

Report of Value Rubric Review Group
Critical Thinking
November 6, 2014

Members: Suzanne Lay, Kurt Haas, Heather Patterson McCullough, Ann Gillies, Judy Williams, Paul Behl, Jeanine Howe, Jamie Walker, Nathan Perry, Risharra Stulc, Courtney Kasun, Jeremy Hawkins, Regis Tucci, Kirk Gustafson, Russ Walker, Brian Parry, Jennifer Daniels, Jeremy Franklin, Gary Looft, Bette Schans

The review group for the critical thinking value rubric met from 2 to 6 p.m. on November 6, 2014. The first hour of the session was spent scoring and calibrating one artifact. Over the next two hours, the group read and scored 5 artifacts each (2 reviewers read the same 5 artifacts) for a total of 51 artifacts. During the remaining time, the group discussed the process and the usefulness of the rubric for assessing critical thinking in Essential Learning.

The following are comments and suggestions as a result of the discussion:

- There should be campus-wide discussions about the definition of critical thinking. Faculty involved in submitting artifacts need to have an understanding of the rubric and ensure that the work being submitted can be assessed for critical thinking.
- Prior to actually scoring the artifacts, the review group should be in agreement about the terminology in the rubric, try to have an understanding of the differences between the ratings of benchmark, milestone and capstone. There needs to be more discussion about the rubric itself prior to the calibration.
- It will be important to have the assignment attached to the artifacts. It was difficult to know if something was missing or just not assigned in the papers. Need to make a separate column for 'not applicable' and 'not met'.
- It was difficult to overlook the grammar and sentence structure and focus just on the critical thinking aspects of the papers.
- There was some questions about the 4 point scale. Should it be broadened?
- Some of the wording in the criteria may need to be changed for clarification. It was hard to find differences between the ratings of 3 versus 4 in the Analysis criteria.
- The wording in the Evidence criteria is not clear. Perhaps changing the title 'Evidence' to 'Support' may fix that issue. The use of the term 'experts' in the last sentence should be changed to 'sources' for clarity. What is the connection between evidence and analysis? Can there be analysis without evidence?
- What is the difference between student's position and the conclusion? Should there be conclusion throughout the document or only in the last one or two paragraphs?
- Overall, the group felt that the rubric is effective and the majority believes it can be used as is. Some stated that, if some wording is changed, it will be usable.
- There was greater consistency in scoring in this section than the other two.

The results are as follows:

Explanation of issues:	2.29
Evidence:	2.13
Analysis:	2.56
Student's position:	1.90
Conclusions and related outcomes:	2.19
Average of Artifacts	2.22