

GEC Learning Outcomes (GLOs) Assessment Critical Thinking

Assessment Type: GEC

Year/Term: AY18

Course: ART 121

Learning Outcome: Critical Thinking

Assessment Method/Tool: Common Rubric-EPCC

Measurement Scale: 3-1

Sample Size: 10

	Proficient (# of students %)		Adequate (# of students %)		Developing (# of students %)	
Identifies and explains Issues	7	70%	2	20%	1	10%
Recognizes contexts and assumptions	7	70%	2	20%	1	10%
Acknowledges multiple perspectives	5	50%	3	20%	2	20%
Evaluates evidence to reach conclusions	8	80%	1	10%	1	10%
Median % (based on 10 student sample size)		70%		20%		10%

Benchmark:

85%

Institutional benchmark goal for median percentage of students to meet “Proficient” or “Adequate” levels in the GEC

Median % Achieving Benchmark:

90% median percentage of students meeting “Adequate” or “Proficient” levels

Closing the Loop:

The median percentage of student samples scoring a “3” or “2” is 90%, well above the GLO Threshold of 85% for institutional effectiveness. However, with an n of 10, we have to be careful with conclusions.

This is typically the 1st project that we undertake in this course. Overall, the majority of students were successful in executing this project and achieving a “proficient” score within the various associated Critical Thinking criteria. Students generally succeed with this assignment in part because of its open-endedness. While there *is* an established due date and physical object they must create within that timeframe, there are very few other limits for the student, allowing them to customize the assignment and accompanying conversations to their interests and questions. The discussions re: context, meaning vs. use, personal perspective, humor, and questioning stereotypes that this assignment touches upon often result in getting new, inexperienced students out of their shell and accustomed to the rigorous and constructively blunt critiques that they may experience in future college courses. There is also an enormous amount of one-to-one instructor and peer feedback as the assignment progresses, which gives students the permission to ask for feedback, make mistakes, and further refine their ideas from outside feedback and challenges.

Where there were dips in meeting the Critical Thinking criteria, it was most noticeable when conversations intersect with the “Recognize contexts and Assumptions” and “Acknowledge multiple perspectives” criteria. While the bulk of students understood the gist, I find that students at EOU have a difficult time recognizing their own ingrained assumptions, and that the way *they* read or interpret a certain work of art is not necessarily the way that *their peers* are reading the same object. In particular, students seem to struggle when their statements are challenged in conversations which approach topics of gender, class and race, and students seem to have difficulty putting themselves “in another’s shoes.” A healthy chunk of this may be due to the “rural bubble” that our student demographic comes from.

Action Plan:

Students are encouraged to travel and explore unfamiliar ideas and surroundings throughout the duration of the course. Future assignment ideas might involve actually physically traveling off-campus for students to create an off-site project. Outside of their familiar comfort zone, students might be more apt to try riskier strategies with their assignment ideas. Program faculty should discuss issues associated with acknowledging multiple perspectives and best practices for addressing them.