

# Student Achievement 2015

---

## **Mission**

As a member of The Texas A&M University System, Texas A&M University-Texarkana is a comprehensive regional University that provides students with academically challenging, engaging, and rewarding educational experiences through quality teaching, scholarship, student support services, co-curricular programming, research, and service. Through the personal attention of our faculty and staff, students are afforded the opportunity to acquire the knowledge, abilities, and skills to become leaders in their chosen profession and to prepare for the opportunities of serving in a global environment.

Texas A&M-Texarkana documents successful student achievement by monitoring broad measures such as student enrollment, persistence rate, number of degrees awarded, and graduation rates.

The institution also monitors measures specific to its mission as follows:

- **Academically challenging, engaging, and rewarding educational experiences.**
- **Personal attention of our faculty and staff** is monitored by the faculty-student ratio.
- **Opportunity to acquire the knowledge, abilities, and skills** is monitored through assessment of discipline-specific knowledge, licensing and certification pass rates and assessment of its Core Curriculum.

## **Goal #1 Students will complete degree programs.**

### **Number of degrees conferred**

*Stretch Goal 700 degrees by 2020*

<b>2009-10</b>	<b>U 326</b>	<b>G 208</b>	<b>Total 534</b>
<b>2010-11</b>	<b>U 335</b>	<b>G 164</b>	<b>Total 499</b>
<b>2011-12</b>	<b>U 376</b>	<b>G 121</b>	<b>Total 497</b>
<b>2012-13</b>	<b>U 334</b>	<b>G 188</b>	<b>Total 522</b>
<b>2013-14</b>	<b>U 350</b>	<b>G 145</b>	<b>Total 495</b>
<b>2014-15</b>	<b>U 346</b>	<b>G 143</b>	<b>Total 489</b>

*\*Source: CBM 009*

**% Bachelor's degrees awarded to at-risk students 72.0%**

*\*Source: THECB 2015 Almanac*

**Average time to degree completion 5.7 years**

*\*Source: THECB 2015 Almanac*

## Student Success

### Overall FTIC Persistence Rate

*Stretch Goal 70%*

<b>Fall 2010</b>	44%
<b>Fall 2011</b>	42%
<b>Fall 2012</b>	44%
<b>Fall 2013</b>	55%
<b>Fall 2014</b>	52%

*\*Source: Legislative Budget Board (LBB)*

### Overall Four-Year Graduation Rate

*Stretch Goal 40%*

<b>2014</b>	16.84%
<b>2015</b>	18.48%

*\*Source: Legislative Budget Board (LBB)*

### First year Persistence Rate for full-time, transfer students

*Stretch Goal 90%*

<b>2015</b>	70.17%
-------------	--------

*\*Source: Legislative Budget Board (LBB)*

### Four-Year Graduation Rate for full-time, transfer students

*Stretch Goal 85%*

<b>2015</b>	61.64%
-------------	--------

*\*Source: Institutional Data Management*

## Graduation Plans

**Baccalaureate graduates employed and/or enrolled in grad or professional school in Texas 75.1%**

*\*Source: Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board*

## Goal #2 Students will achieve academically and participate in engaging educational experiences.

### NSSE data

	<b>TAMU-T</b>	<b>National Avg.</b>
<b>% of seniors who report at least 1 service-learning exp.</b>	60%	61%
<b>% of seniors who report participating in internship or field experience</b>	21%	51%
<b>% of seniors who report participating in international/study abroad experience</b>	5%	15%
<b>% of seniors who report participating in research experience with faculty</b>	19%	25%

*\*Source: NSSE 2015 High-Impact Practices*

**Goal #3 Students will receive personal attention from faculty and staff.**

**Student/Faculty Ratio, Class Sizes**

<b>Fall 2015</b>	<b>TAMU-T</b>	<b>State Average</b>
<b>Undergraduate Classes with &lt;20 students</b>	57.50%	30.8%
<b>Undergraduate Classes with &gt;50 Students</b>	1.70%	15%

**Fall 2014**

<b>Student/Faculty Ratio</b>	15:1	22:1
------------------------------	------	------

*\*Source THECB Accountability System*

**NSSE satisfaction data for faculty-student interaction**

	<b>TAMU-T</b>	<b>National Avg.</b>
<b>% of seniors who report interaction with faculty</b>	23.3%	24%
<b>% of seniors who report effective teaching practices</b>	42%	40.8%
<b>% of seniors reporting at least 1 high-impact practice</b>	76%	86%
<b>% of seniors reporting at least 2 high-impact practices</b>	44%	62%

*\*Source: NSSE 2015*

**Graduating Student Survey**

<b>Name of staff unit or service</b>	<b>Percentage of students indicating that they are either “satisfied” or “very satisfied” overall with the services provided by this staff unit</b>
<b>Admissions process</b>	95.8%
<b>Financial aid</b>	95.2%
<b>Veteran Services</b>	100%
<b>Registrar’s Office</b>	95.8%
<b>Business Office</b>	95.8%
<b>Academic Advising and Student Success</b>	93.3%
<b>Student Life</b>	100%
<b>RecSports</b>	100%
<b>University Counseling</b>	100%
<b>Career Services</b>	100%
<b>Library</b>	100%
<b>Campus Safety</b>	100%
<b>OVERALL PERCENTAGE</b>	<b>97.8%</b>

*\*Source: GSS Fall 2015*

## Student Satisfaction Survey

Percentage of students who “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that each staff unit or service could be characterized by the following positive features:							
Name of staff unit or service	Adequate hours of operation	Reasonable waiting time	Knowledgeable	Correct, helpful information	Kind, caring, thorough	Clear policies and procedures	Online information
Enrollment Services	85.5%	80.0%	91.7%	91.0%	92.4%	--	--
Veteran Services	95.0%	100.0%	100.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%	80.0%
Student Life	81.6%	83.5%	85.4%	82.5%	86.4%	81.6%	--
Academic Advising and Student Success	83.7%	81.3%	79.7%	80.5%	85.4%	85.4%	--
Library	92.3%	--	87.3%	90.8%	85.2%	89.4%	86.6%
Business Office	85.4%	88.3%	87.6%	89.8%	89.1%	83.2%	79.6%
Grounds and Maintenance	--	--	74.0%	71.0%	--	--	--
Information Technology	88.4%	--	83.7%	76.8%	81.4%	86.0%	79.1%
Eagle Central Bookstore	78.4%	86.9%	85.2%	90.3%	87.5%	83.0%	--
University Police	73.9%	--	--	79.0%	80.7%	80.7%	60.1%
Dining Services	79.1%	--	--	--	88.4%	--	--
<b>OVERALL PERCENTAGES</b>	<b>84.3%</b>	<b>86.7%</b>	<b>86.1%</b>	<b>84.7%</b>	<b>87.2%</b>	<b>85.5%</b>	<b>77.1%</b>

\*Source: SSS, Spring 2015

**Goal #4 Students will acquire the knowledge, abilities, and skills they need to become leaders in their chosen professions and serve in their communities.**

### Texas A&M System Objective Assessment

For the 2014-2015 academic school year, Texas A&M University-Texarkana collected sources of direct assessments (e.g., course-embedded assessments and academic program outcome assessments) and indirect assessments (e.g., Graduating Student Survey, or GSS; and the National Survey of Student Engagement, or NSSE) to assess Ethical Decision-Making & Social Responsibility and Globalization and Cultural Diversity.

Results for Ethical Decision-Making and Social Responsibility can be found in Table 1:

**Table 1: Results for Ethical Decision-Making and Social Responsibility Assessment**

Assessment Method	Results: 2015	Analysis	Action	Comments
<p>Assessment of Ethical Decision-Making &amp; Social Responsibility at TAMU-T currently includes: (a) course-embedded assessments of student artifacts using the Ethical Reasoning LEAP VALUE rubric; (b) results from Outcomes Assessment for program learning outcomes in undergraduate majors that aligned with Ethical Decision-Making &amp; Social Responsibility; (c) results from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) on items aligned with Ethical Decision-Making &amp; Social Responsibility; and (d) results from our Graduating Student Survey (GSS) on items aligned with Ethical Decision-Making &amp; Social Responsibility.</p>	<p>Results of course-embedded assessments revealed mean scores ranging from 1.19 to 1.57 on all rubric criteria. Results from discipline-specific outcomes assessment showed students met or exceeded standards set by the programs. For the NSSE, 67% of students indicated that TAMU-T contributed "Very Much" or "Quite a Bit" towards their ability to understand people of other backgrounds, in addition to 70% of students on an item focused on the development of a personal code of values and ethics. Results from the GSS indicated that the percentage of students who Agreed or Strongly Agreed that TAMU-T contributed to their development on various competencies was: (a) 76.4% on an item aligned with understanding multiple cultural perspectives; and (b) 88.2% on an item aligned with understanding social and ethical challenges.</p>	<p>Overall, these results indicate that student performance is sufficient at TAMU-T. For the direct assessment of student artifacts, students meet the acceptable performance standard (which is set as achieving a mean score of 1.0 or higher on all rubric criteria). Since these artifacts were taken from freshmen classes, a 1 indicates acceptable student performance developmentally for first-year students. For the indirect assessments, students mostly met the standard (which is currently set at 70% for both the NSSE and the GSS). Furthermore, in majors programs, seniors met or exceeded the standards set by their programs in discipline-specific assessments.</p>	<p>1) We will continue to use the Ethical Reasoning LEAP VALUE rubric for future Ethical Decision-Making &amp; Cultural Diversity assessment of student artifacts; 2) We will work with program faculty to articulate the impact of Ethical Decision-Making &amp; Social Responsibility within their majors; 3) Training materials, workshops, or other resources will be developed and/or planned to help increase or maintain faculty competency of Ethical Decision-Making &amp; Social Responsibility (and assessment approaches to Ethical Decision-Making &amp; Social Responsibility). Special emphasis will be placed on clearly demonstrating what acceptable "fit" between the assignment parameters of course-embedded assessments and the characteristics of the Ethical Reasoning LEAP VALUE rubric look like; and 4) We will continue to use the NSSE and GSS.</p>	<p>In addition to the NSSE and GSS, we will soon begin using the Global Perspective Inventory (GPI) to provide an additional indirect assessment source for Ethical Decision-Making &amp; Social Responsibility. We will also expand options for the direct assessment of Ethical Decision-Making &amp; Social Responsibility within majors, beginning with research on options such as the Global Awareness Profile.</p>

Results for Ethical Decision-Making and Social Responsibility can be found in Table 2:

**Table 2: Results for Globalization and Cultural Diversity**

Assessment Method	Results: 2015	Analysis	Action	Comments
Assessment of Globalization & Cultural Diversity at TAMU-T currently includes: (a) course-embedded assessments of student artifacts using the Global Learning LEAP VALUE rubric; (b) results from Outcomes Assessment for program learning outcomes in undergraduate majors that aligned with Globalization & Cultural Diversity; (c) results of specific survey items from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) that are aligned with Globalization & Cultural Diversity-related perceptions; and (d) results of specific survey items from our Graduating Student Survey (GSS) that are aligned with Globalization & Cultural Diversity-related perceptions.	Results of course-embedded assessments revealed mean scores ranging from 1.06 to 1.69 on all rubric criteria. Results from discipline-specific outcomes assessment showed students met or exceeded standards set by the programs. For the NSSE, 67% of students indicated that TAMU-T contributed "Very Much" or "Quite a Bit" towards their ability to understand people of other backgrounds. Results from the GSS indicated that the percentage of students who Agreed or Strongly Agreed that TAMU-T contributed to their development of various competencies was: (a) 76.5% on an item aligned with use of multidisciplinary perspectives; (b) 64.7% on an item aligned with understanding global interdependence; and (c) 76.5% on an item aligned with understanding cultural differences.	Overall, these results indicate that student performance is sufficient at TAMU-T. For our direct assessments, the acceptable student performance standard (which is currently set as achieving a mean score of 1.0 or higher on all rubric criteria) was met. Furthermore, in majors programs, seniors met or exceeded the standards set by their programs in discipline-specific assessments. Because these artifacts were taken from freshmen classes, a 1 indicates acceptable student performance developmentally for first-year students. In terms of indirect assessments, student did sometimes meet the standard (which is currently set at 70% for both the NSSE and the GSS).	1) We will continue to utilize the Global Learning LEAP VALUE rubric for future Globalization & Cultural Diversity assessment of student artifacts; 2) We will work with program faculty to articulate the impact of Globalization & Cultural Diversity within their majors; 3) Training materials, workshops, or other resources will be developed and/or planned to help increase or maintain faculty competency of Globalization & Cultural Diversity (and assessment approaches to Globalization & Cultural Diversity). Special emphasis will be placed on clearly demonstrating what appropriate "fit" looks like between course-embedded assignment parameters and the features of the Global Learning LEAP VALUE rubric; and 4) We will continue to use the NSSE & GSS and monitor items aligned with Globalization & Cultural Diversity.	In addition to the NSSE and GSS, we will soon begin using the Global Perspective Inventory (GPI) to provide an additional source of indirect assessment for Globalization & Cultural Diversity. We will also expand options for the direct assessment of Globalization & Cultural Diversity within majors, beginning with research on options such as the Global Awareness Profile.

For more information about Texas A&M System Objective assessment, please see the [Assessment & Measurement Data Sources](#) webpage.

## Assessment of the Texas Core Curriculum: Student Artifacts

A summary of the Core Curriculum assessment process and results are as follows:

In Cycle A of the 3-year cycle (the 2014-2015 academic year), Critical Thinking and Communication (Oral, Visual, and Written) Core Objectives were assessed. As part of this assessment, student artifacts were evaluated using LEAP VALUE rubrics for Critical Thinking and Communication.

Instructors of Core courses aligned to the Critical Thinking and Communication developed embedded assessments for their courses. All artifacts were collected in fall and spring. At the end of the spring semester, faculty review panels convened for a norming session on using the LEAP VALUE rubrics and assessed selected artifacts. The Academic Assessment Coordinator randomly selected 308 artifacts for assessment.

Each of the LEAP VALUE rubrics assesses these competencies on five rubric criteria. The rubric response options ranged from 0 (Below Benchmark) to 4 (Capstone). The acceptable student performance criteria set for these rubrics was earning an overall score of 2 or higher on each LEAP VALUE rubric criterion.

Table 3 shows the results of the Critical Thinking assessment using the LEAP VALUE Critical Thinking Rubric.

**Table 3: Critical Thinking Results, 2014-15**

LEAP VALUE Critical Thinking Rubric Criterion	Overall Score	Acceptable Standard Met?
Explanation of Issues	1.93	Not Met
Evidence	1.69	Not Met
Influence of Context and Assumptions	1.71	Not Met
Student's Position	1.76	Not Met
Conclusions and Related Outcomes	1.88	Not Met

Table 4 reports the results of the Communication assessment using the LEAP VALUE Written Communication Rubric.

**Table 4: Written Communication Results, 2014-15**

LEAP VALUE Written Communication Rubric Criterion	Overall Score	Acceptable Standard Met?
Context of and Purpose for Writing	2.38	Met
Content Development	2.21	Met
Genre and Disciplinary Conventions	2.17	Met
Sources and Evidence	1.69	Not Met
Control of Syntax and Mechanics	2.29	Met

Table 5 reports the results of the Communication assessment using the LEAP VALUE Oral Communication Rubric.

**Table 5: Oral Communication Results, 2014-15**

LEAP VALUE Oral Communication Rubric Criterion	Overall Score	Acceptable Standard Met?
Organization	3.11	Met
Language	2.73	Met
Delivery	2.42	Met
Supporting Material	3.04	Met
Central Message	2.85	Met

For more information about these assessment results for 2014-15, please see the abbreviated and full Core Curriculum Assessment Reports for 2014-15 on the [Assessment & Measurement Data Sources](#) webpage.

**Additional Assessments**

In addition to the direct assessment data produced by assessment of student artifacts from Core Curriculum courses, additional data was collected from other direct assessment sources (e.g., the Collegiate Learning Examination, or CLA+) and indirect assessment sources (including the Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement, or BCSSE; the Graduating Student Survey, or GSS; and the National Survey of Student Engagement, or NSSE).

Details on the acceptable student performance standard and students’ actual performance on each criterion can be seen below in Table 6.

**Table 6: Results of BCSSE, CLA+, NSSE, and GSS**

Assessment Data Source Name	Acceptable Student Performance Standard	Results	Acceptable Standard Met?
<b>BCSSE</b>	70% of students or more will indicate a 4 or higher on their preparedness to demonstrate competencies aligned with Critical Thinking and Communication.	The most recent BCSSE results are from Summer 2015. These results revealed that students exceeded the student performance standard on items aligned with Critical Thinking (88%) and Communication (84% for Written Communication and 81% for Oral Communication).	Met



<b>CLA+</b>	Students will meet or exceed the national norm on sections aligned with Critical Thinking and Communication.	The most recent CLA+ results are from Fall 2014 and Spring 2015. Results for freshmen revealed that freshmen performance (491 on critical reading and evaluation, 506 on critique an argument) fell slightly below the national norm for Critical Thinking (498) and exceeded the national norm for Communication (498). Results for seniors revealed that senior performance (606 on critical reading and evaluation, 563 on critique an argument) exceeded the national norm for Critical Thinking (541) and Communication (538).	Mostly Met (Partially Met for Freshmen and Fully Met for Seniors)
<b>GSS</b>	70% of students or more will indicate that Texas A&M University-Texarkana contributed “much” or “a lot” to the development of these competencies.	The most recent GSS results are from Fall 2015. Results indicated that students exceeded the student performance standard on items aligned with Critical Thinking (95.8%) and Communication (87.5%).	Met
<b>NSSE</b>	70% of students or more will indicate that Texas A&M University-Texarkana contributed either “quite a bit” or “very much” to the development of competencies on items aligned with Critical Thinking and Communication.	The most recent NSSE results are from Spring 2015. These results revealed that students exceeded the student performance standard on items aligned with Critical Thinking (80%) and Communication (81% for Written Communication and 71% for Oral Communication).	Met

For more information about these results, please see the [Assessment & Measurement Data Sources](#) webpage.

**Pass rates for education certification**

2014-15 Teacher Education exam pass rate is 97%

Source is Accountability System for Education Preparation