GEC Learning Outcomes (GLOs) Assessment Critical Thinking– Aggregate Results

Assessment Type: GEC   **Year/Term:** AY18

Course: BIOL 101

Learning Outcome: Critical Thinking

Assessment Method/Tool: Common Rubric-EPCC

Measurement Scale: 3-1

Sample Size: 92

	Proficient (# of students)		Adequate (# of students)		Developing (# of students)	
Identifies and explains issues	17	74%	4	17%	2	9%
Recognizes contexts and assumptions	5	22%	9	39%	9	39%
Acknowledges multiple perspectives	4	17.4%	12	52.2%	7	30.4%
Evaluates evidence to reach conclusions	9	39%	13	57%	1	4%
Median % (based on 92 student sample size)		39%		46%		20%

Benchmark: **85%**   Institutional benchmark goal for median percentage of students to meet "Proficient" or "Adequate" levels in the GEC

Percent Achieving Benchmark: **85%**   Actual median percentage of students meeting "Adequate" or "Proficient" levels

Closing the Loop:

In BIOL 101, I give 7 homework assignments, on each assignment I asked critical thinking questions, we start small and build up to more in depth critical thinking questions. After each assignment is graded, I take time to talk about ways the students could improve their answers from developing to adequate to proficient. I used their last homework assignment for the final assessment.

The benchmark for GEC courses is 85% scoring a 2 or 3. This sample has an 85% mean.

- How do you account for that? One of the issues with the low mean is that only 23 of 36 students did the assignment; I think if the entire class completed the assignment the mean would have been higher.

- How might the program address this issue? I do not know how to get students to do their homework; they already lose points for not doing the work. Make it a greater penalty for not turning work is an option.

  The mean for "Identifies and explains issues" and for "Evaluates evidence to reach conclusions" are very strong at 91% and 96% respectively.

- How do you account for those strengths? What is working well? We worked on this aspect all term. During each class period, I gave them a question that addresses this idea. This is the first term I tried this and it seemed to have really worked well.

  There is a noticeable drop for the mean for "Recognizes contexts and assumptions" and for "Acknowledges multiple perspectives" at 61% and 69.6% respectively.

- How do you account these gaps? What recommendations do you have for improvement? On this assignment, I changed these questions slightly from last year's assignment. The students that I gave a 1 to, all copied answers from last year's question which of course was different but they did not realize it so there answer did not address the question. Other students a "googled" answer and I did not give them credit for their work and they also received a low score. If I threw those students out of the assessment, I would have reached my bench mark.

Action Plan:

I will be sharing these results with my Biology colleagues, and ask for suggestions on ways to improve my benchmark scores.