

Core Curriculum Assessment Report: Teamwork 2018-2019

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT SAN ANTONIO

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Teamwork (TW) Skills are required by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) in three of the eight Core Curriculum component areas: Communication; Life and Physical Sciences; and Creative Arts. To address the THECB’s definition of TW, the Core Curriculum Assessment Team (CCAT) developed two student learning outcomes (SLOs) depicted in the table below.

ALIGNMENT WITH THECB CORE CURRICULUM OBJECTIVES	
THECB Objective Definition	UTSA Student Learning Outcomes
<p><u>Teamwork</u>: The ability to consider different points of view and to work effectively with others to support a shared purpose or goal</p>	<p>Students will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Work together effectively toward a shared purpose relevant to the course or discipline. 2. Apply professional and interpersonal skills by working effectively with others from diverse disciplines and backgrounds.

The population was operationally defined as undergraduate students enrolled in a Core Course that required TW during the Fall 2018 semester. The instructors from fourteen classes in Communication; Life and Physical Sciences; and Creative Arts agreed to participate in the data collection process.

To determine targets for the TW objective, the CCAT consulted UTSA students’ self-reported results on the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). The CCAT expected that the means, medians, and modes for all rubric criteria nested within each SLO would meet or exceed 3 (“Good”) on the 1-4 scale.

UTSA students exceeded the targets set on each of the measured dimensions: (1) their own teamwork skills, (2) the teamwork skills of their group members, and (3) the overall performance of the group. The students’ ratings for the overall group experience was highest (3.70) followed closely by their self-assessment (3.69) and their rating of their peers (3.62).

The committee recommended an aggressive publicity campaign to share (a) the results of the assessment as well as (b) resources developed by UTSA Teaching and Learning Services with faculty and program coordinators to help improve student performance in each of these areas. The Core Curriculum Committee also recommended identifying other data sources that could help validate the TW skills of UTSA students.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
DESCRIPTION OF OVERALL ASSESSMENT PROCESS	3
ASSESSMENT OF TEAMWORK SKILLS.....	4
ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY: METHOD, MEASURES, AND TARGETS.....	4
METHOD	4
MEASURES.....	5
TARGETS.....	5
DESCRIPTION OF POPULATION AND SAMPLE	6
SURVEY RESULTS.....	8
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT	10
RECOMMENDATIONS TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING.....	11
RECOMMENDATIONS TO IMPROVE THE ASSESSMENT PROCESS	11
APPENDIXES	13
APPENDIX A – THECB STATE REQUIRED COURSE OBJECTIVES.....	13
APPENDIX B – TEAMWORK STUDENT SURVEY.....	14
APPENDIX C – CORE CURRICULUM ASSESSMENT TEAM (2018-19)	16
APPENDIX D – CORE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE (2018-2019)	17
APPENDIX E – TEAMWORK FACULTY ASSESSMENT PARTNERS (2018-19)	18
NOTES	19

DESCRIPTION OF OVERALL ASSESSMENT PROCESS

Teamwork (TW) Skills are required by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THCEB) in three of the eight Core Curriculum component areas: Communication; Life and Physical Sciences; and Creative Arts (see Appendix A). The THECB leaves the assessment methodology up to the individual institution. At UTSA, the Core Curriculum Assessment Team (CCAT) developed methods, materials, and timelines for these assessments.

The CCAT consists of 13 faculty members from across all UTSA colleges and is divided into six working groups – one for each objective (See Appendix C for a list of CCAT members). In consultation with the full CCAT, the TW Working Group:

- Developed student learning outcomes,
- Developed a plan for sampling students,
- Developed a survey to collect student responses, and
- Identified specific core courses to be sampled.

The manner in which assessment is designed and conducted varies depending on its specific purpose. The overarching purpose of the CCAT’s work is to address the question: *How well are UTSA students mastering the six state-mandated Core Curriculum objectives?*

To address this question, the CCAT designed an ongoing three-year assessment cycle whereby two (of the six) state-mandated objectives will be assessed each year. In year four (2019-2020), the cycle will begin again.

Table 1. Overview of UTSA CCAT Assessment Schedule

STATE-REQUIRED OBJECTIVE	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
Critical Thinking		X	
Communication Skills	X		
Empirical & Quantitative Skills	X		
Teamwork			X
Social Responsibility		X	
Personal Responsibility			X

In 2018-19, the Teamwork (TW) and Personal Responsibility (PR) objectives were assessed. Details regarding PR Assessment are presented in a separate report. This report speaks to the question, *“How well are UTSA students mastering TW skills as defined by the THECB?”*

ASSESSMENT OF TEAMWORK SKILLS

To address the THECB’s definition of Teamwork, the CCAT developed two student learning outcomes (SLOs) as shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2. THECB Definition and UTSA Student Learning Outcomes

ALIGNMENT WITH THECB CORE CURRICULUM OBJECTIVES	
THECB Objective Definition	UTSA Student Learning Outcomes
<p><u>Teamwork</u>: The ability to consider different points of view and to work effectively with others to support a shared purpose or goal</p>	<p>Students will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Work together effectively toward a shared purpose relevant to the course or discipline. 2. Apply professional and interpersonal skills by working effectively with others from diverse disciplines and backgrounds.

To measure these SLOs, the CCAT determined which courses would be sampled, designed assessment methodologies, developed a scoring rubric, and extended to faculty an invitation to participate in the assessment process. Detailed information regarding methodologies and results is included in the following sections.

ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY: METHOD, MEASURES, AND TARGETS

METHOD

As depicted in Appendix A, TW is required in three of the eight Core Curriculum component areas: Communication; Life and Physical Sciences; and Creative Arts. The population was operationally defined as undergraduate students enrolled in a Core Course that required TW during the Fall 2018 semester.

In the Fall and Spring 2017-18 academic year, the Associate Vice Provost for the Core Curriculum identified courses that had a culminating group project as a regularly-assigned part of the class. The instructors from fourteen classes in Communication; Life and Physical Sciences; and Creative Arts agreed to provide data related to the TW SLOs. The courses from which samples were collected are listed in Appendix E.

As a regular, required classroom assignment, instructors in these courses (see Appendix E) had students complete an online survey (see Appendix B) designed by the CCAT in which students rated their teamwork skills across three dimensions: (1) their own teamwork skills, (2) the teamwork skills of their group members, and (3) the overall performance of the group. The surveys were hosted on Qualtrics; links to the surveys were sent to students via the Blackboard course management system.

Demographic information for each of the students enrolled in the sampled courses was compiled by the UTSA University College staff. This information included (a) the college in which the student was enrolled, (b) gender, (c) ethnicity, (d) classification, and (e) grade point average as of the university census date for the Fall 2018 semester.

MEASURES

Students rated each of the TW qualities in the survey on a four-point scale (1 = *Poor*; 2 = *Fair*; 3 = *Good*; 4 = *Excellent*) using the online survey (see Appendix B). Students were asked to (a) select their name from a class roster and (b) select the members of their group. The data were analyzed using simple descriptive statistics including mean, median, mode, standard deviation, and range. For peer-assessment data, the weighted average was calculated rather than using the arithmetic mean because the number of peer ratings associated with each individual student differed. Students who did not complete a self-assessment but received a peer assessment were excluded from reports that represented ratings disaggregated by demographic characteristics.

We compared results based on the following characteristics: (a) college, (b) gender, and (c) ethnicity. Because the scale-level data were not normally distributed, we used Kruskal Wallis *H* tests to compare group means to see if there were significant differences in the way students rated themselves or their team members based on these variables. We used follow-up Mann-Whitney *U* tests on any significant differences found in the preliminary analysis.

TARGETS

To determine targets for the TW objective, the CCAT consulted UTSA students' self-reported results on the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). The CCAT expected that the means, medians, and modes for all survey items would meet or exceed 3 ("*Good*") on the 1-4 scale. Specifically, two items were used to set preliminary goals:

NSSE Section 1. *During the current school year, about how often have you done the following?*

h. Worked with other students on course projects or assignments?

NSSE Section 17. *How much has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas?*

f. Working effectively with others?

UTSA seniors who responded to the survey produced a mean score of 2.8 and 2.9 respectively these two items on a 4-point scale (see Table 3). The UTSA students' average was significantly higher ($p < .05$) than the UT-System mean in the first variable, but significantly lower than the Carnegie mean on the second variable.

Table 3. NSSE Survey Results – 2017

Core Objective	NSSE Item	UTSA Mean	UT System Mean	Carnegie Mean	ERU Mean
Teamwork	1h	2.8	△2.6	2.8	△2.7
Teamwork	17f	2.9	3.0	▽3.0	3.0
Teamwork Item Average		2.9	2.8	2.9	2.9

Note: △ indicates UTSA students performed significantly higher than this subgroup;

▽ indicates UTSA students performed significantly lower than this subgroup

Based on the analysis of NSSE survey items related to Teamwork, the CCAT set a preliminary target of 3.00 for all survey items.

DESCRIPTION OF POPULATION AND SAMPLE

The population was operationally defined as UTSA undergraduates enrolled in a Core Course that required TW during the Fall 2018 semester. The instructors from fourteen classes in Communication; Life and Physical Sciences; and Creative Arts agreed to participate in the data collection process. See Appendix E for a list of the courses that were sampled.

A total of 324 students completed the online surveys, and ratings were collected for 417 students. Some students did not complete the survey but still were rated by others on their team, so there are more peer ratings than self ratings. Tables 4 through 7 below describe the population (i.e., the total numbers of students enrolled in Core Curriculum courses within the identified groups) and student sample (i.e., the total number of students who completed the online surveys) from the fall semester. Specifically, the population and sample students' college, gender, ethnicity, and grade point average (GPA) are summarized.

While these tables depict a student sample generally representative of the population, it is worth noting that the Colleges of Business; Public Policy; and Science were slightly over-represented (i.e., there were more students proportionally in these colleges who completed survey when compared to the overall population) while the Colleges of Architecture, Business, and Engineering; Education & Human Development; and Engineering were slightly under-represented in the sample (see Table 4). Some of these discrepancies may be accounted for by the students waiting to declare majors and admission practices among various programs, departments, and colleges.

Table 4. Selected Student Population by College

College	Population		Sample	
	n	%	n	%
Architecture, Construction and Planning	203	2.18	2	0.62
Business	1,546	16.58	113	34.88
Education and Human Development	1,073	11.50	28	8.64
Engineering	1,024	10.98	26	8.02
Liberal and Fine Arts	2,084	22.34	75	23.15
Public Policy	7	0.08	7	2.16
Sciences	293	3.14	38	11.73
University College	2,100	22.52	30	9.26
No College Identified	997	10.69	5	1.54
Total	9,327	100.00	324	100.00

Table 5. Selected Student Population by Gender

Gender	Population		Sample	
	n	%	n	%
Female	4,804	51.51	158	48.77
Male	4,523	48.49	166	51.23
Total	9,327	100.00	324	100.00

Table 6. Selected Student Population by Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	Population		Sample	
	n	%	n	%
American Indian or Alaska Native	15	0.16	0	0.00
Asian	590	6.33	23	7.10
Black or African American	911	9.77	33	10.19
Hispanic/Latino	5,192	55.67	185	57.10
International	182	1.95	7	2.16
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	13	0.14	0	0.00
Two or More Races	344	3.69	8	2.47
Unknown	39	0.42	0	0.00
White	2,041	21.88	68	20.99
Total	9,327	100.00	324	100.00

Table 7. Average, Minimum and Maximum GPAs for Selected Population

Classification (<i>n</i> = sample)	Population				Sample			
	Mean	Median	Min	Max	Mean	Median	Min	Max
Freshman (<i>n</i> =36)	2.70	2.8	0.12	4.00	2.78	2.98	0.68	4.00
Sophomore (<i>n</i> =69)	2.87	2.88	0.74	4.00	2.88	2.85	1.58	4.00
Junior (<i>n</i> =38)	2.94	2.91	0.66	4.00	2.85	2.91	0.66	4.00
Seniors(<i>n</i> =16)	2.96	2.92	1.27	4.00	2.99	2.86	2.21	3.97
Total (<i>n</i> =160)	2.86	2.88	0.12	4.00	2.86	2.87	0.66	4.00

SURVEY RESULTS

Survey results are presented separately for the (a) self-assessment, (b) peer-assessment, and (c) overall group ratings (see Table 8). Students met or exceeded all targets set for each area. The students' ratings for the overall group experience was highest (3.70) followed closely by their self-assessment (3.69) and their rating of their peers (3.62).

Table 8. Overall Teamwork Survey Results

Dimension	<i>n</i>	Mean	Median	Mode	Standard Deviation	Range
1. Self Assessment	324	3.69	4.00	4.00	0.426	2.00
2. Peer Assessment	417	3.62	3.83	4.00	0.582	3.00
3. Group Assessment	316	3.70	4.00	4.00	0.442	2.00

Note: Peer assessment is based on a weighted average (number of scores were different amongst students). See p. 5 for a description of the measures used.

Tables 9 through 12 show results of self and peer assessment for subgroups in race and ethnicity as well as gender. Kruskal Wallis *H* tests revealed a significant difference ($\chi^2 = 11.66$, $df = 5$, $p = .04$) in the way students rated their peers based on their own race or ethnicity. Follow up Mann Whitney *U* tests with a Bonferroni adjustment showed a significant difference between the way Asian and Hispanic students rated their peers ($U = 1,365.50$, $Z = -2.70$, $p = .007$) with Asian students tending to rate their peers higher (3.77) than their Hispanic student counterparts (3.63). However, the effect size was small ($abs(r) = 0.19$), indicating a lack of practical significance. It should also be noted that there were only 19 Asian students in the sample. There were no other significant differences in the responses based on race or ethnicity.

Mann Whitney *U* tests revealed a significant difference ($U = 10,825.00$, $Z = -2.27$, $p = .02$), between the way students ranked their peers based on gender. While female students tended to rate their peers lower (3.65) than their male counterparts (3.74), the effect size was extremely small ($abs(r) = 0.07$) indicating a lack of practical significance.

Table 9. Self-Assessment Results by Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	<i>n</i>	Mean	Median	Mode	Standard Deviation
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	-	-	-	-
Asian	23	3.84	4.00	4.00	0.316
Black or African American	33	3.67	3.67	4.00	0.445
Hispanic/Latino	185	3.65	4.00	4.00	0.450
International	7	3.76	4.00	4.00	0.317
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	8	3.67	3.83	4.00	0.398
Unknown	0	-	-	-	-
White	68	3.77	4.00	4.00	0.383
Total	324	3.69	4.00	4.00	0.426

Table 10. Self-Assessment Results by Gender

Gender	<i>n</i>	Mean	Median	Mode	Standard Deviation
Female	158	3.66	4.00	4.00	0.444
Male	166	3.72	4.00	4.00	0.408
Total	324	3.69	4.00	4.00	0.426

Table 11. Peer Assessment Results by Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	<i>n</i>	Mean	Median	Mode	Standard Deviation
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	-	-	-	-
Asian	19	3.77	3.78	4.00	0.212
Black or African American	33	3.67	3.72	4.00	0.308
Hispanic/Latino	177	3.63	3.67	4.00	0.354
International	6	3.73	3.69	3.67	0.170
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	-	-	-	-
Two or More Races	7	3.75	3.73	4.00	0.272
Unknown	0	-	-	-	-
White	66	3.72	3.83	4.00	0.348
Total	308	3.67	3.75	4.00	0.338

Note: Results from students who received a peer assessment who also completed a self-assessment.

Table 12. Peer Assessment Results by Gender

Gender	<i>n</i>	Mean	Median	Mode	Standard Deviation
Female	151	3.66	3.68	4.00	0.314
Male	157	3.68	3.83	4.00	0.360
Total	308	3.67	3.75	4.00	0.338

Note: Results from students who received a peer assessment who also completed a self-assessment.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) requires that Teamwork skills (TW) be included in all three of the eight components of the Core Curriculum: Communication; Life and Physical Sciences; and Creative Arts. The UTSA Core Curriculum Assessment Team (CCAT), made up of 13 faculty members from across all UTSA colleges, determined a three-year assessment cycle whereby two state-required objectives are assessed each academic year.

The 2018-19 academic year assessment cycle included TW and Personal Responsibility (detailed in another report). The following student learning outcomes were assessed:

Students will be able to:

1. Work together effectively toward a shared purpose relevant to the course or discipline.
2. Apply professional and interpersonal skills by working effectively with others from diverse disciplines and backgrounds.

The population was operationally defined as UTSA undergraduates enrolled in a Core Curriculum course that required TW during the Fall 2018 semester. Students in fourteen core classes completed group projects and then submitted online surveys designed to rate their teamwork skills along three dimensions: (1) their own teamwork skills, (2) the teamwork skills of their group members, and (3) the overall performance of the group.

UTSA students exceeded the targets set on each of the measured dimensions. The students' ratings for the overall group experience was highest (3.70) followed closely by their self-assessment (3.69) and their rating of their peers (3.62).

The University Core Curriculum Committee (CCC), made up of faculty representing each UTSA college and one undergraduate UTSA student, reviewed the results to make recommendations for improvement (see Appendix D for a list of CCC members). These recommendations, including those to improve student learning and to improve the assessment process, are summarized below.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING

The CCC and CCAT independently reviewed TW results in the Spring 2019 semester and recommended changes based on an analysis of those results. Although the results suggested strong performance in TW, since the Fall 2018 assessment of TW was the first iteration of the new assessment procedures in this area, the results should be viewed as a baseline upon which future results may be compared.

The committee recommended an aggressive publicity campaign to share (a) the results of the assessment as well as (b) resources developed by the Teaching and Learning Services with faculty and program coordinators to help improve student performance in each of these areas. The CCC also recommended identifying other data sources that could help validate the TW skills of UTSA students.

1. Sharing results of assessment with stakeholders. The Associate Vice Provost for the Core Curriculum is developing a summary infographic to share with faculty, assessors, administrators, and other interested parties. This infographic will summarize the results of this report in an easily understandable, visual format. This infographic, as well as this report, will be shared via campus email and the provost's website (<http://provost.utsa.edu/corecurriculum/>). The infographic will include links to professional development resources described below.
2. Professional Development. Core curriculum faculty should actively engage in professional development opportunities that address how to best design and implement assignments and assessments that foster TW Skills, as defined by the THECB. To that end, the Associate Vice Provost – Teaching and Learning Services and the Associate Vice Provost – Core Curriculum are working closely together to develop and deliver faculty support. Some of these resources can be found on the Teaching and Learning Services Core Curriculum Resource page (<http://teaching.utsa.edu/utsa-core-curriculum-resource-page/>).

RECOMMENDATIONS TO IMPROVE THE ASSESSMENT PROCESS

Based on their review of the assessment data in the Spring 2019 semester, the CCC committee made the following recommendations to improve the assessment process.

1. Considering this year to be a baseline for future assessment, the CCC recommended maintaining a target of 3.0 on a 4-point scale for the next round of surveys.
2. There was not data collected on the number or length of TW projects in the courses surveyed for this assessment. Rather than, or in addition to, a one-shot survey of students' impressions following a culminating teamwork project, we should work to identify courses in which students complete multiple TW assignments and compare students' performance periodically as they move through the course.

3. In order to give context to the assessment results, we should add questions to the current survey to collect data regarding (a) the duration of the group project, (b) how many times the group met, (c) the relative academic weight of the project.
4. Identify students who completed the NSSE surveys in their first year of enrollment to compare their initial ratings of opportunities to enact TW projects with current TW assessment results.
5. Consider the use of an initial survey of TW skills through the AIS 1203 courses as a benchmark for later assessment targets. The AIS 1203 course is required of all first-year students enrolled in all degree programs.

Conclusion

The 2018-19 academic year marked the third year in UTSA's three-year assessment cycle. While there is clearly room for improvement overall – particularly in other assessment areas, the process was generally successful. In reviewing this report, it is important to bear in mind that assessment is an iterative process. Its primary purpose is to provide direction for student learning improvement. To that end, the assessment process was successful.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A – THECB STATE REQUIRED COURSE OBJECTIVES

Foundational Component Area	SCH	Required Core Objectives			Optional Core Objectives		
		CT	COM	EQS	TW	SR	PR
Communication	6	●	●	○	●	○	●
Courses in this category focus on developing ideas and expressing them clearly, considering the effect of the message, fostering understanding, and building the skills needed to communicate persuasively. Courses involve the command of oral, aural, written, and visual literacy skills that enable people to exchange messages appropriate to the subject, occasion, and audience.							
Mathematics	3	●	●	●	○	○	○
Courses in this category focus on quantitative literacy in logic, patterns, and relationships. Courses involve the understanding of key mathematical concepts and the application of appropriate quantitative tools to everyday experience.							
Life and Physical Sciences	6	●	●	●	○	○	○
Courses in this category focus on describing, explaining, and predicting natural phenomena using the scientific method. Courses involve the understanding of interactions among natural phenomena and the implications of scientific principles on the physical world and on human experiences.							
Language, Philosophy & Culture	3	●	●	○	○	●	●
Courses in this category focus on how ideas, values, beliefs, and other aspects of culture express and affect human experience. Courses involve the exploration of ideas that foster aesthetic and intellectual creation in order to understand the human condition across cultures.							
Creative Arts	3	●	●	○	●	●	○
Courses in this category focus on the appreciation and analysis of creative artifacts and works of the human imagination. Courses involve the synthesis and interpretation of artistic expression and enable critical, creative, and innovative communication about works of art.							
American History	6	●	●	○	○	●	●
Courses in this category focus on the consideration of past events and ideas relative to the United States, with the option of including Texas History for a portion of this component area. Courses involve the interaction among individuals, communities, states, the nation, and the world, considering how these interactions have contributed to the development of the United States and its global role.							
Government/Political Science	6	●	●	○	○	●	●
Courses in this category focus on consideration of the Constitution of the United States and the constitutions of the states, with special emphasis on that of Texas. Courses involve the analysis of governmental institutions, political behavior, civic engagement, and their political and philosophical foundations.							
Social and Behavioral Sciences	3	●	●	●	○	●	○
Courses in this category focus on the application of empirical and scientific methods that contribute to the understanding of what makes us human. Courses involve the exploration of behavior and interactions among individuals, groups, institutions, and events, examining their impact on the individual, society, and culture.							
Component Area Option	6	●	●	○	○	○	○
a. A minimum of 3 SCH must meet the definition and corresponding Core Objectives specified in one of the foundational component areas b. As an option for up to 3 semester credit hours of the Component Area Option, an institution may select course(s) that: (i) Meet(s) the definition specified for one or more of the foundational component areas; and (ii) Include(s) a minimum of three Core Objectives, including Critical Thinking Skills, Communication Skills, and one of the remaining Core Objectives of the institution's choice.							

Source: <http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/reports/DocFetch.cfm?DocID=10751&Format=PDF>

APPENDIX B – TEAMWORK STUDENT SURVEY

General Directions: This survey is divided into two parts. In Part I, evaluate how well the group functioned overall. In Part II, rate yourself and each individual in your group. Please be honest in your evaluation. It will take about five minutes to complete the survey. Use the scale below for both parts:

4 = Excellent

3 = Good

2 = Fair

1 = Poor

Part I. Overall Group Rating

Directions: Teamwork is the concept of people working together toward a common goal. Rate how well your group functioned **overall** using the criteria below.

	Excellent (1)	Good (2)	Fair (3)	Poor (4)
Participation. Team members actively participated in the task or project to accomplish a common goal. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Collaboration. The work product was a collective effort; team members had both individual and mutual accountability for the successful completion of the work. The work of each person was acknowledged. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Communication. Team members communicated openly and treated one another with respect. All members listened to ideas. Members felt free to seek assistance and information, share resources and insights, provide advice, or ask questions of each other. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Part II. Individual Rating. Directions: Choose yourself from the list below.

[Students will see a list of names from the class in the online version]

Rate yourself on each criterion from “excellent” to “poor” for each of the criteria below. Be honest in your rating.

	Excellent (1)	Good (2)	Fair (3)	Poor (5)
1. Receptive to others’ input, works well with others, cooperative, and respectful of group process. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Participated actively, contributed sufficient effort. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Met deadlines, was prompt, attended meetings, and was responsive. (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Part II. Individual Rating. Directions: Click on **ALL** the other members of your group in the list below then click the red arrow to rate each individual in your group.

[Students will see a list of names from the class in the online version]

Rate each individual on each criterion from “excellent” to “poor.” Be honest in your ratings. **Note:** *This is not a comparative process. For example, all group members could have the same rating or each one could be different.*

[Students will be presented each team member they selected one at time for evaluation]

	Excellent (1)	Good (2)	Fair (3)	Poor (5)
1. Receptive to others’ input, works well with others, cooperative, and respectful of group process. (1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Participated actively, contributed sufficient effort. (5)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Met deadlines, was prompt, attended meetings, and was responsive. (6)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

APPENDIX C – CORE CURRICULUM ASSESSMENT TEAM (2018-19)

The CCAT is made up of faculty who were recommended by their academic deans based on their expertise in at least one of the state-required core objectives and their knowledge of assessment in undergraduate education. This team, appointed by the Provost, consists of faculty representatives from all UTSA colleges, the library, and a Faculty Senate representative.

Team Members

Si Millican

Chair, ex officio

Associate Vice Provost – Core Curriculum

Professor of Music

Saadet Beeson

Faculty Senate

Associate Professor, CACP

Vic Heller

Associate Professor, COB

Mark Leung

Department Chair

Associate Professor, COB

Manuel Diaz

Interim Department Chair

Associate Professor, COE

Marco Cervantes

Interim Department Chair

Associate Professor, COEHD

Andrea Aleman

Lecturer III, COLFA

Marita Nummikoski

Associate Professor, COLFA

Marie Tillyer

Assistant Department Chair

Associate Professor, COPP

Terri Matiella

Senior Lecturer, COS

David Senseman

Associate Professor, COS

Gail Pizzola

Director, Writing Core Program

Senior Lecturer, UC

Tara Schmidt

UTSA Libraries

Elizabeth Hoff

ex officio

Institutional Intelligence

APPENDIX D – CORE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE (2018-2019)

The Core Curriculum Committee provides recommendations to the Provost related to the on-going development, implementation and evaluation of the University's core curriculum. This includes the review of:

- (1) proposals submitted for specific UTSA courses designed to satisfy the UTSA core curriculum requirements and learning objectives,
- (2) existing core curriculum courses regarding their continued inclusion in the Core Curriculum and
- (3) all assessment data related to the effectiveness of the existing core curriculum, including data collected related to internal, on-going core course evaluation and results from standardized external instruments.

Voting members serve two-year terms except for the student member who serves a one-year term. No voting member shall be eligible to serve more than two consecutive terms.

Committee Members

Si Millican

Chair, ex officio

Associate Vice Provost – Core Curriculum

Professor of Music

Angela Lombardi

Associate Professor, CACP

Meghan Thornton-Lugo

Assistant Professor, COB

Fatma Arslan

Lecturer III, COE

Marco Cervantes

Associate Professor, COEHD

John Zhang

Professor, COLFA

Patrick Gallagher

Assistant Professor, COLFA

Gina Amatangelo

Lecturer II, COPP

Janis Bush

Department Chair

Professor, COS

Jim Longoria

Lecturer III, UC

Sudeep Jacob

Undergraduate Student

Elizabeth Hoff

Ex officio

Institutional Intelligence

Crystal Harris-Harleaux

Ex officio

Admissions

APPENDIX E – TEAMWORK FACULTY ASSESSMENT PARTNERS (2018-19)

Jessica Beckham – *Department of Environmental Science*

ES 2013.005 – Introduction to Environmental Science

ES 2013.008 – Introduction to Environmental Science

Mark Brill – *Department of Music and Dance*

MUS 2243.001 – World Music in Society

Rami El-Farrah – *Department of Music and Dance*

MUS 2663 – History and Styles of Jazz

Terri Matiella – *Department of Environmental Science*

ES 2013.001 – Introduction to Environmental Science

ES 2013.003 – Introduction to Environmental Science

Randi Miles – *Department of Music and Dance*

DAN 2003 – Introduction to Dance

Mike Mixtaki – *Department of Music and Dance*

MUS 2243.002 – World Music in Society

Gail Pizzola – *Director, Writing Center*

Martha Smith – *Writing Center*

WRC 1013.0B1 – Freshman Composition I

WRC 1013.0C2 – Freshman Composition I

Todd Wright – *Writing Center*

WRC 1013.049 – Freshman Composition I

WRC 1013.057 – Freshman Composition I

WRC 1013.0N1 – Freshman Composition I

WRC 1013.0N5 – Freshman Composition I

NOTES

The Associate Vice Provost for the Core Curriculum wishes to thank the following UTSA faculty and staff members for their assistance in assembling this report:

- Kimberly Massaro, Department of Management Science and Statistics, for her assistance in analyzing and organizing survey data.
- Elizabeth Hoff, Director of University Assessment, for her editorial review of this report.
- Mahmoud Abunwas and the Institutional Intelligence staff.
- The UTSA University College team for their continual support:
 - Heather Shipley, Senior Vice Provost and Dean
 - Patricia Cantu Ramirez, Assistant Dean and Financial Administrator
 - Monica Lucero, Senior Administrative Associate
 - Kristi Johnson, Management Analyst
- Dr. Nancy Martin, Associate Vice Provost for the Core Curriculum (retired) for her kind assistance and guidance.

For questions regarding this report, please contact

Si Millican, Ph.D.

Associate Vice Provost – Core Curriculum

Professor of Music Education

si.millican@utsa.edu

210.458.5334