CORE ASSESSMENT REPORT TWU 2021-2022

OBJECTIVES: COMMUNICATION AND CRITICAL THINKING

SUMMARY

For the 2021-2022 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 2021-2022 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*, 84.02% 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.
- Both first-time-in-college (FTIC) and transfer student populations 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, Central Message and Audience-Appropriate Approach & Structure stood out as noteworthy strengths (91.90% and 90.44% of students meeting the criterion for success, respectively), suggesting students are generally good at getting their main point across and following conventions and organizational structures appropriate for the genre or audience of the work.
- Access and Use Information Ethically and Legally, Clarity of Peer Review, and Control of Language, Syntax, and Mechanics stood out as relative weaknesses (65.75%, 75.00%, and 77.63%, respectively), suggesting students may need more scaffolding and practice at shoring up points with research and evidence.

- Finally, Comprehension (84.26%) and Explanation of Issues (84.46%) stood out as criteria that, for how frequently faculty selected them as relevant to assigned tasks, may require more scaffolding and explicit instruction. It is worth noting that these last two criteria are interrelated, in that students who struggle to comprehend assigned materials also struggle to explain them.

For *Critical Thinking,* 78.49% met the criterion for success.

- Notably, the percentages of first-year and sophomore students meeting the criterion for success were the lowest while still meeting goal (79.90% and 72.82%, respectively), though the percentages of juniors (81.72%) and seniors (78.86%) meeting the criterion for success were not noticeably higher than the lower classmen groups.
- While still meeting the goal, transfer students received the lowest amount of students meeting the criteria for success at 75%, followed closely by FTIC students at 77.42%. Dual-credit high school students actually performed better than both FTIC and transfer students at 88.24%.
- Both full-time and part-time students came in above goal.
- Among *Critical Thinking* criteria that were often rated and tended to have more robust reliability, both Define Problem and Implement Solutions stood out as noteworthy strengths (94.92% and 97.30% of students meeting the criterion for success, respectively).
- The only *Critical Thinking* criterion that fell below the benchmark for success was Identify Strategies at 63.33% . Additional areas of weakness are: Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically; Evaluate Potential Solutions; and Source Use and Evaluation (67.21%, 66.67%, and 69.88%, respectively).
- Finally, Evidence Analysis (75.50%) stood out as a criterion that, for how frequently faculty selected it as relevant to assigned tasks, may require more scaffolding and explicit instruction.

CONTENTS

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 are continuously 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 uses several best practices such as using a common template, a form broken up into specific tasks and questions, and smaller steps that 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. Additionally, rubrics and model assignments can further support students' understanding of the expectations. 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 share that the process of rating is an educative experience. They often come 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. Holding annual **Assessment Summits**
    a. Technically, we cannot call these *annual* yet as we have only held one of them. But the one we held virtually in May 2022, with nearly 30 core faculty participants and a series of faculty presenters with insights into improving student results and improving core assessment designs, was enough of a success, as gauged by survey feedback, that we are already planning to hold our next such event in Fall 2022, and every Fall term thereafter. We are thinking of these Summits as a pedagogical take-a-penny/leave-a-penny tray, wherein core faculty can share what they are doing and hear from what others are doing. Our regular assessment raters report benefits from seeing what faculty across the core (particularly in other disciplines) are doing, and we wanted to expand this kind of insight to a larger community beyond our volunteer raters.
2. 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. We have since distributed additional copies to new core faculty on request, to writing fellows, and through raffle drawings to participants in the Spring 2022 Assessment Summit described above.
    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 director of academic assessment and accreditation's primary area of specialization outside of assessment is the teaching of writing across the curriculum. Several years ago, he 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. In both 2018-19 and 2021-22, participants' students performed significantly better ($p < .001$ and $p = .012$, respectively) on *Communication* and *Critical Thinking* benchmark criteria discussed later in this report than students of non-participants did, with moderate effect size advantages (0.3 and 0.2 respectively). With the budget crunch and pandemic of 2020 through last year, funding and personnel have been too stretched to continue this initiative, but we expect to bring back writing fellowships in the next academic year.

3. 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. In this light, we began conversations with stakeholders across campus to study the state of academic integrity here, and revise or improve policies based on integrity research. A multi-disciplinary faculty-and-staff committee oversaw a revision of the university's academic integrity policy, which was approved in August 2021. Although recent budget, pandemic, and accreditation impacts on resources have kept us from following up with our next planned steps, our hope is to continue our efforts by distributing a student survey on academic integrity and using responses and data to begin a student-level dialogue about academic integrity culture. We have also designed several primer assignments to spark dialogue about common integrity issues, with plans to deploy these in the first-year seminar courses (UNIV 1231).
    c. 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 2021-22, 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: 85.44%, Male: 14.56%
- FTIC: 57.10%, Dual-Credit: 16.82%, Transfer: 26.08%
- Full-Time: 73.22%, Part-Time: 26.78%

Student Classification	Percentage
First-Year	48.81%
Sophomore	22.38%

Junior	17.05%
Senior	11.56%
Post-baccalaureate	0.19%
Grand Total	**100.00%**

Student Ethnicity	Percentage
American Indian or Alaska Native, non-Hispanic	0.54%
Asian, non-Hispanic	9.61%
Black, non-Hispanic	17.01%
Hispanic/Latino	33.40%
International	0.39%
Unknown	0.39%
White, non-Hispanic	38.65%
Grand Total	**100.00%**

Student College	Percentage
Arts and Sciences	27.56%
General	17.59%
Health Sciences	15.61%
Nursing	24.87%
Professional Education	8.49%
Grand Total	**100.00%**

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, 39.04% held doctoral degrees or equivalents. The remainder of core faculty comprise mostly adjunct faculty and (particularly for first-year composition) graduate teaching assistants.

Faculty Department	Percentage
Biology	8.45%
Business and Economics	1.87%
Chemistry and Physics	7.90%
Dance	2.84%
English, Speech, and Foreign Language	17.13%
General	7.12%
Kinesiology	1.87%
Mathematics and Computer Science	15.34%
Music and Drama	1.71%
Psychology and Philosophy	16.04%
Sociology and Social Work	3.50%
Teacher Education	1.44%
Visual Arts	3.39%
Women's Studies	9.54%

Grand Total	**100.00%**

CORE-ACADEMY RATERS

Our volunteer rater pool is mostly comprised of faculty, staff, and students, with the remainder filled out by a combination of administrators and alumni.

Raters	Percentage
Adjunct	8.06%
Faculty	36.28%
Grad Student	6.71%
Staff	42.26%
Other	6.69%
Grand Total	**100.00%**

TABLES OF RESULTS

In past years, rates of success generally increased as students progressed through grade ranks, from first-year to senior. A noticeable difference for AY 2021-2022 is the lower percentages seen in the sophomore grade level.

RESULTS BY STUDENT CLASSIFICATION

CORE OBJECTIVE	MEETS STANDARD	
Student Classification	No	Yes
Communication	**16.03%**	**83.97%**
FR	14.39%	85.61%
SO	23.28%	76.72%
JR	13.60%	86.40%
SR	11.98%	88.02%
Critical Thinking	**21.55%**	**78.45%**
FR	20.10%	79.90%
SO	27.18%	72.82%
JR	18.28%	81.72%
SR	21.14%	78.86%
Grand Total	**18.82%**	**81.18%**

RESULTS BY FULL-TIME OR PART-TIME STATUS

Objective	MEETS STANDARD	
Class Load	No	Yes
Communication	**15.98%**	**84.02%**
Full time	18.06%	81.94%
Part time	10.51%	89.49%
Critical Thinking	**21.51%**	**78.49%**
Full time	23.99%	76.01%
Part time	14.62%	85.38%
Grand Total	**18.78%**	**81.22%**

RESULTS BY FIRST-TIME IN COLLEGE OR TRANSFER STATUS

Objective	MEETS STANDARD	
Admission Status	No	Yes
Communication	**15.98%**	**84.02%**
FTIC	17.29%	82.71%
Transfer	19.51%	80.49%
Dual Credit	5.97%	94.03%
Critical Thinking	**21.51%**	**78.49%**
FTIC	22.58%	77.42%
Transfer	25.00%	75.00%
Dual Credit	11.76%	88.24%
Grand Total	**18.78%**	**81.22%**

RESULTS BY CRITERION

Count of MEETS STANDARD	Percentages	
Objectives	**No**	**Yes**
Communication	**15.98%**	**84.02%**
Access and Use Information Ethically and Legally	34.25%	65.75%
Audience-Appropriate Approach & Structure	9.56%	90.44%
Central Message	8.10%	91.90%
Clarity of Peer Review	25.00%	75.00%
Comprehension	15.74%	84.26%
Content Development	16.88%	83.12%
Control of Language, Syntax, and Mechanics	22.37%	77.63%
Data Interpretation	12.02%	87.98%
Explanation of Issues	15.54%	84.46%

Integrated Communication	0.00%	100.00%
Organization	19.83%	80.17%
Critical Thinking	**21.51%**	**78.49%**
Apply Criteria through Peer Review	0.00%	100.00%
Apply Disciplinary Knowledge	20.47%	79.53%
Apply Disciplinary Methods	15.91%	84.09%
Apply Knowledge to Social Issues	14.12%	85.88%
Conclusions and Related Outcomes	27.51%	72.49%
Define Problem	5.08%	94.92%
Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically	32.79%	67.21%
Evaluate Potential Solutions	33.33%	66.67%
Evidence Analysis	24.50%	75.50%
Existing Knowledge, Research, and/or Views	16.25%	83.75%
Identify Strategies	36.67%	63.33%
Implement Solution	2.70%	97.30%
Influence of context and assumptions	26.47%	73.53%
Propose Solutions/Hypotheses	29.07%	70.93%
Source Use & Evaluation	30.12%	69.88%
Student's position	16.67%	83.33%
Textual Analysis	13.48%	86.52%
Use of Evidence	25.27%	74.73%
Grand Total	**18.78%**	**81.22%**

Frequency of Criteria Selection	
Objectives	**Number of Ratings**
Communication	**2530**
Access and Use Information Ethically and Legally	79
Audience-Appropriate Approach & Structure	141
Central Message	223
Clarity of Peer Review	24
Comprehension	322
Content Development	448
Control of Language, Syntax, and Mechanics	259
Data Interpretation	259
Explanation of Issues	462
Integrated Communication	37

Organization	276
Critical Thinking	**2608**
Apply Criteria through Peer Review	28
Apply Disciplinary Knowledge	299
Apply Disciplinary Methods	167
Apply Knowledge to Social Issues	203
Conclusions and Related Outcomes	245
Define Problem	146
Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically	239
Evaluate Potential Solutions	34
Evidence Analysis	273
Existing Knowledge, Research, and/or Views	95
Identify Strategies	30
Implement Solution	52
Influence of context and assumptions	36
Propose Solutions/Hypotheses	88
Source Use & Evaluation	119
Student's position	107
Textual Analysis	140
Use of Evidence	307
Grand Total	**5138**

RESULTS BY COLLEGE AND COMPONENT AREA

Results by College		
CORE OBJECTIVE	**MEETS STANDARD**	
College	**No**	**Yes**
Communication	**15.98%**	**84.02%**
Arts and Sciences	13.44%	86.56%
Business	21.85%	78.15%
General	6.79%	93.21%
Health Sciences	22.42%	77.58%
Nursing	19.50%	80.50%
Professional Education	16.85%	83.15%
Critical Thinking	**21.51%**	**78.49%**
Arts and Sciences	22.11%	77.89%

Business	26.15%	73.85%
General	13.20%	86.80%
Health Sciences	26.97%	73.03%
Nursing	22.92%	77.08%
Professional Education	18.48%	81.52%
Grand Total	**18.78%**	**81.22%**

Results by Component Area		
Count of MEETS STANDARD	**Percentages**	
Component Area	**No**	**Yes**
Communication	**15.98%**	**84.02%**
Communications	7.47%	92.53%
Creative Arts	21.89%	78.11%
Language, Philosophy, & Culture	14.29%	85.71%
Life & Physical Sciences	14.70%	85.30%
Mathematics	30.31%	69.69%
Social & Behavioral Sciences	8.26%	91.74%
Critical Thinking	**21.51%**	**78.49%**
Communications	11.93%	88.07%
Creative Arts	27.53%	72.47%
Language, Philosophy, & Culture	23.30%	76.70%
Life & Physical Sciences	18.13%	81.87%
Mathematics	29.78%	70.22%
Social & Behavioral Sciences	15.89%	84.11%
Grand Total	**18.78%**	**81.22%**

COMPARISONS WITH 2015-16 AND 2018-19

The 2021-22 academic year marks the third time that the core objectives of *Communication* and *Critical Thinking* have been measured, the last having been 2018-19. This means it may be fruitful to compare criteria across the three 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 AMONG 2015-16, 2018-19, AND 2021-22

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. A handful of criteria that saw declines in 2018-19 rebounded in AY 2020-21: Central Message, Explanation of Issues, Organization, Define Problem, and Evidence Analysis. Use of Evidence, which was new in 2018-19, has since increased. 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.

	MEETS STANDARD			
	No		Yes	
Objective / Year / Criterion	**Percentage**	**Count**	**Percentage**	**Count**
Communication	**26.22%**	**3,551**	**73.78%**	**9,990**
Central Message	**16.90%**	**265**	**83.10%**	**1,303**
2015-16	16.46%	122	83.54%	619
2018-19	20.42%	126	79.58%	491
2021-22	8.10%	17	91.90%	193
Comprehension	**27.30%**	**573**	**72.70%**	**1,526**

2015-16	31.06%	333	68.94%	739
2018-19	25.18%	209	74.82%	621
2021-22	15.74%	31	84.26%	166
Content Development	**34.05%**	**764**	**65.95%**	**1,480**
2015-16	41.54%	398	58.46%	560
2018-19	33.52%	300	66.48%	595
2021-22	16.88%	66	83.12%	325
Context of and Purpose for Communication	**25.57%**	**89**	**74.43%**	**259**
2015-16	25.57%	89	74.43%	259
Data Interpretation	**27.58%**	**286**	**72.42%**	**751**
2015-16	31.75%	147	68.25%	316
2018-19	29.92%	117	70.08%	274
2021-22	12.02%	22	87.98%	161
Explanation of Issues	**24.65%**	**711**	**75.35%**	**2,173**
2015-16	23.24%	323	76.76%	1,067
2018-19	29.77%	326	70.23%	769
2021-22	15.54%	62	84.46%	337
Organization	**21.48%**	**567**	**78.52%**	**2,073**
2015-16	18.43%	212	81.57%	938
2018-19	24.56%	309	75.44%	949
2021-22	19.83%	46	80.17%	186
Uses Information Purposefully	**41.05%**	**296**	**58.95%**	**425**
2015-16	41.05%	296	58.95%	425
Critical Thinking	**28.68%**	**2,857**	**71.32%**	**7,103**
Application / Analysis	**36.28%**	**115**	**63.72%**	**202**
2015-16	36.28%	115	63.72%	202
Apply Criteria through Peer Review	**0.00%**		**100.00%**	**9**
2021-22	0.00%		100.00%	9
Apply Disciplinary Knowledge	**28.09%**	**418**	**71.91%**	**1,070**
2015-16	29.50%	159	70.50%	380
2018-19	29.78%	207	70.22%	488
2021-22	20.47%	52	79.53%	202
Apply Disciplinary Methods	**28.61%**	**107**	**71.39%**	**267**
2015-16	42.16%	43	57.84%	59

2018-19	30.71%	43	69.29%	97
2021-22	15.91%	21	84.09%	111
Define Problem	**23.82%**	**252**	**76.18%**	**806**
2015-16	21.85%	123	78.15%	440
2018-19	32.63%	123	67.37%	254
2021-22	5.08%	6	94.92%	112
Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically	**40.89%**	**229**	**59.11%**	**331**
2015-16	48.71%	113	51.29%	119
2018-19	36.89%	76	63.11%	130
2021-22	32.79%	40	67.21%	82
Evidence Analysis	**29.05%**	**504**	**70.95%**	**1,231**
2015-16	27.54%	230	72.46%	605
2018-19	32.72%	213	67.28%	438
2021-22	24.50%	61	75.50%	188
Existing Knowledge, Research, and/or Views	**24.36%**	**285**	**75.64%**	**885**
2015-16	22.06%	107	77.94%	378
2018-19	27.27%	165	72.73%	440
2021-22	16.25%	13	83.75%	67
Propose Solutions/Hypotheses	**25.06%**	**204**	**74.94%**	**610**
2015-16	27.75%	106	72.25%	276
2018-19	21.10%	73	78.90%	273
2021-22	29.07%	25	70.93%	61
Source Use & Evaluation	**29.60%**	**325**	**70.40%**	**773**
2015-16	24.04%	81	75.96%	256
2018-19	32.30%	219	67.70%	459
2021-22	30.12%	25	69.88%	58
Use of Evidence	**31.90%**	**335**	**68.10%**	**715**
2018-19	34.28%	265	65.72%	508
2021-22	25.27%	70	74.73%	207
Uses Information Purposefully	**28.92%**	**83**	**71.08%**	**204**
2015-16	28.92%	83	71.08%	204
Grand Total	**27.27%**	**6,408**	**72.73%**	**17,093**

HISTORY AND POLITICAL SCIENCE

The History and Political Science 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 Political Science 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 have historically submitted their scores to a single faculty member liaison, who then provides them to the assistant director of academic assessment through an Excel spreadsheet. This means that data included above, including for students, faculty, and raters, do not include History or Political Science results.

Starting in Fall 2021, selected faculty used a reporting form that was sent directly to our office, which we then entered into an Excel spreadsheet.

The scores are based on standardized assessments used across all 39 sections of HIST 1013, HIST 1023, POLS 2013, and POLS 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 Political Science 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.

**The Political Science program/courses were previously titled Government*

Spring 2022	No	Yes
Communication	**11.25%**	**88.75%**
Explanation of Issues	10.53%	89.47%
Comprehension	5.56%	94.44%
Interpretation	17.65%	82.35%
Critical Thinking	**8.7%**	**91.3%**
Influence of Context & Assumptions	0%	100%
Existing Knowledge Research and/or Views	11.11%	88.89%
Evidence Analysis	15%	85%
Fall 2021	**No**	**Yes**
Communication	**11.11%**	**88.89%**
Explanation of Issues	16.67%	83.33%
Comprehension	0%	100%
Interpretation	16.67%	83.33%

Critical Thinking	**5.81%**	**94.19%**
Influence of Context & Assumptions	8.33%	91.67%
Existing Knowledge Research and/or Views	0%	100%
Evidence Analysis	9.09%	90.91%

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. Aimée Myers, assistant professor of Curriculum and Instruction and assistant director of academic assessment, at amyers8@twu.edu or (940) 898-2244.