academic integrity here, and revise or improve policies based on integrity research. As shown by the work of researchers like Don McCabe, the most powerful transformations occur when students drive integrity culture instead of responding to it. Accordingly, an ideal long-term goal here is to generate student interest in, not just a student honor code, but in the kind of culture that would support and value one.

PARTICIPANTS

The subsections below shed light on the range of participants, in terms of assessed students, submitting faculty, and core-academy raters.

STUDENTS

For AY 2019-20, students to assess were selected by Institutional Research and Data Management through a stratified random sample of face-to-face students in main-campus core curriculum courses, with the sample sizes calculated so as to produce a margin of error of 5%.

- Female: 90.55%, Male: 9.45%
- FTIC: 65.76%, Transfer: 28.47%, Dual Credit 5.77%
- Full-Time: 84.35%, Part-Time: 15.65%

Student Classification	Percentage
First-Year	41.30%
Sophomore	31.49%
Junior	18.70%
Senior	7.63%
Post-baccalaureate	0.88%
Grand Total	100.00%

Student Ethnicity	Percentage
American Indian or Alaska Native, non-Hispanic	0.49%
Asian, non-Hispanic	12.77%
Black, non-Hispanic	23.48%
Hispanic/Latino	32.07%
International	0.99%
White, non-Hispanic	30.20%
Grand Total	100.00%

Student College	Percentage
Arts and Sciences	24.81%
Business	4.48%
General	6.32%
Health Sciences	17.81%
Nursing	43.31%
Professional Education	3.27%
Grand Total	100.00%

PARTICIPATING FACULTY

Core faculty tend to come from the College of Arts and Sciences. Of faculty teaching the core during the academic year in question, 80.15% held doctoral degrees or equivalents. Faculty teaching core classes in the natural sciences often hold doctoral degrees. The remainder of core faculty comprise mostly adjunct faculty and (particularly for first-year composition) graduate teaching assistants.

Faculty Department	Percentage
Biology	50.66%
Business and Economics	0.66%
Chemistry and Physics	24.24%
Dance	2.11%
English, Speech, and Foreign Language	10.90%
Mathematics and Computer Science	5.05%
Psychology and Philosophy	4.45%
Sociology and Social Work	0.33%
Visual Arts	0.82%
Women's Studies	0.77%
Grand Total	100.00%

CORE-ACADEMY RATERS

Our volunteer rater pool comprised 52.88% full-time faculty, 43.93% staff, and 3.19% guest raters.

Raters	Percentage
Faculty	52.88%
Guest	3.19%
Staff	43.93%
Grand Total	100.00%

TABLES OF RESULTS

Rates of success generally increased as students progressed through grade ranks, from first-year to junior, before dipping slightly at the senior level.

RESULTS BY STUDENT CLASSIFICATION

CORE OBJECTIVE Student Start Term		MEETS STANDARD	
		No	Yes
Empirical/Quantitative	23.70%	76.30%	
FR	23.85%	76.15%	
SO	25.41%	74.59%	
JR	20.00%	80.00%	
SR	25.58%	74.42%	
Teamwork	12.69%	87.31%	
FR	14.14%	85.86%	
SO	7.74%	92.26%	
JR	11.56%	88.44%	
SR	22.86%	77.14%	
Grand Total	19.38%	80.62%	

RESULTS BY FULL-TIME OR PART-TIME STATUS		
Objective Class Load	MEETS STANDARD	
	No	Yes
Empirical/Quantitative	23.63%	76.37%
Full Time	24.06%	75.94%
Part Time	21.47%	78.53%
Teamwork	12.69%	87.31%
Full Time	12.97%	87.03%

Part Time	10.75%	89.25%
Grand Total	19.37%	80.63%

RESULTS BY FIRST-TIME IN COLLEGE OR TRANSFER STATUS		
Objective	MEETS STANDARD	
	No	Yes
Admission Status		
Empirical/Quantitative	23.63%	76.37%
FTIC	26.83%	73.17%
Dual Credit	12.90%	87.10%
TRNS	18.15%	81.85%
Teamwork	12.69%	87.31%
FTIC	13.96%	86.04%
Dual Credit	14.89%	85.11%
TRNS	7.98%	92.02%
Grand Total	19.37%	80.63%

RESULTS BY CRITERION

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MEETING STANDARD BY CRITERION		
Objective	MEETS STANDARD	
	No	Yes
Criteria		
Empirical/Quantitative	23.63%	76.37%
Application / Analysis	23.27%	76.73%
Assumptions	33.33%	66.67%
Calculation	26.09%	73.91%
Data Interpretation	37.61%	62.39%
Data Representation	10.77%	89.23%
Define Problem	14.29%	85.71%
Evaluate Potential Solutions	10.20%	89.80%
Evidence Analysis	10.17%	89.83%
Propose Solutions/Hypotheses	34.38%	65.63%
Textual Analysis	13.95%	86.05%
Teamwork	12.69%	87.31%
Apply Criteria through Peer Review	23.61%	76.39%
Clarity of Peer Review	11.05%	88.95%
Constructive Framing of Peer Review	12.58%	87.42%
Contributes to Team Meetings	15.48%	84.52%

Contribution to a Cohesive Team Thesis	0.00%	100.00%
Cultural self-awareness	100.00%	0.00%
Facilitates the Contributions of Team Members	11.67%	88.33%
Fosters Constructive Team Climate	2.44%	97.56%
Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks	66.67%	33.33%
Responds to Conflict	6.67%	93.33%
Stage of Group Development	0.00%	100.00%
Supports Team When Not Speaking	0.00%	100.00%
Transitions from and to Teammates	0.00%	100.00%
Grand Total	19.37%	80.63%

FREQUENCY OF CRITERIA SELECTION BY PARTICIPATING FACULTY

Objective	
Criteria	Number of Ratings
Empirical/Quantitative	1740
Application / Analysis	269
Assumptions	106
Calculation	243
Data Interpretation	320
Data Representation	75
Define Problem	130
Evaluate Outcomes of Attempted Solutions	41
Evaluate Potential Solutions	60
Evidence Analysis	279
Propose Solutions/Hypotheses	118
Textual Analysis	99
Teamwork	1902
Apply Criteria through Peer Review	264
Clarity of Peer Review	275
Constructive Framing of Peer Review	279
Contributes to Team Meetings	205
Contribution to a Cohesive Team Thesis	54
Cultural self-awareness	6
Facilitates the Contributions of Team Members	177
Follows Directions of Conductor, Captain, or Director	3
Fosters Constructive Team Climate	209
Handles or Sets-Up Shared Property	13
Individual Contributions Outside of Team Meetings	85

Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks	34
Limitations and Implications	6
Perspective Taking	22
Responds to Conflict	148
Responds to Director Feedback	55
Responds to Intercultural Experiences with Empathy	4
Stage of Group Development	26
Supports Team When Not Speaking	11
Transitions from and to Teammates	26
Grand Total	3642

RESULTS BY COLLEGE AND COMPONENT AREA

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MEETING CRITERION FOR SUCCESS, BY COLLEGE			
CORE OBJECTIVE		MEETS STANDARD	
		No	Yes
College			
Empirical/Quantitative	23.63%		76.37%
Arts and Sciences	19.43%		80.57%
Business	14.00%		86.00%
General	12.90%		87.10%
Health Sciences	21.98%		78.02%
Nursing	28.20%		71.80%
Professional Education	6.90%		93.10%
Teamwork	12.74%		87.26%
Arts and Sciences	15.00%		85.00%
Business	13.33%		86.67%
General	16.33%		83.67%
Health Sciences	13.91%		86.09%
Nursing	11.64%		88.36%
Professional Education	5.00%		95.00%
Grand Total	19.40%		80.60%

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MEETING CRITERION FOR SUCCESS, BY FOUNDATIONAL COMPONENT AREA OF THE CORE CURRICULUM			
CORE OBJECTIVE		MEETS STANDARD	
		No	Yes
Foundational Component Area			

Empirical/Quantitative	23.63%	76.37%
Life & Physical Sciences	24.47%	75.53%
Mathematics	15.24%	84.76%
Social & Behavioral Sciences	28.37%	71.63%
Teamwork	12.69%	87.31%
Communications	18.18%	81.82%
Creative Arts	14.47%	85.53%
Life & Physical Sciences	9.16%	90.84%
Grand Total	19.37%	80.63%

COMPARISONS WITH 2016-17

The 2019-20 academic year marks the first time that the core objectives of *Teamwork* and *Empirical & Quantitative Skills* have been measured a second time, the last having been 2016-17. It may be fruitful to compare the academic years in question. However, reliability issues can render differences elusive to detection, and assessment rating conditions are, by necessity, nothing like controlled research conditions. Fortunately, we have several years' worth of rating data to analyze for rater reliability. Before we get to the comparison, then, we would like to take a small detour to talk about reliability and how we have arrived at what we are calling *Benchmark Criteria*.

RELIABILITY AND BENCHMARK CRITERIA

For these analyses, we have used [Inter-Rater Facets](#) (IRF), a tool developed by assessment expert David Eubanks, which we think is among the most useful and robust tools for reliability in assessment situations. IRF identifies not only general indicators of agreement, but also offers insights into where rater agreement breaks down. For instance, IRF tells us that for the criterion of Evaluate Potential Solutions, rater differentiation between level 2 and level 3 performance is good ($p = .09$), but that differentiation between levels 1 and 2 tends to be highly unreliable ($p = .88$). We are leaving such criteria on the menu for faculty to choose and raters to rate because perhaps with better training or adjustments to the language, we can improve that reliability. (Evaluate Potential Solutions used to be called Evaluate Solutions, for instance. Both faculty and raters sometimes assumed it was referring to solutions already attempted by the student or someone else. But the descriptors focus on the evaluation of proposed ideas, actions not yet carried out. So we have renamed it in the hopes of improving its reliability.)

As a general rule, the more frequently raters discuss and apply criteria, the more consistent their ratings will be with other raters. Other factors can also affect reliability, including ambiguity in performance level descriptions or unclear criteria names. While we have been fine-tuning the language and naming of criteria based on such analyses, we have also developed a "short list" of selected criteria, what we might call *Benchmark Criteria*, which tend to be more reliable than most of the others. A criterion can be reliable on, essentially, three axes: 1 vs 2, 1 vs 3, and 2 vs 3. We have designated criteria as benchmarks if they meet either of the following conditions: 1) $p < .1$ on two or more axes, and no worse than $p < .5$ on the worst axis; or 2) $p < .3$ on all axes. More statistically minded readers will recognize that these are not research-level standards. However, assessment does not take place under research conditions. We have a wide range of assignments, a wide range of student classifications, and more than sixty total criteria, with assignments differing on which criteria apply. Although quite a few of our benchmark criteria achieve research-level p values on two or more axes (in some cases all three), our primary goal in

developing this list is to cut out the noise of criteria that have proven quite unreliable, at least until we can get better at rating them.

COMPARING BENCHMARK CRITERIA BETWEEN 2015-16 AND 2018-19

Benchmark criteria associated with *Empirical & Quantitative Skills* saw uniform increases, with sizable improvements in frequently selected criteria like Application / Analysis, Define Problem, Evidence Analysis, and Propose Solutions. None of the benchmark criteria in *Empirical & Quantitative Skills* experienced a decline. For *Teamwork*, results were much more mixed. While students improved at applying criteria during peer review, they appeared to worsen on several activities more directly associated with collaborative moments, including Contributes to Team Meetings and Facilitates the Contributions of Team Members. While this might be a meaningful decline, it may also represent an improvement in the grounding of student reflections about their team experiences, which during our first year of *Teamwork* assessments tended to be very forgiving toward peers. We have encouraged some best practices including 360-degree team evaluations, more objective questions (like how many meetings were attended by a peer, of those held), and anonymous peer reviews, which tended to result in more critical insights and thus lower scores. We suspect what we are looking at with the 2019-20 *Teamwork* data is a reset which may in later years appear to be the real starting point for tracking improvements.

Objective / Year / Criterion	RATINGS			
	No		Yes	
	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count
Empirical/Quantitative	31.33%	767	68.67%	1,681
Application / Analysis	28.69%	206	71.31%	512
2016-17	30.81%	159	69.19%	357
2019-20	23.27%	47	76.73%	155
Data Interpretation	39.51%	307	60.49%	470
2016-17	40.25%	225	59.75%	334
2019-20	37.61%	82	62.39%	136
Define Problem	31.87%	29	68.13%	62
2016-17	35.06%	27	64.94%	50
2019-20	14.29%	2	85.71%	12
Evidence Analysis	18.35%	111	81.65%	494
2016-17	23.58%	87	76.42%	282
2019-20	10.17%	24	89.83%	212
Propose Solutions/Hypotheses	44.36%	114	55.64%	143
2016-17	50.31%	81	49.69%	80
2019-20	34.38%	33	65.63%	63
Teamwork	11.71%	250	88.29%	1,885

Apply Criteria through Peer Review	35.45%	95	64.55%	173
2016-17	39.80%	78	60.20%	118
2019-20	23.61%	17	76.39%	55
Contributes to Team Meetings	9.65%	52	90.35%	487
2016-17	8.57%	39	91.43%	416
2019-20	15.48%	13	84.52%	71
Facilitates the Contributions of Team Members	7.05%	28	92.95%	369
2016-17	6.23%	21	93.77%	316
2019-20	11.67%	7	88.33%	53
Fosters Constructive Team Climate	5.78%	31	94.22%	505
2016-17	6.39%	29	93.61%	425
2019-20	2.44%	2	97.56%	80
Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks	46.88%	15	53.13%	17
2016-17	42.31%	11	57.69%	15
2019-20	66.67%	4	33.33%	2
Responds to Conflict	7.99%	29	92.01%	334
2016-17	8.25%	25	91.75%	278
2019-20	6.67%	4	93.33%	56
Grand Total	22.19%	1,017	77.81%	3,566

CONTACT INFORMATION

For more information about core assessment results, consult on assignment design for assessments, or learn more about joining our volunteer community of raters, Core Rater Academy, please contact Dr. Gray Scott, assistant professor of English and assistant director of academic assessment, at grayscott@twu.edu or (940) 898-2327.