



2010-2015 General Education Assessment Plan

General Education Assessment Task Force

Martin Bourgeois, College of Arts and Sciences
Rebecca Donlan, Library Services
Sherree Houston, College of Education
Bette Jackson, College of Arts and Sciences
Scott Karakas, General Education Program Director (Co-chair)
Chuck Lindsey, Faculty Senate President (Co-chair)
Maria Roca, College of Arts and Sciences
Carol Sweeney, Lutgert College of Business
Mary Ann Zager, College of Professional Studies

September 27, 2010

Assessment of Written Communication

I. Proposed Five-Year Plan for Assessment of Written Communication Skills

- Use the Written Communication VALUE (Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education) Rubric developed by the Association of American Colleges and Universities. For our purposes, the Benchmark Criteria (1) will be what is expected from students who enter Composition I and the Milestone Criteria (2) will be what is expected from students who have completed Composition II.
- For the Direct Assessment, faculty external to the sample course sections will use the Written Communication rubric to score approximately 100 essays from five randomly-selected course sections; for the Indirect Assessment, students will use the same rubric to evaluate their own work. We will analyze the correlation between faculty scores and student self-evaluations and will work to achieve a high level of correlation between these scores. Complete only a Direct Assessment in the pilot year (Spring 2010); add an Indirect Assessment (student survey using the same instrument) in the first full year (2010-11).
- External assessment will be undertaken through analysis of student responses to the Writing questions from the ETS Proficiency Profile.

II. Proposed Timeline for Assessment

Summer 2010

- Evaluate 100 essays gathered from students at the end of Composition II in the spring 2010 year.
- Complete a rubric-based scoring session using the VALUE rubric in order to assess student learning in the areas provided on the rubric.

Fall 2010

- Present the data gathered in the summer to the Composition Steering Committee.
- Discuss and then set a specific improvement goal for the academic year based on the data.
- Determine whether we can assess the specific goal with our regular yearly process or if we wish to adopt additional assessment measures.
- Identify and share resources with faculty to facilitate work on the goal.
- Plan and present a professional development opportunity to help faculty member's work on the improvement goal in Composition I and II classes.
- Share data review and improvement plan, including inter-rater reliability and exemplars, with the General Education Program Director.

Spring 2011

- Gather 100 essays from students nearing completion of Composition II from a random selection of sections taught by faculty other than those who scored the essays in the pilot year (Spring 2010).
- Use the same group of scorers as in the pilot year to score the 100 essays, along with two new scorers.
- Have the students in those classes complete an indirect assessment of their work using the same rubric that the faculty will use to score the essays.
- At the end of the 2010-2011 academic year, the Director of Composition will review all assessment data for the Written Communication competency in conjunction with the General Education Program Director, and will offer suggestions for curricular revision or for future assessment plans.

Summer 2011

- Repeat assessment of essays procedure to determine if an improvement in attainment of student learning outcomes has occurred.
- Determine if a continued focus on the area of improvement is warranted or if a new area for improvement will be defined.

Academic Year 2011-12

- Complete a second round of assessment.

Academic Year 2012-13

- Complete a third round of assessment.

After 2013, perform assessment biennially. Assessment procedures will be reviewed on an ongoing basis, and adapted as necessary.

Written Communication Skills Assessment Proposed Annual Budget

6 scorers @ \$250 per scorer

For summer 2011, the same scorers will be used as in the summer 2010 pilot, plus two additional scorers (Lori Cornelius, Emily Vallier, Niki Costantino, Anna Haney-Withrow, Linda Rowland and two new scorers). Each year, new scorers will be added, and others will rotate out to maintain 6 scorers per session.

1 Coordinator @ \$500 (Linda Rowland)

Supplies and miscellaneous expenses @ \$100

5 x \$250 = \$1250

1 x \$500 = \$500

1 x \$100 = \$100

Total = \$1850 per academic year. Annual increase of 7% to cover projected enrollment increases.

Scorer Qualifications and Responsibilities

- MA, MFA, or PhD in English
- Instructor or Adjunct teaching Composition I and II at FGCU
- Read and score all sample essays before scoring session, using rubric, for norming
- Attend scoring session, prepared to discuss sample essays for norming and to read and score collected essays
- Total time: 2 hours (scoring sample essays) + 8 hours (for scoring session) = 10 hours (\$25 per hour)

Coordinator Qualifications and Responsibilities

- MA, MFA, or PhD in English
- Composition Coordinator at FGCU
- Coordinate standardized assignment and use of rubric for indirect assessment
- Collect all essays for scoring session from instructors
- Collect all indirect assessments completed by students
- Select sample essays for norming during scoring session
- Attend scoring session, prepared to lead discussion about sample essays for norming and to read and score collected essays
- Total time: 10 hours (coordinating assignment; collecting essays; collecting indirect assessments; selecting norming essays) + 8 hours (for scoring session) + 2 hours (coordinating responses) = 20 hours (\$25 per hour)

| FGCU Outcome | Rubric criteria | Capstone (4) Senior year | Milestone (3) Junior year | Milestone (2) End of Comp II | Benchmark (1) Entering freshmen |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| <p>Comp 1: Formulate a topic and develop it for a specific audience and purpose</p> <p>Comp 2: Formulate a sound argument and develop it for a specific audience and purpose</p> | <p>Context of and Purpose for Writing <i>Includes considerations of audience, purpose, and the circumstances surrounding the writing task(s).</i></p> | <p>Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.</p> | <p>Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus on the assigned task(s) (e.g., the task aligns with audience, purpose, and context).</p> | <p>Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).</p> | <p>Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).</p> |
| <p>Comp 1 and 2: Select, organize, and relate ideas and information with clarity and precision</p> | <p>Content Development</p> | <p>Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work.</p> | <p>Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work.</p> | <p>Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work.</p> | <p>Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work.</p> |
| <p>Comp 1: Employ conventions specific to particular types of essays</p> <p>Comp 2: Employ conventions specific to academic writing</p> | <p>Genre and Disciplinary Conventions <i>Formal and informal rules inherent in the expectations for writing in particular forms and/or academic fields.</i></p> | <p>Demonstrates detailed attention to and successful execution of a wide range of conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task (s) including organization, content, presentation, formatting, and stylistic choices</p> | <p>Demonstrates consistent use of important conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s), including organization, content, presentation, and stylistic choices</p> | <p>Follows expectations appropriate to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) for basic organization, content, and presentation</p> | <p>Attempts to use a consistent system for basic organization and presentation.</p> |
| <p>Comp 1: Use basic research skills including collecting, managing, and documenting information</p> <p>Comp 2: Use higher level research skills including collecting, evaluating, managing, incorporating, and documenting information</p> | <p>Sources and Evidence</p> | <p>Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing</p> | <p>Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are situated within the discipline and genre of the writing.</p> | <p>Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing.</p> | <p>Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the writing.</p> |
| <p>Comp 1 and 2: Employ the conventions of standard written English</p> | <p>Control of Syntax and Mechanics</p> | <p>Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free.</p> | <p>Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the portfolio has few errors.</p> | <p>Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors.</p> | <p>Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.</p> |

Borrowed from AAC&U's VALUE project – Written Communication Rubric

Assessment of Oral Communication

I. Proposed Five-Year Plan for Assessment of Oral Communication Skills

Communication faculty will use an Oral Communication rubric (adapted from AAC&U's VALUE project) to assess oral presentations in selected General Education courses. Faculty external to the courses where the assessment will occur will use the rubric to score student presentations; students will also complete a self-assessment of their presentation, using the same rubric. Students will be expected to reach Milestone 2 on the Direct Assessment.

II. Proposed Timeline for Assessment

Summer 2010

- Design survey of General Education courses to determine where oral presentations are required.
- Distribute survey to faculty.
- Select appropriate General Education courses for fall 2010 assessment.
- Begin analyzing survey responses.

Fall 2010

- Select/design appropriate validated assessment rubric for the Oral Communication competency.
- Based on the same rubric that faculty will use for assessment, develop student self-assessment rubric for indirect assessment.

Spring 2011

- Assess presentations in selected General Education courses, including both the Direct Assessment (faculty external to the courses will visit the courses and use the Oral Communication rubric to assess student learning) and Indirect Assessment (students in these same classes will assess their own presentation using the same rubric).
- At the end of the 2010-2011 academic year, a Communication assessment team will review all assessment data for the Oral Communication competency in conjunction with the General Education Program Director, and will offer suggestions for curricular revision or for future assessment plans for the Oral Communication competency.

Summer 2011

- Plan for implementation of proposed curricular changes.

Academic Year 2011-12

- Complete a second round of assessment.

Academic Year 2012-13

- Complete a third round of assessment.

After 2013, complete assessment on a biennial basis.

N.B. Currently, FGCU does not require students to complete a course that teaches oral communication skills. Students complete presentations in a variety of classes, but these presentations are generally designed to meet other goals (not to teach oral communication skills). To teach this outcome at a high level would mean requiring Public Speaking or some other course that teaches this skill.

Oral Communication Skills Assessment Proposed Annual Budget

6 scorers @ \$125 per scorer

Each year, new scorers will be added, and others will rotate out to maintain 6 scorers per session.

1 Assessment Coordinator @ \$500

Supplies and miscellaneous expenses @ \$100

5 x \$125 = \$625

1 x \$500 = \$500

1 x \$100 = \$100

Total = \$1225 per academic year. Annual increase of 7% to cover projected enrollment increases.

6 scorers will visit a total of 4 class sessions each (1 hour 15 minute sessions), in 2-person teams. Each team of scorers would visit two weeks' worth of classes and evaluate 35 presentations, for a total of 105 presentations. Each scorer would work a total of 5 hours @ \$25 per hour.

Final Review Session/Compilation & Analysis of Data

The Assessment Coordinator will compile the data and do the first cut of the analysis. The sharing of the data and conclusions should be led by the General Education Director, working with the faculty who teach the Gen Ed courses where the assessment occurred.

Scorer Qualifications and Responsibilities

- MA, MFA, or PhD in Communication (or a related discipline)
- Faculty member in Communication (or a related discipline) at FGCU
- Read and score all sample essays before scoring session, using rubric, for norming
- Attend scoring session, prepared to discuss sample essays for norming and to read and score collected essays

Coordinator Qualifications and Responsibilities

- MA, MFA, or PhD in Communication (or a related discipline)
- Faculty member in Communication (or a related discipline at FGCU)
- Coordinate standardized assignment and use of rubric for indirect assessment
- Collect all essays for scoring session from instructors
- Collect all indirect assessments completed by students
- Select sample essays for norming during scoring session
- Attend scoring session, prepared to lead discussion about sample essays for norming and to read and score collected essays

Cost for Adding Sufficient Sections for a Required General Education Course in Public Speaking

- We currently have 18 sections on the fall 2010 schedule = 450 students. If we have a similar number in the spring, we would cover a total of 900 students between fall and spring.
- We had 2,250 FTICs this year, along with a large number of transfer students who would need to complete this requirement, totaling approximately 3,000 students in the 2010/2011 year.
- We would need additional seats for 2,100 students, or 84 sections over fall and spring—42 sections per semester. If 75% are taught by full-time faculty, this would equate to about 32 sections per semester, or about 10 faculty lines. Along with these 10 faculty lines, we would need an increase in our adjunct budget of \$50,000 (10 sections per semester x \$2,500 x 2 semesters).
- As our student population grows, so would the number of lines and adjunct budget dedicated to this course.

Oral Communication VALUE Rubric

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org

The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

The type of oral communication most likely to be included in a collection of student work is an oral presentation and therefore is the focus for the application of this rubric.

Definition

Oral communication is a prepared, purposeful presentation designed to increase knowledge, to foster understanding, or to promote change in the listeners' attitudes, values, beliefs, or behaviors.

Framing Language

Oral communication takes many forms. This rubric is specifically designed to evaluate oral presentations of a single speaker at a time and is best applied to live or video-recorded presentations. For panel presentations or group presentations, it is recommended that each speaker be evaluated separately. This rubric best applies to presentations of sufficient length such that a central message is conveyed, supported by one or more forms of supporting materials and includes a purposeful organization. An oral answer to a single question not designed to be structured into a presentation does not readily apply to this rubric.

Glossary

The definitions that follow were developed to clarify terms and concepts used in this rubric only.

- **Central message:** The main point/thesis/"bottom line"/"take-away" of a presentation. A clear central message is easy to identify; a compelling central message is also vivid and memorable.
- **Delivery techniques:** Posture, gestures, eye contact, and use of the voice. Delivery techniques enhance the effectiveness of the presentation when the speaker stands and moves with authority, looks more often at the audience than at his/her speaking materials/notes, uses the voice expressively, and uses few vocal fillers ("um," "uh," "like," "you know," etc.).
- **Language:** Vocabulary, terminology, and sentence structure. Language that supports the effectiveness of a presentation is appropriate to the topic and audience, grammatical, clear, and free from bias. Language that enhances the effectiveness of a presentation is also vivid, imaginative, and expressive.
- **Organization:** The grouping and sequencing of ideas and supporting material in a presentation. An organizational pattern that supports the effectiveness of a presentation typically includes an introduction, one or more identifiable sections in the body of the speech, and a conclusion. An organizational pattern that enhances the effectiveness of the presentation reflects a purposeful choice among possible alternatives, such as a chronological pattern, a problem-solution pattern, an analysis-of-parts pattern, etc., that makes the content of the presentation easier to follow and more likely to accomplish its purpose.
- **Supporting material:** Explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities, and other kinds of information or analysis that supports the principal ideas of the presentation. Supporting material is generally credible when it is relevant and derived from reliable and appropriate sources. Supporting material is highly credible when it is also vivid and varied across the types listed above (e.g., a mix of examples, statistics, and references to authorities). Supporting material may also serve the purpose of establishing the speaker's credibility. For example, in presenting a creative work such as a dramatic reading of Shakespeare, supporting evidence may not advance the ideas of Shakespeare, but rather serve to establish the speaker as a credible Shakespearean actor.

Oral Communication VALUE Rubric

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org

Definition

Oral communication is a prepared, purposeful presentation designed to increase knowledge, to foster understanding, or to promote change in the listeners' attitudes, values, beliefs, or behaviors.

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance

| | Capstone 4 | Milestones | | Benchmark 1 |
|----------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| | | 3 | 2 | |
| Organization | Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable and is skillful and makes the content of the presentation cohesive. | Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable within the presentation. | Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is intermittently observable within the presentation. | Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is not observable within the presentation. |
| Language | Language choices are imaginative, memorable, and compelling, and enhance the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience. | Language choices are thoughtful and generally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience. | Language choices are mundane and commonplace and partially support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience. | Language choices are unclear and minimally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is not appropriate to audience. |
| Delivery | Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation compelling, and speaker appears polished and confident. | Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation interesting, and speaker appears comfortable. | Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation understandable, and speaker appears tentative. | Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) detract from the understandability of the presentation, and speaker appears uncomfortable. |
| Supporting Material | A variety of types of supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that significantly supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic. | Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that generally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic. | Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that partially supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic. | Insufficient supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make reference to information or analysis that minimally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/ authority on the topic. |
| Central Message | Central message is compelling (precisely stated, appropriately repeated, memorable, and strongly supported.) | Central message is clear and consistent with the supporting material. | Central message is basically understandable but is not often repeated and is not memorable. | Central message can be deduced, but is not explicitly stated in the presentation. |

Assessment of Critical Thinking

I. Proposed Five-Year Plan for Assessment of Critical Thinking Skills

Faculty who teach HUM 2510 - Understanding Visual and Performing Arts will use a Critical Thinking rubric (adapted from AAC&U's VALUE project) to assess student essays completed in this course. Students will be expected to reach Milestone 2 on this direct assessment. Indirect assessment will be accomplished through added student questions on the Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI) for the course. External assessment will be undertaken through analysis of student responses to the Reading/Critical Thinking questions from the ETS Proficiency Profile.

II. Timeline for Assessment

Summer 2010

- Plan assessment of critical thinking skills using the Critical Thinking VALUE (Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education) Rubric developed by the Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Develop indirect assessment questions based on the above criteria for the Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI)

Fall 2010

- Begin utilizing the VALUE Critical Thinking rubric for the two Critical Analysis Essay assignments. Preceptor and faculty training in the rubric to be completed early in the fall semester.
- For each of the two Critical Analysis Essays, HUM 2510 preceptors provide specific feedback to students, including the enhanced grading criteria for critical thinking skills.
- At the end of the semester, the HUM 2510 course coordinator collects a random selection of 10% of student submissions for each Critical Analysis Essay, to be assessed by a designated preceptor using the Essay Grading Rubric.
- Indirect assessment of student perceptions of their own critical thinking skills undertaken through added questions on the SAI for the course. Students will have received a copy of the Essay Grading Rubric at the beginning of the semester.

Spring 2011

- Designated preceptor scores HUM 2510 essays using the Critical Thinking rubric.
- Faculty members assess attainment of the student learning outcomes by comparing the results of the direct and the indirect assessments for each of the two sets of sample essays. Scores from the two essays will also be compared to determine value added from preceptor feedback.
- HUM 2510 faculty members make curricular changes to improve student achievement of critical thinking skills for AY 2011-2012.

Summer 2011

- The HUM 2510 course coordinator collects the faculty data, deliberations, and course changes related to student achievement of critical thinking skills. The course coordinator will then forward the material to the General Education Program Director for review.
- Throughout AY 2010-2011, faculty members continue working with the E-Learning Designer on the HUM 2510 course redesign, to include enhanced assessment of student achievement of General Education Competency 4: Critical Thinking. Assessment will follow plan approved by the University Assessment Council. Goal for implementation of redesigned version of HUM 2510: fall of 2012.

Academic Year 2011-12

- Complete a second round of assessment of multiple choice items and of indirect assessment.

Academic Year 2012-13

- Complete a third round of assessment.

After 2013, perform assessment biennially. Assessment procedures will be reviewed on an ongoing basis, and adapted as necessary.

Critical Thinking Skills Assessment Proposed Annual Budget

Faculty Members: 4 @ \$250 per person = \$1000

Preceptor: 120 essays @ \$10 per essay = \$1200

Course Coordinator: stipend = \$2050

Total = \$4250 per academic year. Annual increase of 7% to cover projected enrollment increases.

Faculty Member Qualifications and Responsibilities

- MFA/PhD in the Humanities
- Supervise essay scoring by all preceptors in his/her course section
- Assess sample of Critical Analysis Essays collected by course coordinator, using enhanced Essay Grading Rubric
- Review assessment data and make pedagogical changes to improve student achievement of critical thinking skills
- Total time per faculty member: 10 minutes per essay x 120 essays = 20 hours @ \$25 per hour

Preceptor Qualifications and Responsibilities

- BA/BS in the Humanities
- Nominated by one or more HUM 2510 faculty members
- Responsible for 1-2 cohorts of 60 students each, depending on experience
- Read and score all Critical Analysis Essays, using AAC&U VALUE rubric
- Provide essay feedback for each assigned student, 60-120 per semester
- Total time per preceptor: 10 minutes per essay x 2 essays = 20-40 hours (40-80 hours per AY)

Course Coordinator Qualifications and Responsibilities

- BA in the Humanities
- 5+ years experience with HUM 2510 and the ANGEL online course management system
- Collect a random selection of 10% of student submissions for each of the two Critical Analysis Essays, to be assessed by HUM 2510 faculty members
- Collect all indirect assessments completed by students for the fall semester SAI
- Coordinate faculty direct assessment of collected sample essays and indirect SAI student feedback
- Collect faculty data, deliberations, and course changes related to student achievement of critical thinking skills, generate report and forward to the General Education Program Director
- Implement faculty course changes in ANGEL, editing online syllabus, text documents and assignments as necessary
- Total time: 10 hours (collecting sample essays and indirect student assessments, coordinating faculty analysis of direct and indirect assessments) + 10 hours (collecting faculty data and generating report for Gen Ed Program Director) + 10 hours (implementing changes to online course) = 30 hours annually

Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org

The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

Definition

Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.

Framing Language

This rubric is designed to be transdisciplinary, reflecting the recognition that success in all disciplines requires habits of inquiry and analysis that share common attributes. Further, research suggests that successful critical thinkers from all disciplines increasingly need to be able to apply those habits in various and changing situations encountered in all walks of life.

This rubric is designed for use with many different types of assignments and the suggestions here are not an exhaustive list of possibilities. Critical thinking can be demonstrated in assignments that require students to complete analyses of text, data, or issues. Assignments that cut across presentation mode might be especially useful in some fields. If insight into the process components of critical thinking (e.g., how information sources were evaluated regardless of whether they were included in the product) is important, assignments focused on student reflection might be especially illuminating.

Glossary

The definitions that follow were developed to clarify terms and concepts used in this rubric only.

- Ambiguity: Information that may be interpreted in more than one way.
- Assumptions: Ideas, conditions, or beliefs (often implicit or unstated) that are "taken for granted or accepted as true without proof." (quoted from www.dictionary.reference.com/browse/assumptions)
- Context: The historical, ethical, political, cultural, environmental, or circumstantial settings or conditions that influence and complicate the consideration of any issues, ideas, artifacts, and events.
- Literal meaning: Interpretation of information exactly as stated. For example, "she was green with envy" would be interpreted to mean that her skin was green.
- Metaphor: Information that is (intended to be) interpreted in a non-literal way. For example, "she was green with envy" is intended to convey an intensity of emotion, not a skin color.

Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org

Definition

Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance

| | Capstone 4 | Milestones | | Benchmark 1 |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| | | 3 | 2 | |
| Explanation of issues | Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding. | Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions. | Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown. | Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description. |
| Evidence <i>Selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion</i> | Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are questioned | Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning. | Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning. | Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/evaluation. Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question. |
| Influence of context and assumptions | Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position. | Identifies own and others' assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position. | Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa). | Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions). Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position. |
| Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) | Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) are acknowledged. Others' points of view are synthesized within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis). | Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue. Others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis). | Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue. | Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious. |
| Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences) | Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical and reflect student's informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order. | Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly. | Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly. | Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified. |

Assessment of Quantitative Reasoning

I. Proposed Five-Year Plan for Assessment of Quantitative Reasoning Skills

- Use embedded assessment of quantitative reasoning (QR) outcomes by analyzing performance on specific items on multiple choice tests. These items will be identified by a group of faculty as addressing the QR competencies. The faculty team will also establish student outcome benchmarks.
- Indirect assessment will be done by including supplemental questions on the Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI) survey.
- Beginning in 2011-12, conduct a similar assessment for students in STA 2037 (Statistics with Calculus).
- External assessment will be undertaken through analysis of student responses to the Mathematics questions from the ETS Proficiency Profile.

Summer 2010

- Designate a sample of 6-7 sections of STA 2023 from which data will be collected.
- Identify sections of STA 2023 textbook that all instructors in the sample are going to cover
- Identify learning objectives in those sections that correspond to QR outcomes

Fall 2010

- Identify test items to be given on in-class exams that address the learning objectives identified earlier.
- Design supplemental questions for SAI to measure students' self-perceptions on their attainment of QR competencies.
- Collect results on the identified items for all students in the sample.
- Compile data on percentage who gave correct answers and certain incorrect answers.

Spring 2011

- Review data; make recommendations for course changes to improve outcomes.
- Review assessment process to see if any changes need to be made in sample selection and/or choice of test items.
- Make curricular changes to address needs/deficiencies identified in review.
- Forward assessment data, faculty responses, and related material to the General Education Program Director.

Academic Year 2011-12

- Complete a second round of assessment of multiple choice items and of indirect assessment

Academic Year 2012-13

- Complete a third round of assessment.

After 2013, perform assessment biennially. Assessment procedures will be reviewed on an ongoing basis, and adapted as necessary.

Quantitative Reasoning Skills Assessment Proposed Annual Budget

Assessment Coordinator: \$1000

The assessment coordinator will be responsible for bringing together faculty teams to decide on items to be assessed and for writing supplemental SAI questions for indirect assessment. S/he will collect and archive test answer sheets with relevant questions, compiling the data each semester, and performing preliminary analysis on the results, and communicating these results to the mathematics faculty.

Total = \$1,000 per academic year. Annual increase of 7% to cover projected enrollment increases.

External Assessment Plan

I. Proposed Five-Year Plan for External Assessment of the General Education Competencies

- Use the Educational Testing Service (ETS) Proficiency Profile, formerly known as the Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP). This national assessment tool has been approved by the Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) as a gauge of general education outcomes.
- The two-hour standard form comprises 108 questions assessing student skills in Reading/Critical Thinking, Writing, and Mathematics. An additional 30 minutes are required for the pre-administration process. The standard form provides the overall total score for the students, along with their individual proficiency levels and norm-referenced scores. **None of the test questions assess oral communication skills.**
- The standard form is offered in both paper/pencil and online formats. Reporting for both formats is delivered online, so that different groups of students can be combined even if different formats are used subsequently.
- There are no testing timeframes, so tests may be used at any time. Unused tests do not expire, and may be used for subsequent administrations.
- Assessment of cohorts of students at three points in their academic careers - as entering freshmen, at 60-70 credit hours, and at 100-120 hours - will provide longitudinal data on educational value added, for both the FGCU General Education Program and institutional VSA reports.
- Cost for the standard form is \$15.80/test. Volume discounts at \$14.80/test for purchasing 500+ tests at a time, or \$13.80/test for purchasing 1000+ tests at a time.

II. Timeline for Assessment

Academic Year 2010-2011

- Purchase 279 paper/pencil format ETS Proficiency Profile tests at \$15.80 per test.
- ETS Proficiency Profile tests administered to 279 students in randomly-selected sections of HUM 1931 - First Year Humanities Seminar.
- Assessment results collected from participating faculty members by the General Education Program Director, who reports them to the academic deans, the Assessment Council, the General Education Council, and the Associate Provost/Vice President for Planning and Institutional Performance.
- Results are distributed to faculty throughout the General Education Program, to assist them in planning curricular changes to improve student achievement of Writing, Mathematics, and Critical Thinking skills.

Academic Year 2011-2012

- Purchase 1000 online format ETS Proficiency Profile tests at \$13.80 per test, for use in assessments from 2011-2014.
- Invite a representative sample of approximately 300 entering FTIC and transfer students to become members of the FGCU Eagles for Excellence team.
- Students who are invited to join Eagles for Excellence will be asked to commit to taking the ETS Proficiency Profile three times (two times in the case of transfer students), and to sharing their results with the institution for analysis. They may also be asked to participate in focus groups and surveys.
- Benchmark standard is for FGCU students to achieve mean scores equivalent to the national norms in the areas of Reading/Critical Thinking, Writing, and Mathematics.
- Assessment results are collected from participating faculty members by the General Education Program Director, who will report their findings to the academic deans, the Assessment Council, the General Education Council, and the Associate Provost/Vice President for Planning and Institutional Performance.
- For their participation, all Eagles for Excellence members will receive the following:
 - Score reports that will enable them to see their progress over time and compare their results with national standards,
 - Feedback from the institution on how their results will be used to improve student achievement of key academic skills,
 - A letter of thanks from the General Education Program Director upon completion of their commitment.

- In addition to the above, participants who achieve test scores in the upper 20% range will receive:
 - 50% remission of their on-campus parking fees for the year in which their score was achieved;
 - A letter of congratulations from the Provost for their accomplishment.
- Those participants who achieve test scores in the upper 10% range will receive:
 - 100% remission of their on-campus parking fees for the year in which their score was achieved;
 - A letter of congratulations from the President for their accomplishment.

Academic Year 2012-13

- Assessment results are distributed to faculty throughout the General Education Program, to assist them in planning curricular changes to improve student achievement of Writing, Mathematics, and Critical Thinking skills.

After 2013, perform assessment biennially for each successive group of cohorts. Assessment procedures will be reviewed on an ongoing basis, and adapted as necessary.

**ETS Proficiency Profile
Proposed 2010-2014 Budget**

Academic Year 2010-2011

279 paper/pencil standard form tests @ \$15.80 per test = \$4408

Supplies and miscellaneous expenses = \$100

Total = \$4508

Academic Year 2011-2012

300 online form tests @ \$15.80 per test = \$4740

Testing Center administration costs for 300 students @ \$1.25 per student = \$375

Total = \$5115

Increase of 12% per testing cycle to cover projected enrollment increases. Also:

Est. 40 x 50% student parking fee remissions @ \$41.25 per student = \$1650 less revenue

Est. 30 x 100 % student parking fee remissions @ \$82.50 per student = \$2475 less revenue

After 2011-2012, perform assessment biennially, purchasing additional ETS online tests as needed. Assessment procedures and costs will be reviewed on an ongoing basis, and adapted as necessary.

Proposed Six-Year ETS Testing Schedule

| Cohort Type | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 |
|---------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| In-Class | 279 | | | | | |
| 0-20 Hours | | 200 | | 330 | | 375 |
| 60-70 Hours | | 100 | | 330 | | 375 |
| 100-120 Hours | | | | | | 375 |

ESTIMATED 2010-2016 ANNUAL ASSESSMENT BUDGETS

| Assessment Type | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 |
|--------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Written Communication | \$1850 | \$1980 | \$2118 | \$0 | \$2425 | \$0 |
| Oral Communication | \$1225 | \$1310 | \$1402 | \$0 | \$1605 | \$0 |
| Critical Thinking | \$4250 | \$4548 | \$4865 | \$0 | \$5570 | \$0 |
| Quantitative Reasoning | \$1000 | \$1070 | \$1145 | \$0 | \$1310 | \$0 |
| ETS Proficiency Profile | \$4508 | \$5115 | \$0 | \$10,143 | \$0 | \$15,900 |
| TOTAL | \$12,833 | \$14,023 | \$9503 | \$10,143 | \$10,910 | \$15,900 |

Average total annual assessment budget for general education and the VSA = \$12,218.66