2012 Summer Assessment Institute
CRITICAL THINKING Summary Report

A faculty institute was conducted in July 2012 to assess LCC's progress with student achievement of Critical Thinking. The institute consisted of nine faculty participants and a faculty coordinator. Participants were selected by the Vice President of Instruction. Artifacts were evaluated based on a rubric developed by the Instructional Assessment Committee (the outcomes were approved by the Instructional Council). Participants for the Critical Thinking Institute included: **Tim Allwine, Hiedi Bauer, Brad Benjamin, Katrina Fuller, Joan Herman, Sue Homme, Klint Hull, Susan James, and Sue Yarbrough**. **Colleen Allwine** served as faculty coordinator.

OVERVIEW: CRITICAL THINKING

Three hundred and thirty artifacts from a variety of disciplines were evaluated, including Diesel Tech lab journals, Nursing care plans, essays and research papers from a variety of disciplines, math and chemistry assignments, Biology lab reports, Integrative Studies papers, Capstone papers, assignments related to Excel and Access, and Auto Tech diagnostic lab reports.

Prior to beginning the rating process, faculty participated in a discussion about the rubric and calibrated ("normed") their scoring by evaluating two artifacts as a group. Periodic recalibration took place throughout the institute to keep faculty on track.

One hundred and thirty one artifacts, randomly selected from the total number submitted, were assessed using a 5-point scale. Raters were also given the option of not evaluating a particular outcome (for the given assignments) by checking the "*" box on the rubric.

Observations/notes:
- A recurring theme with the summer assessment institute is that it can be difficult to assess some evidence of student learning without the assignment. Several faculty actually submitted the assignment in advance, which was helpful.
- Overall, there is ample evidence that students are thinking critically. The weakest aspect of the outcome in terms of scoring was "D."
- The most difficult outcome to assess was Outcome "D," which is related to coming up with a "solution" to a problem. Although this language works with some disciplines, it

does not work well with others. It was suggested that the outcome be modified to allow for flexibility here, such as providing faculty with the opportunity to substitute a more appropriate word (such as "application" or "deliverable") for the word "solution." Another issue with Outcome "D" is that it's unclear whether the focus is on *evaluation* of a solution or on *proposal* of a solution (or both). The Instructional Assessment Committee will address this issue in the fall, after the faculty-wide discussion held during in-service week.

- For the in-service week session on Global Skills, Colleen Allwine will provide an overview of findings from the institute along with a refresher on Bloom's taxonomy. Brad Benjamin volunteered to facilitate a small group exercise focused on brainstorming ways to get students to show their work (critical to accurate faculty assessment of Critical Thinking). The groups will report out at the end of the workshop, with ideas captured on paper and distributed to both full- and part-time faculty.
- Faculty will also be invited to have their assignments reviewed in terms of encouraging student demonstration of particular outcomes. A workshop will be held in the fall on Critical Thinking assignments, and on Communication assignments in winter quarter. Hiedi Bauer, Klint Hull and Susan James volunteered to facilitate the workshops.
- The schedule for reviewing GLOBAL SKILLS is as follows:
  - 2013 – Communication
  - 2014 – Numeracy (recommendation is to rename this outcome)
  - 2015 – Interpersonal Relations
  - 2016 – Critical Thinking

SCORING

Critical Thinking *Apply* objective, valid methods of inquiry and problem-solving to draw rational, ethical, and coherent conclusions.

A) Students will identify and define primary problems or issues.

- **AVERAGE SCORE = 3.56** (10 artifacts were not assessable for this outcome)

B) Students will present relevant, accurate, and objective information from a variety of sources and will draw valid inferences from that information.

   Proposed revision: Students will present relevant, accurate, and objective information/evidence from appropriate source(s).

- **AVERAGE SCORE = 3.28** (2 artifacts were not assessable for this outcome)

C) Students will use techniques or processes appropriate to the subject to analyze and make judgments.

Proposed revision: Students will use techniques or processes appropriate to the subject to draw inferences, analyze the information/evidence, and make judgments.

- **AVERAGE SCORE = 3.39** (4 artifacts were not assessable for this outcome)

D) Students will propose and evaluate solutions based on the criteria of logic, evidence, ethical principles, and coherence.

Proposed revision: Students will propose and evaluation solutions/ applications/deliverables/etc. based on the criteria of logic, evidence, ethical principles and coherence.

- **AVERAGE SCORE = 3.00** (41 artifacts were not assessable for this outcome)

OVERALL

- **AVERAGE OVERALL SCORE = 3.30**

2012 Critical Thinking Artifacts

	A	B	C	D
Average Score	3.56	3.28	3.39	3.00
Artifacts not assessable	10	2	4	41