Scoring Session Feedback

Spring 2020

Scoring Participants: Doug Texter, Coy Speer, Dara Sanders-Aceves, Robin Billington, Nick Macaluso, and Stephen Miller

Facilitators: Doug Texter

Outcome Scored: Critical Thinking General Education

Task: The scoring participants was asked to assess a common student assignment intended to measure the General Education Outcome of Critical Thinking. Each scorer used the same adjusted AAC&U VALUE rubric to assess each student assignment. At the debriefing meeting the following findings were recorded.

Assessment Findings

❖ **What was good about the student sample? What do our students do well?**

The first good thing about our sample is, quite simply, that there was one and that it was as robust as it was. 238 out of 1000 is quite good. Blackboard worked quite well as a delivery method. Some students seemed to understand the cultural limitations of the video, i.e., that success was defined very narrowly and that the examples of successful people seemed to be picked from a very narrow range. Some students were able to compare their own lives to the video.

- **What do our students need to improve under this outcome**?
  (Listed by priority)

Students didn't, for the most part, interrogate the video very much. Students didn't question the concept of success offered in the video. In addition, students didn't question the figures offered as models of success. Finally, students weren't able to contextualize the messages about success that they were hearing and were unable to situate the advice in a wider matrix of success talks and success literature. Part of the reason for this lack of contextualization is that most students haven't had exposure to the classic works of success literature, such as those of Carnegie, Robbins, etc. We questioned the wisdom of having a contextually unembedded "text" for analysis since content mastery leads to being able to think more critically. Students said things like, "Well, it's a Ted Talk; it must be good." Other students concentrated on the fact that the video talked about Bill Gates. Since Gates is so successful, the advice must be good, students opined.

Faculty Scorers' Recommendations

- **What can we do to improve students' skills regarding the outcome at the:**

Faculty/Course Level

We were unsure about how assessment of critical thinking could be done outside of the context of course material or discipline. We think that individual instructors need to better model how critical thinking is done in their areas. We also believe that critical thinking could be taught within disciplines by linking course content and skills to real-world issues, possibly through simulations asking students to apply what they've learned in the course to extra-course situations.

Division Level

We wondered if a better evaluation tool or rubric for assessing critical thinking might be available. We also thought that students' critical thinking skills might benefit from team teaching in that students could see how different people think and disagree about the same issues.

Institutional Level

We thought that that there could be better support for faculty efforts in assessment, more structured training for assessment. We thought that there could be more support for professional development for critical thinking, especially critical thinking in discipline-specific contexts. We also wondered why dual-credit students scored higher than our own regular students.

Assessment Feedback Plan: All college departments will be asked to provide feedback on the above findings in the annual assessment plans, under "takeaways" of general education assessment.

Overview and Quantitative Facts

Unique Student Count of Assessed Artifacts by Student Type

Row Labels	Count of Student ID
Continuing	61.0
First Time Fresh w/hours	1.0
First-time Freshman	77.0
First-Time Non-Degree	1.0
Private HS CC Enrl (Pvt,HmSch)	9.0
Public HS Dual Credit Enrlmt	52.0
Readmit	24.0
Transfer from NM	3.0
Transfer Outside NM	2.0
(blank)	
Grand Total	**230.0**

Unique Student Count of Assessed Artifacts by Ethnicity

Row Labels	Count of Student ID
American Indian/Alaskan Nat	7.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	6.0
Black/African Am/Non-Hispanic	4.0
Hispanic	116.0
Unknown\No Response	27.0
White Non-Hispanic	70.0
(blank)	
Grand Total	**230.0**

Unique Student Count of Assessed Artifacts by Gender

Row Labels	Count of Student ID
F	151.0
M	76.0
N	3.0
(blank)	
Grand Total	**230.0**

Average Age by Student Type

Row Labels	Average of Age
Continuing	26.1
First Time Fresh w/hours	18.0
First-time Freshman	20.1
First-Time Non-Degree	26.0
Private HS CC Enrl (Pvt,HmSch)	16.9
Public HS Dual Credit Enrlmt	16.2
Readmit	29.6
Transfer from NM	24.7
Transfer Outside NM	36.0
(blank)	
Grand Total	**21.9**

Ages for Assignment Submission Ranged from 14 to 63 (Mode 18 with 56 participants)

Student submissions came from 27 separate majors plus dual credit students

Average Score by Question and Student Type

Average Score for Problem Setting: Delineate a problem or question.	Average Score for Evidence Acquisition: Identify and gather the information/data necessary to address the problem or question.	Average Score for Evidence Evaluation: Evaluate evidence/data for credibility (e.g. bias, reliability, validity), probable truth, and relevance to a situation.	Average Score for Reasoning/Conclusion: Develop conclusions, solutions, and outcomes that reflect an informed, wellreasoned evaluation.	Average of Total Score
1.47	1.38	1.42	1.73	1.50

Average Score by Student Type

Student Type	Average of Total Score
Continuing	1.39
First-time Freshman	1.52
Dual Credit	1.61
Readmit	1.49

Scoring Scale

Scoring Scale
0 = Did not Attempt/Irrelevant Response
1 = Emerging
2 = Developing
3 = Proficient

Critical Thinking Rubric

Critical Thinking Rubric (Addresses 4 of 4)

This rubric was created using the *NMHED Essential Skill Rubrics*, and the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) *Written Communication VALUE Rubric.*

Retrieved from https://www.aacu.org/value-rubrics

Rating	Did not attempt	Emerging	Developing	Proficient
Problem Setting: Delineate a problem or question.	☐	☐Yes ☐No ☐ An open-ended problem or question, appropriate to the context, is stated without clarification or description.	☐Yes ☐No ☐ An open-ended problem or question, appropriate to the context, is stated, but the description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.	☐Yes ☐No ☐ An open-ended problem or question, appropriate to the context, is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all the relevant information necessary for a full understanding.
Evidence Acquisition: Identify and gather the information/data necessary to address the problem or question.	☐	☐Yes ☐No ☐ Some, but not sufficient, evidence is acquired from source(s) with minimal or no consideration of its appropriateness to the problem or question.	☐Yes ☐No ☐ Evidence is taken from source(s) to minimally address the problem or question at hand, with some consideration of its appropriateness.	☐Yes ☐No ☐ Evidence is taken from source(s) to sufficiently address the question or problem, with a thorough consideration of its appropriateness.
Evidence Evaluation: Evaluate evidence/data for credibility (e.g. bias, reliability, validity), probable truth, and relevance to a situation.	☐	☐Yes ☐No ☐ Information taken from source(s) is minimally evaluated, but not enough to develop a well-rounded assertion of its credibility.	☐Yes ☐No ☐ Information taken from source(s) is evaluated, providing some justified assertions of its credibility, but without sufficient awareness of the evaluation process itself (such as personal assumptions).	☐Yes ☐No ☐ Information taken from source(s) is evaluated, providing some justified assertions of its credibility, and giving sufficient consideration of the evaluation process itself (such as personal assumptions).
Reasoning/Conclusion: Develop conclusions, solutions, and outcomes that reflect an informed, well-reasoned evaluation.	☐	☐Yes ☐No ☐ Conclusion(s) is/are given, but are inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes and solutions are oversimplified.	☐Yes ☐No ☐ Conclusion(s) is/are logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	☐Yes ☐No ☐ Conclusion(s) is/are logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.