

GELO Assessment Report

Critical Thinking

Students will identify and explain issues, analyze evidence, assess assumptions, define their own perspectives and positions, and present the implications and consequences of their conclusions

Assessment Plan

Measure:	Critical Thinking Assessment (attached) <i>Course level Direct - Student Artifact</i>
Acceptable Target:	Students will score a 1 on the analytic rubric
Ideal Target:	Students will score a 2 on the analytic rubric
Implementation Plan (timeline):	Spring 2017
Key/Responsible Personnel:	Valentina Abordonado and Robert Wilson

Assessment Findings

Summary of Findings:

An interesting challenge was the process of convening a group of faculty that cuts across departmental boundaries to evaluate critical thinking artifacts collected in Spring 2016. Several faculty were on leave or in the process of retiring in Fall 2016, so it wasn't possible to convene the instructors in this curriculum area. Assessment of this outcome will continue to be a challenge as faculty tend to think in terms of departmental boundaries.

To assist in this endeavor, the help of the university-wide General Education Curriculum and Assessment Committee (GECLAC) was enlisted in Spring 2017 to engage in rubric norming, paired scoring, reconciliation, and closing the loop. The aggregated results of this assessment are summarized in the table below:

2016 - 2017 General Education Critical Thinking Assessment Results			
Learning Outcome	Criteria	Average Score	Performance Level Equivalency
Critical Thinking	Summary of Problem or Issue	2.02	Emerging
n = 25	Student's Own Perspective	1.88	Initial/Emerging
	Other Perspectives	1.69	Initial/Emerging
	Evidence from Sources	1.67	Initial/Emerging
	Analysis of Issues	1.80	Initial/Emerging
	Conclusions, Implications, Consequences	1.78	Initial/Emerging

Students scored as "initial/emerging" on the criteria for student's own perspective, other perspectives, evidence from sources, analysis of issues, and conclusions, implication, consequences. They scored as "emerging" for summary of the problem or issue.

The members of the GECLAC met in Fall 2017 to close the loop. Below is a summary of their discussion:

- The findings were a little low, but on track
- May need to focus teaching on the areas of the two lowest scores (evidence from sources, other perspectives)
- A common prompt, article, and rubric are helpful
- Explicit instructions should be included in the assignment
- Rubric norming is crucial
- Reconciling the scoring is important
- Paired scoring is a good idea
- Exemplars for each criterion would be helpful
- Good process with benefits to departments about what we can learn from the process
- Feedback to faculty is necessary

Results

Acceptable Target Achievement: Met

Ideal Target Achievement: Approaching

Recommendation:

Critical Thinking should be assessed again as part of the HPU ILO Assessment Project in 2018 – 2019

Action Plan

To engender a spirit of inquiry among its faculty, Hawai'i Pacific University has declared the 2018 - 2019 academic year as "The Year of Critical Thinking with the plan to assess critical thinking in general education and both undergraduate and graduate capstone courses. The hope is to launch a campus-wide discussion about what our students know and are able to do with regard to critical thinking.

Specifically, we will gather evidence from embedded course assignments in general education and both undergraduate and graduate capstone courses, and we will engage faculty in scoring student work, using a common rubric adapted from AAC&U's rubric for Critical Thinking.

This evidence will be collected using Taskstream Aqua, a technology tool that enables students to submit their work electronically through Blackboard, our learning management system. Our collective hope is that this simple path for direct assessment of student learning will yield a streamlined scoring experience for faculty, but even more importantly, it will provide data that will serve as a catalyst for campus-wide discussions about institutional learning outcomes. Particularly exciting is the plan to disaggregate the data to examine learning outcomes for equity issues, such as income, race, age, and gender

Implementation Plan (timeline):	Fall 2018 - Spring 2019
Key/Responsible Personnel:	Members of the Academic Assessment and Program Review Shared Governance Committee
Measures:	Critical Thinking Assessment
Budget approval required? (describe):	no
Budget request amount:	\$0.00
Priority:	High

Status Report

Current Status: In Progress

Budget Status: Approved

Additional information: Plan Assessment - Fall 2018
Collect Student Work - Spring 2019
Score Student Work - Fall 2019
Aggregate and Analyze Results - Winter 2019
Close the loop - Spring 2020 - Fall 2020

Critical Thinking Essay

Read the article, "Forget the GDP. Some States Have Found a Better Way to Measure Our Progress" by Lew Daly and Sean McElwee: <http://www.newrepublic.com/article/116461/gpi-better-gdp-measuring-united-states-progress>. Compose an essay that responds to the following questions:

I. Explanation of Issues

1. What is the main problem/question at issue in this article?
2. What are some of the subsidiary, embedded, or implicit aspects of the problem, and what are their relationships to each other?

II. Your Position

1. What is your point of view on the issue?
2. How does your position relate to and/or synthesize with other positions?

III. Other Perspectives

1. What are the other salient perspectives and positions that are important to the analysis of the issue?

IV. Evidence from Sources

1. What evidence can you provide to support your position?
2. What is/are the source(s) of your information?
3. How is this evidence appropriate and sufficient to support your position?
4. How is this evidence relevant to the point you are making?
5. What is your evaluation of this evidence?

V. Issue in Context

1. What contexts (e.g. cultural, political, and social) are relevant to your analysis of the issue?
2. Who is the audience for your analysis?

VI. Conclusions, Implications, and Consequences

1. What are the conclusions, implications, and consequences of this issue, considering the context, assumptions, data and evidence?

Submit your work to Taskstream, where it will be evaluated by your professor, using the following criteria, as indicated in the attached rubric:

- Identification and Summary of the Problem/Question
- Identification and Presentation of the Student's own Perspective and Position
- Identification and Consideration of other Salient Perspectives and Positions
- Evidence from Sources to Support Position
- Analysis of Issues in Context
- Identification and Assessment of Conclusions, Implications, and Consequences

Critical Thinking Rubric

COMPETENCY		0 NOT PRESENT	1 INITIAL (shows some comprehension)	2 EMERGING	3 DEVELOPED	4 HIGHLY DEVELOPED
1	Identifies and summarizes the problem/question at issue (and/or the source's position).	Does not identify and summarize the problem, is confused or identifies a different and inappropriate problem.	Shows some ability to identify the main problem and subsidiary, embedded, or implicit aspects of the problem; and identifies them clearly, addressing their relationships to each other.	Identifies the main problem and subsidiary, embedded, or implicit aspects of the problem; and identifies them clearly, addressing their relationships to each other.	In a developed manner, identifies the main problem and subsidiary, embedded, or implicit aspects of the problem; and identifies them clearly, addressing their relationships to each other.	In a highly developed manner, identifies the main problem and subsidiary, embedded, or implicit aspects of the problem; and identifies them clearly, addressing their relationships to each other.
2	Identifies and presents the student's own perspectives and positions as it is important to the analysis of the issue.	Does not identify clearly a perspective or perspective is simplistic. Fails to clarify the established or presented position relative to one's own.	Shows some ability to identify, appropriately, one's own position on the issue and relates it to and/or synthesizes it with other perspectives.	Identifies, appropriately, one's own position on the issue and relates it to and/or synthesizes it with other perspectives.	In a developed manner, identifies, appropriately, one's own position on the issue and relates it to and/or synthesizes it with other perspectives.	In a highly developed manner, identifies, appropriately, one's own position on the issue and relates it to and/or synthesizes it with other perspectives.
3	Identifies and considers other salient perspectives and positions that are important to the analysis of the issue.	Deals only with a single perspective and fails to discuss other possibilities.	Shows some ability to address multiple and diverse perspectives. Conclusions are logical.	Addresses multiple and diverse perspectives. Conclusions are logical.	In a developed manner, addresses multiple and diverse perspectives. Conclusions are logical.	In a highly developed manner, addresses multiple and diverse perspectives. Conclusions are logical.
4	Supports opinion with evidence from sources.	Evidence does not adequately support the thesis. Lists evidence but doesn't explain how it does or doesn't support a point. Does not completely or correctly identify sources of information. Evidence not or incompletely evaluated.	Shows some ability to: -provide appropriate and sufficient evidence to effectively support all parts of the thesis. -smoothly synthesize evidence from sources and clearly ties it to the point being made, or assesses the source as not being appropriate. -correctly identify all sources of information. Evaluates evidence.	Provides appropriate and sufficient evidence to effectively support all parts of the thesis. Smoothly synthesizes evidence from sources and clearly ties it to the point being made, or assesses the source as not being appropriate. Correctly identifies all sources of information. Evaluates evidence.	In a developed manner, -provides appropriate and sufficient evidence to effectively support all parts of the thesis. -smoothly synthesizes evidence from sources and clearly ties it to the point being made, or assesses the source as not being appropriate. -correctly identifies all sources of information. Evaluates evidence.	In a highly developed manner, provides appropriate and sufficient evidence to effectively support all parts of the thesis. Smoothly synthesizes evidence from sources and clearly ties it to the point being made, or assesses the source as not being appropriate. Correctly identifies all sources of information. Evaluates evidence.

5	Analyzes the issues in context.	Does not present the problem as having connections to other contexts, e.g. cultural, political, social, etc.	Shows some ability to -analyze issues with a clear sense of context, including an assessment of the audience of the analysis. -consider other pertinent contexts.	Analyzes issue with a clear sense of context, including an assessment of the audience of the analysis. Considers other pertinent contexts.	Shows developed ability to -analyze issues with a clear sense of context, including an assessment of the audience of the analysis. -consider other pertinent contexts.	Shows highly developed ability to -analyze issues with a clear sense of context, including an assessment of the audience of the analysis. -consider other pertinent contexts..
6	Identifies and assesses conclusions, implications and consequences.	Fails to identify conclusions, implications, and consequences of the issue. May only repeat verbatim what has already been said. May be simplistic and inconsistent with evidence presented.	Shows some ability to -identify and discuss conclusions, implications and consequences considering context, assumptions, data and evidence. -Goes beyond restating thesis or problem. Consistent with evidence presented.	Identifies and discuss conclusions, implications and consequences considering context, assumptions, data and evidence. -Goes beyond restating thesis or problem. Consistent with evidence presented.	Shows developed ability to -identify and discuss conclusions, implications and consequences considering context, assumptions, data and evidence. -Goes beyond restating thesis or problem. Consistent with evidence presented.	Shows highly developed ability to -identify and discuss conclusions, implications and consequences considering context, assumptions, data and evidence. -Goes beyond restating thesis or problem. Consistent with evidence presented.