

Learning Outcomes Assessment - Critical Thinking

Assessment ID: 188

Assessment Type: General Learning Outcome

Year/Term: 2010 / 2

Name: hartman, Rebecca

Email: rhartman@eou.edu

Program: History

Prefix / Course Number: HIST / 202

High Impact Practice (HIP):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> First Year Experience | <input type="checkbox"/> Learning Community |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Leadership Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Co-Curriculum |
| <input type="checkbox"/> University Writing Requirement | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Collaborative Assignments and Projects |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate Research | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Diversity / Global Learning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Service Learning / Community-Based Learning | <input type="checkbox"/> Internship / Practicum / Field Work |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance | <input type="checkbox"/> Portfolio |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Capstone Project | |

Learning Outcome: Critical Thinking

Assessment Method/Tool: Rubric

Measurement Scale: 1 - 3

Sample Size: 22

	Developing (# of students)		Adequate (# of students)		Proficient (# of students)	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
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 <u>22</u> 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
 (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.)

Percent Achieving Benchmark 76.1% Actual percent of students meeting "Adequate" or "Proficient" levels

Learning Outcomes Assessment - Critical Thinking

Assessment: ID: 188

Question / Prompt / Assignment: Analyzing WWI Propaganda
(used for the assessment) 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.
(provide context within the course/activity for the question/prompt/assignment)

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

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 will you use the results to improve student learning?

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)

Developing Example (web address)

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

Assessment Type: General Learning Outcome

Year/Term: 2010 / 2

Name: Wilson, Tim

Email: twilson@eou.edu

Program: History

Prefix / Course Number: HIST / 202

High Impact Practice (HIP):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> First Year Experience | <input type="checkbox"/> Learning Community |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Leadership Training | <input type="checkbox"/> Co-Curriculum |
| <input type="checkbox"/> University Writing Requirement | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Collaborative Assignments and Projects |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate Research | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Diversity / Global Learning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Service Learning / Community-Based Learning | <input type="checkbox"/> Internship / Practicum / Field Work |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Performance | <input type="checkbox"/> Portfolio |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Capstone Project | |

Learning Outcome: Critical Thinking

Assessment Method/Tool: Rubric

Measurement Scale: 1 - 3

Sample Size: 22

	Developing (# of students)		Adequate (# of students)		Proficient (# of students)	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
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 <u>22</u> 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
 (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.)

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)