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

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

Course: ECON 201

Learning Outcome: Critical Thinking

Assessment Method/Tool: Common Rubric-EPCC

Measurement Scale: 3-1

Sample Size: Exam 1: 18/Exam 2: 20

	Proficient (# of students)		Adequate (# of students)		Developing (# of students)	
Exam 1: Identifies and explains Issues	14	78%	6	33%	6	33%
Exam 2: Identifies and explains Issues	14	70%	4	20%	2	10%
Exam 1: Recognizes contexts and assumptions	13	72%	7	19%	5	28%
Exam 2: Recognizes contexts and assumptions	18	90%	0	0%	2	10%
Exam 1: Acknowledges multiple perspectives	7	19%	1	6%	10	55%
Exam 2: Acknowledges multiple perspectives	5	25%	7	30%	8	40%
Exam 1: Evaluates evidence to reach conclusions	5	28%	4	22%	7	39%
Exam 2: Evaluates evidence to reach conclusions	11	55%	8	40%	1	10%
Median %		63%		21%		24%

Benchmark:	85%	Institutional benchmark goal for median percentage of students to meet "Proficient" or "Adequate" levels in the GEC
Median % Achieving Benchmark:	84%	Actual median percentage of students meeting "Adequate" or "Proficient" levels

Closing the Loop:

Critical Thinking was assessed with specific questions on two exams, with an n of 18 on the first exam and 20 on the second. The median average for those scoring "proficient" or "adequate" for the two exams is 84%, one percentage point below threshold for the Critical Thinking Outcome in the General Education Core.

Looking at the performance of students from exam 1 and exam 2, I get an overall mean of 72% hitting the target of either "proficient" or adequate, with a median of 84%. This is the composite mean of the performance on exam 1 (83%) and exam 2 (61%).

Looking at performance over two exams helps me be confident that high/low scores are not an exceptional result related to a given question. For example, performance was reasonably good for criteria 1 and 2 (Identify/explain issues and recognize context/assumptions) across both exams. Performance was weak for criterion 3 (multiple perspectives) on both exams. For the fourth criterion (effectively evaluating evidence to reach conclusions), performance was very good on the first exam and poor on the second exam. This leads me to think that performance on criteria one and two is relatively strong, on criterion three performance is poor, and I am unsure about criterion four. Also, across all four criteria, performance dipped from exam 1 to exam 2.

The fall in scores from exam 1 to exam 2 may be the result of significantly more difficult material but I am only guessing. We need to focus some attention on performance over the course of the term to determine if this is an anomaly, a remnant of difficult material, or a fall in student performance. Of course, if we conclude that student performance is falling then we can ask why.

Action Plan:

With these results in mind, looking ahead we need to 1) strengthen the work

explicitly dedicated to acknowledging multiple perspectives, and 2) refine our approach to gauging performance with respect to criteria four. This latter action should be do-able by designing a question that better targets the criteria.

Program faculty should discuss issues associated with acknowledging multiple perspectives and evaluating evidence and best practices for addressing them.