DATE: March 22, 2017

TO: Tamela Eitle, Associate Provost

FROM: Deb Blanchard & Carl Igo, US CORE Assessment Team Co-Chairs

SUBJECT: Fall 2016 University Seminar Critical Thinking Assessment Summary

During the fall 2016 semester, all University Seminar directors were tasked with assessing the Learning Outcome for critical thinking common to all US courses:

Demonstrate critical thinking abilities

Included with this cover are the critical thinking assessment evaluation instrument (the Association of American Colleges and Universities Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric), and the detailed reports for the following US CORE courses:

- AGED 140US: Leadership for Agribusiness & Industry
- BGEN 194US: Business and Entrepreneurship Fundamentals
- CLS 101US & 201US: Knowledge and Community
- COLS 101US: First Year Seminar (Gallatin College)
- COMX 111US: Introduction to Public Speaking
- EDU 101US: Teaching and Learning
- HONR 202US: Texts and Critics: Imagination
- LS 101US: Ways of Knowing
- US 101US: First Year Seminar
- US 121US: Humanity, Society & Culture in the Digital Landscape

The US CORE Assessment Committee decided to use the evaluation instrument with no changes; equating the four AAC&U levels as follows:

- Benchmark (1) = Below Expectations
- Milestones (2, 3) = Meets Expectations
- Capstone (4) = Above Expectations.

Most Seminars reported their assessment results using the standard Below-Meets-Above Expectations levels, but at least one used the Benchmark-Milestone-Capstone language from the AAC&U Rubric.

SUMMARY:

Of the ten courses evaluated, nine easily reached the 60% “Meets Expectations” requirement overall. Only the US 121US course yielded below a 60% overall threshold (49%). With only 12 students enrolled, the US 121 director explained that only four student assignments were included for evaluation. The assignment used for this critical thinking evaluation also did not address one of the five criteria of the rubric. These two factors together provide the contextual
understanding for the lower rankings within this course. The report author provided a goal to strengthen the work leading to this particular assignment as a way to address the marginal results related to critical thinking.

Regardless of results, each US seminar director/instructor has identified targeted areas for future improvement related to the critical thinking outcome learning outcome as noted in each individual assessment report.
CRITICAL THINKING VALUE RUBRIC

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

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capstone</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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

**Selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion**

- **Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly.**
- **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.**
Course Title: AGED 140US Leadership for Agribusiness & Industry

Author of Report: Carl Igo

Outcome Being Assessed: Critical Thinking

Semester and Year: Fall 2016

Course Enrollment: 63

Number of Course Sections: 5

Number of Assignments Assessed: 12

Assessment Team: Dustin Perry, Ass’t Professor & Critical Thinking researcher; Ethan Igo, GTA; Austin Jones, GTA

Method of Selecting Work: The instructor used an online random number generator to identify students, based on their GID. Service Leadership Reflection papers were pulled for the 12 students by the instructor and all identifying student information was electronically removed.

Inter-rater Reliability: The assessment team reviewed the criteria and categories within the rubric. Each independently scored one paper then shared their ratings. In categories where scores were greater than 1 point apart, discussion ensued to reach consensus agreement. Each assessor then used the prescribed rubric (AACU) to score papers individually. All assessors evaluated each assignment.

Notes About Scoring: For each category, rubric scores were coded as benchmark (1), milestone (2), and capstone (3). Assessors’ scores were entered into EXCEL for data analysis and mean scores.

Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Capstone (3)</th>
<th>Milestone (2)</th>
<th>Benchmark (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of Issues</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of Context</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student’s Position</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations for AGED 140US:

While it is clear the overwhelming majority of students met milestone acceptability in all categories measured by the rubric, there is a concern about the number of students at benchmark (below expectations) on a final paper for the course. We sometimes forget these particular areas of targeted instruction are the responsibility of every faculty as they are important in every course. Of particular concern was the category of Student’s Position.

Beginning in fall 2016, we will implement instructional changes to ensure students are able to critically examine multiple sides of an issue as well as acknowledging multiple perspectives. Earlier and more often during the semester, we will incorporate opportunities and expectations for students to both discuss and write about their own biases in relation to perspectives and hypotheses.

We have little understanding or explanation for the 22% of students who scored benchmark in the Student’s Position category. Anecdotal evidence collected from spring 2017 AGED 140US students revealed there is minimal expectation for students at this level to develop and operationalize their own specific positions and to examine those positions coherently against other’s viewpoints; the essays they are expected to submit are overwhelmingly informative in style, rather than persuasive or expressive.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Course Title:</strong></th>
<th>BGEN 194US Seminar. Business and Entrepreneurship Fundamentals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Author of Report:</strong></td>
<td>Terry Profota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Being Assessed:</strong></td>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semester and Year:</strong></td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course Enrollment:</strong></td>
<td>Approx. 450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Course Sections:</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Assignments Assessed:</strong></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Team:</strong></td>
<td>Susan Dana, Myleen Leary, Sarah Cairoli and Terry Profota</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assignment and Method of Selecting Student Work:**
The assignment selected for this evaluation was titled, “Entrepreneur Research Paper.” It required students to choose an entrepreneur of interest and research their background, business idea, and to analyze, identify and support their leadership strengths and weaknesses. The assignment also required students to analyze, identify and support their personal leadership strengths and weaknesses. Finally, students were instructed to consider if they would be a good leader by comparing themselves with their entrepreneur and distilling key learning points to improve their leadership effectiveness.

Terry Profota, Course Coordinator, randomly chose four students from each of the twenty-three sections. Professors submitted two of the four papers for assessment. All identifying information was redacted from the papers which were then numbered in consecutive order from 1-46.

**Method of Ensuring Inter-rater Reliability:**
The University Core Seminar Committee elected to use the AACU Critical Thinking Rubric for this assessment. The rubric was adjusted from a four-level assessment to a three-level assessment which consisted of the following scoring levels: above expectations, meets expectations (a combination of two levels of the AACU Rubric) and below expectations.

Each of the scoring levels was given a numerical rating, with an “above expectations” score of 3; “meets expectations” a score of 2; and “below expectations” a score of 1.

Papers with overall average scores between 15-12 were classified as “above expectations”; overall average scores between 11-8 were classified as “meeting expectations”; and overall average scores below 7 were classified as “below expectations.”

The Jake Jabs College of Business and Entrepreneurship (JCBE) assessment team gathered prior to assessing student work to discuss each criterion in relationship to the assignment and clarify what and how they would evaluate each criterion. Work was then assessed individually. Two assessors evaluated each assignment. No assessors evaluated their own student work.
Scoring Variances:
Of the 46 papers reviewed, 10 papers were reviewed by a third grader and after a second review a common rating was agreed upon. An additional 12 papers were reviewed and discussed by the two-person grading team and after a second review, a common rating was agreed upon.

Results:
Overall Averaged Results:
- 72% of the papers Met Expectations.
- 10% of the papers Exceeded Expectations.
- 20% of the papers were Below Expectations.

Breakdown per Criterion
An examination of individual criterion indicates that students were very strong in three of the five criteria, scoring a 75% or higher in the “meets or above expectations” levels. Students scored above the 60% “meets or above expectations” threshold on the “conclusions and outcomes” criterion, but just barely at 63%. Students did not meet the 60% threshold in just one criterion, “explanation of issues” with a combined score of 57%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Above Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Below Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of Issues</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Position</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of Context</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion &amp; outcomes</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Action Plan for BGEN 194:
Our action plan for improving students’ abilities in “explanation of issues” and “conclusions and outcomes” follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Focus</th>
<th>Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of Issues</td>
<td>Re-work the assignment to clarify the learning objectives of the assignment and to provide training to the teaching team so they can offer better prompts, educations, feedback and support. Provide additional time in class to work with students on understanding the purpose of the assignment and assist them in improving their abilities to clearly articulate issues and construct concise and focused thesis statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion and outcomes</td>
<td>The lower rating in this area was due in part because of a lack of clarity in the assignment. Many students did not include an analysis/comparison section in their paper; those who did scored at “meets or above expectations.” The “Entrepreneur Research” assignment has been revised for S-2017. The section of the paper asking for conclusions and outcomes is more explicit and easier to understand for both students and the professors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University Seminar Core Student Learning Outcome Assessment Report

Course Title: CLS 101/201US Knowledge & Community

Author of Report: David Cherry

Outcome Being Assessed: Critical Thinking

Semester and Year: Fall 2016

Course Enrollment: 550

Number of Course Sections: 37

Number of Assignments Assessed: 40

Assessment Team:
Mary Biehl, Instructor; Professor Walter Fleming, NAS; Jennifer Hill, Instructor; Professor Matt Herman, NAS

Method of Selecting Student Work:
Course manager randomly selected 1-2 final papers each from 37 sections. Papers were randomly assigned to two members of the Assessment Team for evaluation.

Method of Ensuring Inter-rater Reliability:
Two assessors evaluated each assignment. No assessors evaluated their own students’ work.

Notes about Scoring:
Papers were scored against the AACU rubric for Critical Thinking, with a 1 representing “Benchmark”, 2, “Milestones” 3, “Capstone”. Scores were averaged across assessors.

Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Capstone (3)</th>
<th>Milestones (2)</th>
<th>Benchmark (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of Issues</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of Context</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student’s position</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations for CLS 101/201: In so far as 90-95% of students achieved the equivalent of a “passing” grade on all 5 criteria, no immediate changes are recommended in respect to the ways in which the course attempts to inculcate critical thinking attitudes and habits.
University Seminar Core Student Learning Outcome Assessment Report

Course Title: COLS 101US First-Year Seminar

Author of Report: Jeffrey W. Hostetler

Outcome Being Assessed: Critical Thinking

Semester and Year: Fall 2016

Course Enrollment: 66

Number of Course Sections: 4

Number of Assignments Assessed: 10

Assessment Team: Jeffrey Hostetler, Instructor; Janet Heiss-Arms, General Education Director

Method of Selecting Student Work:
During the semester, each instructor made preliminary copies of a common writing assignment titled Comparative Essay. They removed any student identifying marks, and we then pooled the essays, randomly shuffled them, and instead of limiting ourselves to a 10% sample (6 essays) we decided to evaluate an even 10. This equates to a 15% sample size.

Method of Ensuring Inter-rater Reliability:
Janet and I have worked together evaluating writing and oral presentations, so we were confident our reliability would remain consistent, and the results support this.

Notes about Scoring:
If we did have a variation, we used the higher score, since we could not score ½ points to a criteria.

Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Above Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Below Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of issues</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of context assumptions</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion and related outcomes</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Action Plan for COLS 101US:** Based on these results, we see nearly 1/5 of our students are performing below expectations regarding critical thinking. Although we are encouraged by the 68% average in the Meets Expectations category, we want to reach out and bring up these other students. Our goal in the next year will be to try and identify with early assessment in the classroom those students who might be in this category, and work with them individually in hopes of shifting them into the next category.

Additionally, as a campus we should consider inviting more scholars who specialize in evaluating and teaching critical thinking, and focusing a conference/seminar around these speakers. It could inspire all of us, provide campus faculty with an opportunity to present on their own critical thinking research and techniques, as well as generate new teaching and evaluation tools.
University Seminar Core Student Learning Outcome Assessment Report

Course Title: COMX 111US Intro to Public Speaking

Author of Report: Tammy Machowicz Olsztyn

Outcome Being Assessed: Critical Thinking

Semester and Year: Fall 2017

Course Enrollment: 337

Number of Course Sections: 19

Number of Assignments Assessed: 38

Assessment Team:
Kathleen Byrne, Instructor
Tammy Machowicz Olsztyn, Assistant Teaching Professor
David McLaughlin, Associate Teaching Professor

Method of Selecting Student Work:
The assessment coordinator randomly chose two numbers to represent two students on each section’s alphabetical class roster for a total of 38 persuasive speech outlines assessed. A number was assigned to each student paper, but all other identifying student information was removed. (COMX 111US instructors choose to evaluate the final and most complex assignment, the persuasive speech to evaluate critical thinking).

Method of Ensuring Inter-rater Reliability:
The assessment team met to review the core criteria and agreed upon how to define the categories for “above expectations”, “meets expectations” and “below expectations” as it relates to the assignment being evaluated. Evaluators then assessed other instructor’s student persuasive speech outlines individually using the AACU Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric. Two assessors evaluated each assignment. No assessors evaluated their own student work.

Notes about Scoring:
Scores were compared and tallied and an average score was given to each category if two evaluators scored the same work differently.
Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Above Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Below Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of Issues</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of Context and Assumptions</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student’s position</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion and Related Outcomes</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations for COMX 111US**: Overall, the evaluators/instructors of COMX 111US were satisfied with the results of the assessment; a majority (68%) of the students’ persuasive outlines assessed met expectations for the criteria outlined for critical thinking, 29% exceeded expectations and only 3% fell below the overall criteria of the critical thinking rubric for the COMX 111US assessments.

In Fall 2016, instructors implemented putting more emphasis on teaching the outline process, developing and defining clear thesis/propositions, and encouraged students to document and acknowledge required assignment elements which allowed us to better assess their critical thinking. In addition, instructors provided better documented outlines for students to use as templates. We think putting more emphasis on the strategies of building students’ persuasive outlines, and defining and developing themes/propositions/claim statements may have contributed to strengthening COMX students’ critical thinking for this assignment.

Overall, instructors were pleased with the results and will continue to meet each academic year as a COMX 111US teaching team to review teaching/learning standards and expectations to ensure we meet the needs of the learners.
University Seminar Core Student Learning Outcome Assessment Report

Course Title: EDU 101US First-Year Seminar

Author of Report: Nigel Waterton

Outcome Being Assessed: Critical Thinking

Semester and Year: Fall 2016

Course Enrollment: 171

Number of Course Sections: 9

Number of Assignments Assessed: 18 (10%)

Assessment Team: Nigel Waterton, Teresa Greenwood

Method of Selecting Student Work:
Course director randomly chose 2 numbers, to represent two students on each section’s alphabetical class roster. Instructors submitted assignments to course director. Assignments were coded and anonymized.

Method of Ensuring Inter-rater Reliability:
The assessment team reviewed the assessment rubric prior to assessing student work agreed upon levels of achievement. We then assessed all student work individually. At least two assessors evaluated each assignment.

Notes about Scoring:
Differing scores were averaged for a difference of 1 and sent to a third reader for a difference of more than one.

Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Above Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Below Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of issues</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of context assumptions</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion and related outcomes</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations for EDU 101: The EDU 101 team will continue to work with students who do not meet critical thinking expectations. We will consider both course content and individual students. Similarly, we will continue to challenge students who meet and exceed expectations through course activity and readings.
University Seminar Core Student Learning Outcome Assessment Report

Course Title: HONR 202 Texts and Critics: Imagination

Author of Report: Shannon D. Willoughby

Outcome Being Assessed: Critical Thinking

Semester and Year: Spring, 2017

Course Enrollment: 362

Number of Course Sections: 25

Number of Assignments Assessed: 43

Assessment Team: Simon Dixon, Tanner McFadden, Shannon Willoughby.

Method of Selecting Student Work:
The names of two students were chosen from each of the sections. Names were placed into a single excel file and a random number generator was used to choose each student according to their number in the spreadsheet.

Method of Ensuring Inter-rater Reliability:
The team discussed the criteria listed on the rubric. Several pieces of student work were assessed by two of the three team members in order to ensure inter-rater reliability. No assessors evaluated their own student work.

Notes about Scoring:
Standard rounding methods were used. If two scorers disagreed, the average of the scores was taken.

Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Above Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Below Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of issues</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of context</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student’s position</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Action Plan for HONR202**: Because more than 10% of students were below expectations regarding these three areas, we plan the following actions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Focus</th>
<th>Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of issues</td>
<td>Take time in class to have Faculty and Student Fellows use examples from the text to help explain issues. Encourage students to comprehensively discuss issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of context</td>
<td>Ask students to clearly state underlying assumptions. Discuss in class why this is important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student’s position</td>
<td>Clarify to students that their position/thesis must be clearly stated and easy to identify. This is best done during the editing process, either by peers or at the Writing Center. Ask Faculty Fellows to point out the thesis statement in written work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Course Title: LS101US – Ways of Knowing

Author of Report: Teresa Greenwood and Bridget Kevane

Outcome Being Assessed: Critical Thinking

Semester and Year: Fall 2016

Course Enrollment: 90

Number of Course Sections: 5

Number of Assignments Assessed: 12

Assessment Team:
Greenwood, Teresa; Townsend-Mehler, John; Waterton, Nigel

Method of Selecting Student Work:
Teresa Greenwood randomly chose 2 numbers, to represent two students on each section’s alphabetical class roster. Instructor sent papers to director by email, leaving the last name and first initial on each student piece, but removing all other identifying student information.

Method of Ensuring Inter-rater Reliability:
The assessment team gathered prior to assessing student work to review sample work and agree upon levels of achievement. Teams then assessed their work individually. At least two assessors evaluated each assignment. Bridget Kevane, Interim Director of Liberal Studies, reviewed the papers along with Greenwood and Townsend-Mehler’s assessment. Nigel Waterton was the second reader of the papers from Townsend-Mehler’s (JTM) classes.

Notes about Scoring:
In no case was there more than a category difference in the score of the two assessors and where there was a difference the student was scored in the lower category. So if one assessor scored a student benchmark and the second scored the same student at milestone (2), the student was coded at benchmark. This allows for a more conservative measure of overall student performance. A couple of papers (CP14B and LL14B) are outliers. CP14B represents an alternative assignment given to the student (reflect on your favorite quotation from one of the course texts). LL14B was submitted by the instructor because the student whose name had been randomly selected withdrew from the course. Students in LS 101 are doing well and 75% of papers met at least the criteria for “Milestone.”
Assessments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JT: 3,2,2,2,3</th>
<th>TG: 3,2,2,2,2</th>
<th>Final: 3,2,2,2,2</th>
<th>Overall: 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CP6A</td>
<td>JT: 3,2,2,1,2</td>
<td>TG: 3,2,2,1,2</td>
<td>Final: 3,2,2,1,2</td>
<td>Overall: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP14A</td>
<td>JT: 2,2,2,3,2</td>
<td>TG: 3,2,2,2,2</td>
<td>Final: 3,2,2,2,2</td>
<td>Overall: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP6B</td>
<td>JT: 0,0,0,1,0</td>
<td>TG: 0,0,0,1,0</td>
<td>Final: 0,0,0,1,0</td>
<td>Overall: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTM14B</td>
<td>NW: 4,4,4,3,3</td>
<td>TG: 3,4,4,3,3</td>
<td>Final: 3,4,4,3,3</td>
<td>Overall: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTM6A</td>
<td>NW: 3,4,4,3,3</td>
<td>TG: 4,4,4,4,4</td>
<td>Final: 3,4,4,3,3</td>
<td>Overall: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTM14A</td>
<td>NW: 2,2,2,2,2</td>
<td>TG: 2,3,2,2,2</td>
<td>Final: 2,2,2,2,2</td>
<td>Overall: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTM6B</td>
<td>NW: 4,3,4,4,4</td>
<td>TG: 4,4,4,4,4</td>
<td>Final: 4,3,4,4,4</td>
<td>Overall: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL6A</td>
<td>JT: 1,1,1,1,1</td>
<td>TG: 1,1,1,1,1</td>
<td>Final: 1,1,1,1,1</td>
<td>Overall: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL14A</td>
<td>JT: 1,1,1,1,1</td>
<td>TG: 1,1,1,1,1</td>
<td>Final: 1,1,1,1,1</td>
<td>Overall: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL6B</td>
<td>JT: 1,1,1,1,1</td>
<td>TG: 1,1,1,1,1</td>
<td>Final: 1,1,1,1,1</td>
<td>Overall: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL14B</td>
<td>JT: 3,3,3,3,3</td>
<td>TG: 3,3,3,3,3</td>
<td>Final: 3,3,3,3,3</td>
<td>Overall: 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Outlier – Instructor selected paper because the student whose paper was randomly selected withdrew from the class.]

Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Above Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Below Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of Issues</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of context and assumptions</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student’s position</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications and consequences</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations for LS 101: All of the “Benchmark” papers are from courses taught by one instructor whose final assignment is a reflection essay rather than a paper that calls for the student to state a thesis and develop an argument. Bridget Kevane, Tami Eitle (former Director of Liberal Studies) and the future director (Summer 2017) will discuss the direction the course should take in the future and whether a common syllabus or common final assignment is warranted.
# University Seminar Core Student Learning Outcome Assessment Report

**Course Title:** US 101US First-Year Seminar  
**Author of Report:** Margaret Konkel  
**Outcome Being Assessed:** Critical Thinking  
**Semester and Year:** Fall 2016  
**Course Enrollment:** 660 (post withdraw deadline)  
**Number of Course Sections:** 42  
**Number of Assignments Assessed:** 80

**Assessment Team:**  
The Assessment Team included the following US101 Instructors who volunteered for the role: Amanda Bitz, Anna Greenberg, Molly Taylor, Erin MacDonald-Peck, Crystal Stanionis, Megan Swanson, Megan Bowen, Jim Thull, Judi Haskins, Kathleen Melee, Jade Lowder, and Alli Gidley. Team leaders included Meg Konkel, Director of First-Year Seminar, and Deb Blanchard, Assistant Director of First-Year Seminar.

**Method of Selecting Student Work:**  
*The Seminar Director and Assistant Director determined that the Presentation Storyboard assignment would be the assessed assignment (see attached assignment description.) The Presentation Storyboard functions as a narrative or script for a Pecha Kucha presentation of a research project students are engaged with in the final 5 weeks of the semester. The Storyboard assignment aligns well in what is being asked in the AACU Critical Thinking rubric, and supports the AACU’s definition of critical thinking as a process of comprehensive exploration of issues and ideas.*

A random sample of student work was collected by the following process:  
1. the Assistant Seminar Director pulled from a set of numbered cards two numbers which translated to students in an alphabetical list. The numbers drawn were #2 and #12.  
2. All faculty were asked to pull the #2 and #12 assignments from their Presentation Storyboard assignment folder in D2L.  
3. Faculty were asked to remove any identifying information from the documents selected, to upload both files to a Box folder using a file name that identified each assignment by section and by student code (Student A and Student B) to ensure anonymity.

Of the initial sample of 85, 5 Storyboards were submitted but incomplete, or not conforming to the nature of the assignment – the Storyboard assignment asks students to incorporate a full narrative of their presentation. In some cases, students incorporated self-directed instructions, such as “talk about issue here,” instead of a full narrative, and those Storyboards were dropped from the sample set.

**Method of Ensuring Inter-rater Reliability:**
Based on our experience in the previous two years of program assessment, it was determined that the common US Core Critical Thinking (AACU) rubric would be used as the basis for the evaluation rubric for the Storyboard assignment in the course. In this way, all instructors would have familiarity with the standards and expectations of the common assessment rubric, and students would have transparency as to the expectations both for the course and the common US Core program.

Volunteers were solicited among the US101US Instructors at the mid-semester, and volunteer assessors were paired in teams of two. Box folders with batches of assignments (11 per team of two) were established, and the US Core Critical Thinking Rubric was distributed to each team. No team members assessed any student work from their own sections to ensure objectivity. An online assessment rubric was employed to complete the scoring, and numerical values were assigned to each of the scoring levels.

Notes about Scoring:
The US Core Critical Thinking rubric has 4 measures for scoring:
Level 1 – Benchmark
Level 2 – Milestone
Level 3 – Milestone
Level 4 – Capstone

In discussion, the US Core Committee agreed to score assignments using the 4-level scoring system, but to calculate assessment based on the following:

Level 1 – Below Expectations
Levels 2 and 3 – Meets Expectations
Level 4 – Above Expectations

Once the assessment scores were submitted, the Seminar Director reviewed the two assessor scores for each essay. The two scores for each essay were then averaged to provide a single numerical score for each criteria category. If a student earned both a 2 and a 3 for one criteria, the average score of 2.5 was recorded. A total average score for all criteria categories was then generated.

Scores were rated based on the following:
Below 1.9 = Below Expectations
2.0 – 3.9 = Meets Expectations
4.0 = Above Expectations

Results:
The overall average score for the assessment was 2.4 (Meets Expectations.) The distribution of those average scores is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 - 3.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 - 2.9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 1.9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on this distribution, **73.8% of our students met or exceeded** the expectations of the program relative to their work in Critical Thinking, while **26.3% of our students fell below** the expected standard for Critical Thinking in the program.

When looking at each of the assessment categories, our students exceeded the target in their ability to meet or exceed expectations in the demands of that category. The following table represents the percentage of individual storyboards that fell within each level of achievement (note: percentage values may not exactly add to 100% due to decimal rounding):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Above Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Below Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of Issues</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of Context and Assumptions</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Position</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions and Outcomes</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action Plan for US101US:**

Given the central importance of Critical Thinking in this course, the assessment was fruitful to our program in many ways. We were able to identify consistent strength across all of the factors included in the rubric in our students' work; in no measure do we fall below the target of 60% for the US Core assessment.

Additionally, this assessment has been productive in providing some clarity in how we integrate Critical Thinking into our course, and how assignments make progress from stage to stage in the development of skills outlined in the rubric. Our goal for the upcoming year is to make that progression much more transparent, not only to our students but more importantly to our instructors. Each of our assignments is designed to pick up on each of the factors included in the CT rubric, but it’s clear based on some of the questions we encountered from our assessors (who are also instructors) during the assessment process that we can be much more direct in communicating that design to them.
Research Project: Presentation Storyboard

OBJECTIVES:
Synthesize information, verbal and visual, from multiple sources in an organized, clearly articulated sequence
Demonstrate a clear, well organized argument
Represent a comprehensive exploration of an issue or idea as contributing to a sound conclusion
Demonstrate analytical, critical, and creative thinking in written communication

OVERVIEW:
30 points.
Planning is critical in order to successfully deliver a professional, well-organized presentation, particularly of the Pecha Kucha (PK) format. The presentation storyboard is a document that allows you to prepare what you want to communicate about your research, how best that information should be communicated, and what visual imagery will most successfully support your presentation.

The presentation storyboard will also serve as the narrative for your presentation, allowing you to fully articulate your researched argument.

The storyboard template is set up to include the sequence of slides in order of their presentation, images that will be presented on screen, information that you will share in the narrative for each slide, and in-text source citations for any supporting data that you present.

EXPECTATIONS AND REQUIREMENTS:
Your presentation storyboard will organize information in a number of categories so that you are fully prepared for your presentation.

Assignment Specifics:
The storyboard template (see page 41 for sample) is set up slide-by-slide. For each slide, you will be asked to provide the following information:
Slide Narrative:
• What do you want to say?
• What part of the overall sequence of your argument are you stating?
• Write 2-5 sentences for each slide that summarize each step in the story/argument you are presenting.
• In-text citations should be integrated into Narrative.
• Give a brief title (claim, argument, counter-argument, etc.) at the start of each slide’s narrative to organize your thinking.

Supporting Evidence
• What information from your sources backs up what you are saying?
• If you have provided data from your sources in the Narrative, provide an in-text citation here to cite your source.

Supporting Visuals:
• What do you need visually to support what you’re saying?
• Provide a thumbnail of the image that you are using in the PK.

Works Cited Page:
• Provide a Works Cited page following your storyboard template that cites all research sources and all image sources.
## Presentation Storyboard Evaluation Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position/Thesis</th>
<th>Above Expectations 26-30 B+ to A</th>
<th>Meets Expectations 21-23 C- to B</th>
<th>Below Expectations 0-20 F to D+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Specific position (perspective, thesis, or hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of the issue</td>
<td>• Specific position (perspective, thesis, or hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of the issue</td>
<td>• Specific position (perspective, thesis, or hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Limits of position are acknowledged</td>
<td>• Different sides of the issue are acknowledged within the position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Other points of view are synthesized within position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative/Explanation of Issues</th>
<th>Above Expectations 26-30 B+ to A</th>
<th>Meets Expectations 21-23 C- to B</th>
<th>Below Expectations 0-20 F to D+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively</td>
<td>• Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated and described so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions.</td>
<td>• Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• All relevant information necessary for full understanding is delivered</td>
<td>• May have some information, terms, or ambiguities not fully clarified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Evidence</th>
<th>Above Expectations 26-30 B+ to A</th>
<th>Meets Expectations 21-23 C- to B</th>
<th>Below Expectations 0-20 F to D+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis.</td>
<td>• Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis.</td>
<td>• Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly</td>
<td>• Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning.</td>
<td>• Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context and Assumptions</th>
<th>Above Expectations 26-30 B+ to A</th>
<th>Meets Expectations 21-23 C- to B</th>
<th>Below Expectations 0-20 F to D+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assumptions (own and others’) are thoroughly analyzed in presentation of position</td>
<td>• Assumptions (own and others’) are questioned in presentation of position</td>
<td>• Shows emerging awareness of present assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Context is carefully evaluated when presenting own or others’ position</td>
<td>• Context is acknowledged when presenting own or others’ position</td>
<td>• Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conclusions and Implications</th>
<th>Above Expectations 26-30 B+ to A</th>
<th>Meets Expectations 21-23 C- to B</th>
<th>Below Expectations 0-20 F to D+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical</td>
<td>• Conclusion is logically connected to information presented</td>
<td>• Conclusion is not consistently connected to information discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conclusions reflect student’s informed evaluation of evidence and perspectives presented</td>
<td>• Opposing viewpoints are considered</td>
<td>• Implications and consequences are oversimplified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Presentation Storyboard Evaluation Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Above Expectations 26-30 B+ to A</th>
<th>Meets Expectations 21-23 C– to B</th>
<th>Below Expectations 0-20 F to D+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Slide Visuals**        | Images strengthen and advance central message  
Images are visually impactful | Images strengthen or advance central message  
Easy to understand, do not distract audience from speaker’s narrative  
Free of errors or malfunction | Images do not connect to central message  
Overt reliance on text and/or graphs and charts  
Timing does not conform to PK format |
| **Submitted Materials:**  | All Storyboard components are thoroughly completed  
Proofread and free of errors  
Works Cited citations follow MLA format for all research sources and image sources | All Storyboard components are completed  
With one or two exceptions, is free of errors  
Works Cited citations follow MLA format with few exceptions for all research sources and image sources | Does not use Storyboard Template or does not fill in Template completely  
Works Cited citations do not follow MLA format  
Lack of proofreading |
University Seminar Core Student Learning Outcome Assessment Report

Course Title: US121US

Author of Report: Meg Konkel

Outcome Being Assessed: Critical Thinking

Semester and Year: Fall 2016

Course Enrollment: 12

Number of Course Sections: 1

Number of Assignments Assessed: 4

Assessment Team:
Margaret T. Konkel, Seminar Director, and Deborah Blanchard, Assistant Seminar Director

Method of Selecting Student Work:
The Seminar Director and Assistant Director randomly chose 4 numbers between 1 and 12 (course enrollment), and the Instructor provided those samples with names redacted and identifying features removed. The Seminar Director and Assistant Director then read and scored the assignments based on the rubric.

Method of Ensuring Inter-rater Reliability:
The assignment being assessed for US121US is an Annotated Bibliography connected to a research exercise students in the course complete. To ensure reliability, the two assessors met to review the scope of the assignment, and to compare the expectations of the assignment against the rubric and its evaluation categories. Once a common interpretation of how the assessment measure might be evident in the assignment parameters, each assessor read and scored all four assignments.

Neither of the assessors teach in this course, so all student work was evaluated by those other than the course instructor.

Notes about Scoring:
All scores were tabulated in the following way: an overall average score was calculated for each student, and then the two scores were averaged to compute a single overall score per student. In addition, an average of each criteria’s scores was tabulated in order to provide an average score per criteria. When two scores differed, an average was calculated in order to have a single score per criteria per student, which then informs the rankings.

One note regarding the assignment: given the nature of the Annotated Bibliography assignment, the “conclusions and outcomes” criteria of the assessment rubric was dropped. Students were asked to communicate evaluation of their sources that addressed all other criteria in the rubric, however no conclusions or outcomes of the source assessment were asked for in the scope of the assignment.

Results:
The overall average score for the 4 samples assessed was 1.9 – the scores were 1.0, 3.3, 1.4, and 2.1. In part, this is representative of such a small sample size – with a single section being offered each fall only, any sample other than the whole group may be misleading.

The criteria scores are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Above Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Below Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of Context and Assumptions</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Position</td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions and Outcomes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations for US121US:
As noted above, the numbers as indicated are difficult to interpret given the sample size. However, it’s clear that students completing this style of assignment are comfortable and competent examining the evidence of the text and questioning the source’s viability and bias. The other factors represent less competence, and Seminar Directors will work directly with the Instructor of this course to strengthen the work leading up to this assignment (and the larger project it sits in) to address these challenges.