

# CORE ASSESSMENT REPORT TWU 2018-19

## OBJECTIVES: COMMUNICATION AND CRITICAL THINKING

### SUMMARY

For the 2018-19 academic year, TWU assessed the objectives of *Communication* and *Critical Thinking* in the following undergraduate general education areas as assigned by the state:

- Communications (first-year composition)
- Mathematics
- Life & Physical Sciences
- Creative Arts
- Social & Behavioral Sciences
- History
- Government
- Language, Philosophy, & Culture

The objectives assessed in 2018-19 are defined by THECB as follows:

- **Critical Thinking Skills (CTS)** – to include creative thinking, innovation, inquiry, and analysis, evaluation and synthesis of information;
- **Communication Skills (COMS)** – to include effective development, interpretation and expression of ideas through written, oral and visual communication.

Facets of each objective are captured through suites of narrower criteria. The objective of *Communication*, for instance, includes the criteria of Explanation of Issues and Organization. *Critical Thinking* includes Evidence Analysis and Define Problem. These criteria are assessed by volunteer raters in organized sessions, who employ a modified VALUE rubric on a three-point scale, with a 1 representing an unmet standard, a 2 indicating a mixed or partial success, and a 3 indicating clear success. Our currently published goal is that 65% of students will meet at least level 2 for any criterion.

For *Communication*, 71.96% of students met that criterion for success.

- All class levels, from first-year to senior, saw above 65% of constituents meeting the criterion for success, with seniors reporting the highest level of mastery at 75.39%.
- First-time-in-college (FTIC), dual credit, and transfer student populations also came in above goal, and both full-time and part-time students did so, too.
- Among *Communication* criteria that were often rated and tended to have more robust reliability, Comprehension (74.82%) and Explanation of Issues (70.23%) showed strong indicators that students excelled at understanding material. Although fewer faculty chose Integrated Communication, students showed high mastery of the skills of expressing key content through design choice (89.77%).
- Access and Use Information Ethically and Legally continued to score just below benchmark, with only 60.21% of students showing mastery.
- Finally, Comprehension (74.82%) scored higher this year than in 2015-16. Assignment selection, instructions, and scaffolding may have increased in effectiveness due to increased awareness of

assessment issues due to faculty and adjunct involvement in core rating: Departments involved in this year's assessment have faculty who regularly volunteer time as core-academy raters.

For *Critical Thinking*, 67.36% met the criterion for success.

- This year, first-year mastery of the objective reached our stated benchmark, hitting 65.61%. All other class levels also passed the benchmark.
- FTIC students also saw an increase in mastery levels, with 66.70% reaching mastery this year. Dual credit (74.69%) and transfer students (65.85%) similarly passed the benchmark.
- Both full-time and part-time students came in above goal again.
- Among *Critical Thinking* criteria that were often rated and tended to have more robust reliability, both Existing Knowledge, Research, & Views (72.73%) and Apply Disciplinary Knowledge (70.22%) had a high number of students meeting the criterion for success.
- In this year's findings, Student's Position (59.17%) and Textual Analysis (54.26%) showed the greatest weaknesses. Student Position requires students to acknowledge varied perspectives of an issue, which may require a high level of scaffolding and instruction to assure students understand that their submission must demonstrate awareness of the other sides of an issue.
- Despite students scoring well on the criteria Propose Solutions/Hypotheses (78.90%) and Implement Solution (73.45%), faculty were not likely to select these criteria for their assignments.

## CONTENTS

Summary.....	1
Recommendations.....	3
Interventions .....	4
Participants.....	5
Students.....	5
Participating Faculty .....	6
Core-Academy Raters .....	6
Tables of Results .....	7
Results by Student classification.....	7
Results by Criterion.....	8
Results by College and Component Area.....	10
Comparisons with 2015-16.....	11
Reliability and Benchmark Criteria .....	11
Comparing Benchmark Criteria between 2015-16 and 2018-19.....	12
History and Government .....	14
Contact Information .....	15

## RECOMMENDATIONS

New recommendations will appear near the top of these lists in each report. Recommendations from previous reports may reappear later because they bear repeating or for the benefit of those new to the core community.

**Set appropriate challenge levels.** A heavy cognitive load impairs performance on all criteria, not just the one under stress. Give students a difficult analytical challenge and their grammar will suffer, too. We saw this sort of thing a lot in the assessed artifacts. First-year composition asked students to do something difficult: analyze two articles with competing opinions and make an argument for what value or principle was most driving the authors apart. A student's organization scores for such an assignment will be lower than they would be for a class in which they were simply asked to summarize a textbook chapter, wherein the structure is already partly baked in. In some cases, a challenge may have been set too high. We saw several assignments that asked students to summarize, or in some cases even evaluate the methodology of, scientific articles from journals like *Nature*. Often students responded to this challenge by plagiarizing or patch-writing what the article said, a response well-predicted by [research on plagiarism](#). Conversely, too low a bar keeps students from improving. The ideal learning situation tends to be [challenging but scaffolded](#) in such a way that students can navigate through it with the help provided by the scaffolding. One way to do this is to break up a challenging task into discrete steps. Our raters were impressed with the Social Action Project assignment created for one of the Women's Studies core courses (WS 2013). Students are asked to analyze a social problem and recommend a research-supported social action that might effect change, neither of which are easy. But the assignment has a common template, a form broken up into specific tasks and questions, and these walk students through the process of responding to the challenge.

**Emphasize foundational criteria.** It's difficult to explain something without first comprehending it. It's difficult to develop content that hasn't been sufficiently researched or analyzed. Which is to say, some of the criteria on our rubric may be more deserving of emphasis than others, simply because growth in those areas is likely to have trickle-out effects to other criteria. Comprehension is one such criterion for *Communication*. Evidence Analysis is one for *Critical Thinking*.

**Build background knowledge.** [Research in educational psychology](#) emphasizes the critical relationship between background knowledge and reading comprehension, critical thinking, and evaluation. What you already know determines to large extent what you are ready to understand. Background knowledge not only includes specialized terminology or statistical concepts but also easy-to-overlook elements like the organizational structure of a typical peer-reviewed scientific article. (Students without this knowledge often misinterpret the opening literature review as a thesis-bearing introduction and will report as findings what was meant to be historical background.)

**Take advantage of the "teaching effect" to build student background knowledge.** Most faculty have experienced the phenomenon in which, by teaching a subject, they learn it better than they ever would have understood it if they had spent that same time continuing to study as a student. [Students experience this, too](#). By giving students more opportunities to explain content, faculty can take advantage of this effect. One powerful method for encouraging student explanations is [Writing to Learn](#): short, informal written tasks, performed in-class or in preparation for class, which instead of being graded or commented on are instead, more often, used during group or class activities and perhaps recorded as credit/no-credit. (Writing to Learn combines powerfully with [Team-Based Learning](#) in-class activities.)

**Make assignment expectations clear in written instructions.** Even if expectations are transmitted orally, they should also be communicated in writing for reference. Assignments for which such information was scant often had weaker student performances.

**Volunteer to rate artifacts.** Many of the above observations stem from discussions that bloomed during rating sessions. Faculty participants often came away from their rating experiences with new ideas for assignments or plans to revise assignments. It is one thing to see how your own students react to your own course, and quite another to see how many students respond to many different kinds of requests. You get a sense of what all students seem to struggle with, and of what kinds of work students are capable of when they're challenged but have the right kind of scaffolding.

## INTERVENTIONS

We have attempted several small-scale interventions to improve scores in recent years, enumerated here.

1. Emphasizing **Writing across the Curriculum** and **Writing to Learn**
  - a. *Overall Strategy.* In an effort to improve core criteria in the Communication and Critical Thinking objectives primarily, but also in hopes of spillover effects to other kinds of learning, we have initiated several actions related to the concept of writing-to-learn. (See the “teaching effect” tip under Recommendations, above.)
  - b. *Book Distribution.* We distributed copies of John C. Bean’s landmark handbook on writing-to-learn instruction, *Engaging Ideas* (second edition) to all 194 faculty teaching core classes in Fall 2017, along with [a letter describing how its guidance can help faculty assign more high-impact writing activities without becoming overwhelmed by grading](#). We also distributed copies of the above books to members of the Undergraduate Council assessment committee.
  - c. *Reading and Writing across the Core criteria.* The Undergraduate Council’s assessment committee, with approval by the Undergraduate Council at large, identified twelve criteria on the core rubrics to serve as Reading and Writing across the Core criteria. These twelve now appear [at the tops of our core rubrics](#), and each is cross-listed in multiple assessment years. For instance, Evidence Analysis appears under both Critical Thinking and Empirical & Quantitative Skills. The idea behind this cross-listing is to encourage greater emphasis on these criteria and to collect more data on student achievement with regard to them.
  - d. *Writing Fellowships.* The assistant director of academic assessment’s primary area of specialization outside of assessment is the teaching of writing across the curriculum. As such, he has launched a stipend-supported series of mentorships of core curriculum faculty interested in redesigning key assignments to provide students with better writing experiences while maintaining a grading workload that is reasonable. The initiative had five fellows in Summer 2018 and another six in Spring 2019. Participants have included coordinators for some of the largest programs in the core, including the First-Year Composition program and the First-Year (UNIV 1231) Seminars. It may be too early to gauge impacts as not all interventions have been implemented yet and some data are still being analyzed, but we look forward to reporting on this effort, and continuing this effort, in the future.
2. Renewing commitment to academic integrity.
  - a. TWU [research](#) suggests there is truth to the frequent admonishment by faculty that learners who cheat only cheat their own learning.
  - b. Accordingly, we have begun conversations with stakeholders across campus to study the state of academic integrity here, and revise or improve policies based on integrity research. As shown by the work of researchers like Don McCabe, the most powerful transformations occur when students drive integrity culture instead of responding to it. Accordingly, an ideal long-term goal

here is to generate student interest in, not just a student honor code, but in the kind of culture that would support and value one.

## PARTICIPANTS

The subsections below shed light on the range of participants, in terms of assessed students, submitting faculty, and core-academy raters.

### STUDENTS

For AY 2018-19, students to assess were selected by Institutional Research and Data Management through a stratified random sample of face-to-face students in main-campus core curriculum courses, with the sample sizes calculated so as to produce a margin of error of 3%.

- Female: 87.24%, Male: 12.76%
- FTIC: 60.99%, Transfer: 25.72%, Dual Credit: 13.28%
- Full-Time: 78.57%, Part-Time: 21.43%

Student Classification	Percentage
First-Year	49.75%
Sophomore	25.20%
Junior	15.91%
Senior	8.48%
Post-baccalaureate	0.66%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

Student Ethnicity	Percentage
American Indian or Alaska Native, non-Hispanic	2.40%
Asian, non-Hispanic	11.62%
Black, non-Hispanic	18.63%
Hispanic/Latino	30.59%
International	0.81%
Unknown	0.55%
White, non-Hispanic	35.41%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

Student College	Percentage
Arts and Sciences	27.59%
Business	5.71%
General	14.03%
Health Sciences	15.56%
Nursing	30.73%
Professional Education	6.39%

<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
--------------------	----------------

#### PARTICIPATING FACULTY

Core faculty tend to come from the College of Arts and Sciences. Of faculty teaching the core during the academic year in question, 42.84% held doctoral degrees or equivalents. The remainder of core faculty comprise mostly adjunct faculty and (particularly for first-year composition and Women's Studies) graduate teaching assistants.

Faculty Department	Percentage
Biology	17.30%
Business and Economics	0.39%
Chemistry and Physics	8.26%
Dance	2.97%
English, Speech, and Foreign Language	19.70%
General	8.54%
Health Studies	0.44%
Kinesiology	1.76%
Mathematics and Computer Science	15.70%
Music and Drama	2.83%
Psychology and Philosophy	7.81%
Sociology and Social Work	3.73%
Teacher Education	0.31%
Visual Arts	2.03%
Women's Studies	8.21%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

#### CORE-ACADEMY RATERS

Our volunteer rater pool comprised 32.24 % full-time faculty, 33.48% staff, and 12.93% adjunct faculty. The remainder of the pool was a combination of administrators, graduate students, and guests.

Raters	Percentage
Adjunct	12.93%
Admin	9.73%
Faculty	32.24%
Grad Student	6.81%
Guest	4.81%
Staff	33.48%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

## TABLES OF RESULTS

Rates of success generally increased as students progressed through grade ranks, from first-year to senior.

### RESULTS BY STUDENT CLASSIFICATION

CORE OBJECTIVE	MEETS STANDARD	
	No	Yes
<b>Student Classification</b>		
<b>Communication</b>	<b>28.04%</b>	<b>71.96%</b>
First-Year	27.43%	72.57%
Sophomore	29.38%	70.62%
Junior	29.69%	70.31%
Senior	24.61%	75.39%
<b>Critical Thinking</b>	<b>32.64%</b>	<b>67.36%</b>
First-Year	34.39%	65.61%
Sophomore	30.32%	69.68%
Junior	30.74%	69.26%
Senior	32.77%	67.23%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>31.14%</b>	<b>68.86%</b>

### RESULTS BY FULL-TIME OR PART-TIME STATUS

Objective	MEETS STANDARD	
	No	Yes
<b>Class Load</b>		
<b>Communication</b>	<b>28.00%</b>	<b>72.00%</b>
Full time	29.43%	70.57%
Part time	22.69%	77.31%
<b>Critical Thinking</b>	<b>32.57%</b>	<b>67.43%</b>
Full time	33.55%	66.45%
Part time	28.70%	71.30%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>30.36%</b>	<b>69.64%</b>

### RESULTS BY FIRST-TIME IN COLLEGE OR TRANSFER STATUS

Objective	MEETS STANDARD	
	No	Yes
<b>Admission Status</b>		
<b>Communication</b>	<b>28.00%</b>	<b>72.00%</b>
FTIC	29.02%	70.98%
Dual-Credit	17.93%	82.07%
Transfer	30.70%	69.30%

<b>Critical Thinking</b>	<b>32.57%</b>	<b>67.43%</b>
FTIC	33.30%	66.70%
Dual-Credit	25.31%	74.69%
Transfer	34.15%	65.85%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>30.36%</b>	<b>69.64%</b>

## RESULTS BY CRITERION

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MEETING STANDARD BY CRITERION		
Objective Criteria	MEETS STANDARD	
	No	Yes
<b>Communication</b>	<b>28.00%</b>	<b>72.00%</b>
Access and Use Information Ethically and Legally	39.79%	60.21%
Audience-Appropriate Approach & Structure	29.62%	70.38%
Central Message	20.42%	79.58%
Clarity of Peer Review	0.00%	100.00%
Comprehension	25.18%	74.82%
Content Development	33.52%	66.48%
Control of Language, Syntax, and Mechanics	31.53%	68.47%
Data Interpretation	29.92%	70.08%
Explanation of Issues	29.77%	70.23%
Integrated Communication	10.23%	89.77%
Organization	24.56%	75.44%
<b>Critical Thinking</b>	<b>32.57%</b>	<b>67.43%</b>
Apply Disciplinary Knowledge	29.78%	70.22%
Apply Disciplinary Methods	30.71%	69.29%
Apply Knowledge to Social Issues	35.74%	64.26%
Conclusions and Related Outcomes	37.50%	62.50%
Define Problem	32.63%	67.37%
Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically	36.89%	63.11%
Evaluate Outcomes of Attempted Solutions	25.43%	74.57%
Evaluate Potential Solutions	26.73%	73.27%
Evidence Analysis	32.72%	67.28%
Existing Knowledge, Research, and/or Views	27.27%	72.73%
Identify Strategies	35.21%	64.79%
Implement Solution	26.55%	73.45%

Influence of context and assumptions	37.85%	62.15%
Propose Solutions/Hypotheses	21.10%	78.90%
Source Use & Evaluation	32.30%	67.70%
Student's position	40.83%	59.17%
Textual Analysis	45.74%	54.26%
Use of Evidence	34.28%	65.72%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>30.36%</b>	<b>69.64%</b>

#### FREQUENCY OF CRITERIA SELECTION BY PARTICIPATING FACULTY

<b>Objective</b>	
Criteria	Number of Ratings
<b>Communication</b>	<b>7934</b>
Access and Use Information Ethically and Legally	204
Audience-Appropriate Approach & Structure	393
Central Message	763
Clarity of Peer Review	21
Comprehension	1442
Content Development	1010
Control of Language, Syntax, and Mechanics	767
Data Interpretation	508
Explanation of Issues	1295
Integrated Communication	177
Oral Delivery	16
Organization	1338
<b>Critical Thinking</b>	<b>8433</b>
Apply Criteria through Peer Review	7
Apply Disciplinary Knowledge	785
Apply Disciplinary Methods	202
Apply Knowledge to Social Issues	307
Conclusions and Related Outcomes	741
Define Problem	479
Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically	268
Evaluate Outcomes of Attempted Solutions	234
Evaluate Potential Solutions	372
Evidence Analysis	773
Existing Knowledge, Research, and/or Views	785
Identify Strategies	237

Implement Solution	145
Influence of context and assumptions	264
Propose Solutions/Hypotheses	401
Source Use & Evaluation	783
Student's position	449
Textual Analysis	277
Use of Evidence	924
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>16367</b>

**RESULTS BY COLLEGE AND COMPONENT AREA**

<b>PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MEETING CRITERION FOR SUCCESS, BY COLLEGE</b>		
<b>CORE OBJECTIVE</b>	<b>MEETS STANDARD</b>	
College	No	Yes
<b>Communication</b>	<b>28.00%</b>	<b>72.00%</b>
Arts and Sciences	32.60%	67.40%
Business	35.11%	64.89%
General	18.83%	81.17%
Health Sciences	26.81%	73.19%
Nursing	27.74%	72.26%
Professional Education	25.73%	74.27%
<b>Critical Thinking</b>	<b>32.57%</b>	<b>67.43%</b>
Arts and Sciences	34.91%	65.09%
Business	43.18%	56.82%
General	26.15%	73.85%
Health Sciences	30.00%	70.00%
Nursing	31.69%	68.31%
Professional Education	35.75%	64.25%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>30.36%</b>	<b>69.64%</b>

<b>PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MEETING CRITERION FOR SUCCESS, BY FOUNDATIONAL COMPONENT AREA OF THE CORE CURRICULUM</b>		
<b>CORE OBJECTIVE</b>	<b>MEETS STANDARD</b>	
Foundational Component Area	No	Yes
<b>COMMUNICATION</b>	<b>28.00%</b>	<b>72.00%</b>
Communications	26.72%	73.28%

Creative Arts	26.13%	73.87%
Language, Philosophy, & Culture	26.74%	73.26%
Life & Physical Sciences	25.69%	74.31%
Mathematics	36.50%	63.50%
Social & Behavioral Sciences	28.17%	71.83%
<b>CRITICAL THINKING</b>	<b>32.57%</b>	<b>67.43%</b>
Communications	38.43%	61.57%
Creative Arts	40.40%	59.60%
Language, Philosophy, & Culture	31.13%	68.87%
Life & Physical Sciences	28.54%	71.46%
Mathematics	31.12%	68.88%
Social & Behavioral Sciences	35.16%	64.84%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>30.36%</b>	<b>69.64%</b>

## COMPARISONS WITH 2015-16

Because of our new assessment system's three-year assessment cycle, the 2018-19 academic year marks the first time that the core objectives of *Communication* and *Critical Thinking* have been measured a second time, the last having been 2015-16. This means it may be fruitful to compare the 2015-16 and 2018-19 academic years.

However, reliability issues can render differences elusive to detection, and assessment rating conditions are, by necessity, nothing like controlled research conditions. Fortunately, we have several years' worth of rating data to analyze for rater reliability. Before we get to the comparison, then, we would like to take a small detour to talk about reliability and how we have arrived at what we are calling *Benchmark Criteria*.

---

## RELIABILITY AND BENCHMARK CRITERIA

For these analyses, we have used [Inter-Rater Facets](#) (IRF), a tool developed by assessment expert David Eubanks, which we think is among the most useful and robust tools for reliability in assessment situations. IRF identifies not only general indicators of agreement, but also offers insights into where rater agreement breaks down. For instance, IRF tells us that for the criterion of Evaluate Potential Solutions, rater differentiation between level 2 and level 3 performance is good ( $p = .09$ ), but that differentiation between levels 1 and 2 tends to be highly unreliable ( $p = .88$ ). We are leaving such criteria on the menu for faculty to choose and raters to rate because perhaps with better training or adjustments to the language, we can improve that reliability. (Evaluate Potential Solutions used to be called Evaluate Solutions, for instance. Both faculty and raters sometimes assumed it was referring to solutions already attempted by the student or someone else. But the descriptors focus on the evaluation of proposed ideas, actions not yet carried out. So we have renamed it in the hopes of improving its reliability.)

As a general rule, the more frequently raters discuss and apply criteria, the more consistent their ratings will be with other raters. Other factors can also affect reliability, including ambiguity in performance level descriptions or unclear criteria names. While we have been fine-tuning the language and naming of criteria based on such analyses, we have also developed a "short list" of selected criteria, what we might call *Benchmark Criteria*, which tend to be more reliable than most of the others. A criterion can be reliable on, essentially, three axes: 1 vs 2, 1 vs

3, and 2 vs 3. We have designated criteria as benchmarks if they meet either of the following conditions: 1)  $p < .1$  on two or more axes, and no worse than  $p < .5$  on the worst axis; or 2)  $p < .3$  on all axes. More statistically minded readers will recognize that these are not research-level standards. However, assessment does not take place under research conditions. We have a wide range of assignments, a wide range of student classifications, and more than sixty total criteria, with assignments differing on which criteria apply. Although quite a few of our benchmark criteria achieve research-level  $p$  values on two or more axes (in some cases all three), our primary goal in developing this list is to cut out the noise of criteria that have proven quite unreliable, at least until we can get better at rating them.

---

#### COMPARING BENCHMARK CRITERIA BETWEEN 2015-16 AND 2018-19

We saw improvements in many benchmark criteria, including Comprehension, Content Development, Data Interpretation, Apply Disciplinary Methods, Evaluate Information and Its Sources Critically, and Propose Solutions. However, several frequently-selected criteria experienced declines, including Central Message, Explanation of Issues, Organization, Evidence Analysis, and Define Problem. Some criteria appearing on this chart, like Application/Analysis have been reassigned to other core objectives since 2015, so they only appear once on this table. A few, like Use of Evidence, are new criteria, created by the Undergraduate Council's Assessment Committee to synthesize several overlapping items and emphasize angles within them.

Objective / Year / Criterion	MEETS STANDARD			
	No Percentage	Count	Yes Percentage	Count
<b>Communication</b>	<b>27.72%</b>	<b>3,307</b>	<b>72.28%</b>	<b>8,622</b>
<b>Central Message</b>	<b>18.26%</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>81.74%</b>	<b>1,110</b>
2015-16	16.46%	122	83.54%	619
2018-19	20.42%	126	79.58%	491
<b>Comprehension</b>	<b>28.50%</b>	<b>542</b>	<b>71.50%</b>	<b>1,360</b>
2015-16	31.06%	333	68.94%	739
2018-19	25.18%	209	74.82%	621
<b>Content Development</b>	<b>37.67%</b>	<b>698</b>	<b>62.33%</b>	<b>1,155</b>
2015-16	41.54%	398	58.46%	560
2018-19	33.52%	300	66.48%	595
<b>Context of and Purpose for Communication</b>	<b>25.57%</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>74.43%</b>	<b>259</b>
2015-16	25.57%	89	74.43%	259
<b>Data Interpretation</b>	<b>30.91%</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>69.09%</b>	<b>590</b>
2015-16	31.75%	147	68.25%	316
2018-19	29.92%	117	70.08%	274
<b>Explanation of Issues</b>	<b>26.12%</b>	<b>649</b>	<b>73.88%</b>	<b>1,836</b>
2015-16	23.24%	323	76.76%	1,067
2018-19	29.77%	326	70.23%	769
<b>Organization</b>	<b>21.64%</b>	<b>521</b>	<b>78.36%</b>	<b>1,887</b>
2015-16	18.43%	212	81.57%	938

2018-19	24.56%	309	75.44%	949
<b>Uses Information Purposefully</b>	<b>41.05%</b>	<b>296</b>	<b>58.95%</b>	<b>425</b>
2015-16	41.05%	296	58.95%	425
<b>Critical Thinking</b>	<b>29.75%</b>	<b>2,544</b>	<b>70.25%</b>	<b>6,006</b>
<b>Application / Analysis</b>	<b>36.28%</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>63.72%</b>	<b>202</b>
2015-16	36.28%	115	63.72%	202
<b>Apply Disciplinary Knowledge</b>	<b>29.66%</b>	<b>366</b>	<b>70.34%</b>	<b>868</b>
2015-16	29.50%	159	70.50%	380
2018-19	29.78%	207	70.22%	488
<b>Apply Disciplinary Methods</b>	<b>35.54%</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>64.46%</b>	<b>156</b>
2015-16	42.16%	43	57.84%	59
2018-19	30.71%	43	69.29%	97
<b>Define Problem</b>	<b>26.17%</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>73.83%</b>	<b>694</b>
2015-16	21.85%	123	78.15%	440
2018-19	32.63%	123	67.37%	254
<b>Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically</b>	<b>43.15%</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>56.85%</b>	<b>249</b>
2015-16	48.71%	113	51.29%	119
2018-19	36.89%	76	63.11%	130
<b>Evidence Analysis</b>	<b>29.81%</b>	<b>443</b>	<b>70.19%</b>	<b>1,043</b>
2015-16	27.54%	230	72.46%	605
2018-19	32.72%	213	67.28%	438
<b>Existing Knowledge, Research, and/or Views</b>	<b>24.95%</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>75.05%</b>	<b>818</b>
2015-16	22.06%	107	77.94%	378
2018-19	27.27%	165	72.73%	440
<b>Propose Solutions/Hypotheses</b>	<b>24.59%</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>75.41%</b>	<b>549</b>
2015-16	27.75%	106	72.25%	276
2018-19	21.10%	73	78.90%	273
<b>Source Use &amp; Evaluation</b>	<b>29.56%</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>70.44%</b>	<b>715</b>
2015-16	24.04%	81	75.96%	256
2018-19	32.30%	219	67.70%	459
<b>Use of Evidence</b>	<b>34.28%</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>65.72%</b>	<b>508</b>
2018-19	34.28%	265	65.72%	508
<b>Uses Information Purposefully</b>	<b>28.92%</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>71.08%</b>	<b>204</b>
2015-16	28.92%	83	71.08%	204
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>28.57%</b>	<b>5,851</b>	<b>71.43%</b>	<b>14,628</b>

## HISTORY AND GOVERNMENT

The History and Government programs, housed in a common department, have elected to submit their general education artifacts separate from other general education courses. The sample of students to be assessed in History and Government is generated the same way, at the same time, and in the same batch as are the samples for the rest of the core curriculum. The list of criteria, scales of performance, benchmarks for success, and the rubrics used are the same as for the rest of the core. However, instead of having than instructors individually submit artifacts to the university’s core assessment rating system, these programs submit their scores to a single faculty member liaison, who then provides them to the assistant director of academic assessment through an Excel spreadsheet.

The scores are based on standardized assessments used across all sections of HIST 1013, HIST 1023, GOV 2013, and GOV 2023. Students are provided with a reading and a series of multiple-choice questions, each of which is coded as aligning with one of the criteria in the table below, with each criterion corresponding to three questions. For instance, Textual Analysis has three questions associated with it. If a student answers all three correctly, the student’s score for this criterion is 3. If the student answers two correctly, the score is 2. Otherwise, the student doesn’t meet the criterion for success and the score is a 1.

All students take the same test in every core History and Government class, which means some students may take it as many as four times. For this reason, data from these programs are segregated from the data in the main core assessment system. Possibly as a partial result of the above policies, criterion-of-success rates are higher here than in the core community at large, though Explanation of Issues and Define Problem (from *Communication* and *Critical Thinking*, respectively) stand out as opportunities for progress.

<b>Fall 2018</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>COMMUNICATION</b>	<b>23.81%</b>	<b>76.19%</b>
Comprehension	14.29%	85.71%
Explanation of Issues	28.57%	71.43%
Interpretation	28.57%	71.43%
<b>CRITICAL THINKING</b>	<b>23.81%</b>	<b>76.19%</b>
Evidence Analysis	14.29%	85.71%
Existing Knowledge, Research, and/or Views	42.86%	57.14%
Influence of Context & Assumptions	14.29%	85.71%
<b>Spring 2019</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>COMMUNICATION</b>	<b>17.80%</b>	<b>82.20%</b>
Comprehension	23.81%	76.19%
Explanation of Issues	19.05%	80.95%
Interpretation	10.53%	89.47%
<b>CRITICAL THINKING</b>	<b>19.37%</b>	<b>80.63%</b>
Evidence Analysis	20.00%	80.00%
Existing Knowledge, Research, and/or Views	14.29%	85.71%
Influence of Context & Assumptions	23.81%	76.19%

## CONTACT INFORMATION

For more information about core assessment results, consult on assignment design for assessments, or learn more about joining our volunteer community of raters, Core Rater Academy, please contact Dr. Gray Scott, assistant professor of English and assistant director of academic assessment, at [grayscott@twu.edu](mailto:grayscott@twu.edu) or (940) 898-2327.