## Learning Outcomes Assessment - Critical Thinking

**Assessment ID:** 188

**Name:** hartman, Rebecca  
**Email:** rhartman@eou.edu  
**Program:** History  
**Prefix / Course Number:** HIST / 202

### High Impact Practice (HIP):

- First Year Experience
- Leadership Training
- University Writing Requirement
- Undergraduate Research
- Service Learning / Community-Based Learning
- Performance
- Capstone Project

### Learning Outcome: Critical Thinking

**Assessment Method/Tool:** Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Assumption</th>
<th>Developing (# of students)</th>
<th>Adequate (# of students)</th>
<th>Proficient (# of students)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Identifies and explains issues</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>3 13.6%</td>
<td>19 86.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Recognizes contexts and assumptions</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 27.3%</td>
<td>13 59.1%</td>
<td>3 13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Acknowledges multiple perspectives</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 27.3%</td>
<td>13 59.1%</td>
<td>3 13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Evaluates evidence to reach conclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 40.9%</td>
<td>10 45.5%</td>
<td>3 13.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Averages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Benchmark:

- **85%** Institutional benchmark goal for percent of students to meet "Adequate" or "Proficient" levels
- **76.1%** Actual percent of students meeting "Adequate" or "Proficient" levels

(This institutional benchmark does not take into account the level of the course and the preparedness of the students in the sample. Results will help the institution understand the learning needs of participating students.)
Question / Prompt / Assignment: Analyzing WWI Propaganda Workshop Hist 202

Objectives: To learn about life on the home front during the war.
   To understand why the Wilson administration created the CPI, what the committee did, and how, or if, it contributed to the homogenization of and hysteria within American society during the war.

Small Group Work. Discuss and answer the following questions: 15 minutes
1. For whom was this piece of propaganda designed? How do you know? (Here you must analyze images and symbols and think about whom they would appeal to and why. What message would someone read into these images?) Explain.
2. What was this piece trying to get people to think? To do?
3. What logical appeal was being made?
4. What emotional appeal(s) was being made?
   a. Look for gendered content—some have sexual innuendo, or draw upon ideas of masculinity and femininity. Drawing on what you know from the lectures/readings on gender and WWI, would this content have been effective? Why?
5. Can you theorize on what the results of these appeals may have been? If you were a member of the targeted audience, how would you have reacted? If you were a member of the CPI, what reaction would you be hoping for?

Be sure to take notes. We will reconvene as a class to discuss.

Brief report from each group 10-15 minutes

Whole class discussion: 15-20 minutes
1. What common themes, appeals and images can we identify?
2. How did the U.S. use propaganda to influence public opinion?
3. What general goals would you argue the CPI propaganda wanted to achieve?
4. In your opinion, would the propaganda have contributed to social homogenization and/or hysteria? Discuss.

Commentary / Explanation: This survey course covers US involvement in WWI about 5 weeks into the course. It's designed to start preparing students to analyze much of the visual evidence from late 20th century. It also introduces them to cultural history evidence and how it can be used to draw historical, analytical conclusions.

Data Analysis: What do these results mean? (what do the results indicate regarding student proficiency in the outcome assessed)

The results suggest to me that the students in general are quite proficient in identifying issues and adequate/prof. in recognizing contexts, assumptions and recognizing multiple perspectives. The weakness is in evaluating evidence to reach conclusions, especially independent conclusions.

Closing the Loop: I will work through the process of evaluating visual imagery before the workshop in a way that will model for them how to move beyond a set of more "obvious" claims based on the evidence and develop an analysis of the material that can lead students to more independent conclusions based on evidence.

How do these results relate to University, Program, and General Education Learning Outcomes?) Next time I would do a more thorough set up of the expectations of critical thinking, but I would also disaggregate my own rubric a bit to capture the ways most or many students achieved proficiency in 2 or 3 of the 5 sections of the CT outcomes. For GEC these results suggest we need to focus on one particular issue of CT, actual evaluation and conclusions.

Student Samples (optional): (web links to posted, online files)
   Adequate Example (web address)
   Proficient Example (web address)

NOTE: Student names cannot be used on the samples.
Learning Outcomes Assessment - Critical Thinking

Assessment: ID: 189
Name: Wilson, Tim
Email: twilson@eou.edu
Program: History
Prefix / Course Number: HIST / 202

High Impact Practice (HIP):
- □ First Year Experience
- □ Leadership Training
- □ University Writing Requirement
- □ Undergraduate Research
- □ Service Learning / Community-Based Learning
- □ Performance
- □ Capstone Project
- □ Learning Community
- □ Co-Curriculum
- □ Collaborative Assignments and Projects
- □ Diversity / Global Learning
- □ Internship / Practicum / Field Work
- □ Portfolio

Learning Outcome: Critical Thinking
Assessment Method/Tool: Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement Scale:</th>
<th>1 - 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size:</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developing (# of students)</th>
<th>Adequate (# of students)</th>
<th>Proficient (# of students)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Identifies and explains issues
- 0 0.0% 3 13.6% 19 86.4%

2. Recognizes contexts and assumptions
- 6 27.3% 13 59.1% 3 13.6%

3. Acknowledges multiple perspectives
- 6 27.3% 13 59.1% 3 13.6%

4. Evaluates evidence to reach conclusions
- 9 40.9% 10 45.5% 3 13.6%

Averages: (based on 22 student sample size)
- 5.3 23.9% 9.8 44.3% 7 31.8%

Benchmark: 85%
Institutional benchmark goal for percent of students to meet "Adequate" or "Proficient" levels

Percent Achieving Benchmark: 76.1%
Actual percent of students meeting "Adequate" or "Proficient" levels
Learning Outcomes Assessment - Critical Thinking

Assessment: ID: 189

Question / Prompt / Assignment:
(used for the assessment)

Commentary / Explanation:
(provide context within the
course/activity for the
question/prompt/assignment)

Data Analysis: What do these results mean?
(what do the results indicate regarding student proficiency in the outcome assessed)

Closing the Loop:
How will you use the results to improve student learning?

How do these results relate to University, Program, and General Education Learning Outcomes?)

Student Samples (optional): (web links to posted, online files)
NOTE: Student names cannot be used on the samples.

Developing Example (web address)
Adequate Example (web address)
Proficient Example (web address)