



UNIVERSITY
OF HAWAII
HILO

TO: UHH Faculty Congress

FROM: Seri Luangphinith
Chair, Department of English
Chair, Assessment Support Committee

CC: Phillip Castile, VCAA

RE: Final Report of the Assessment Support Committee for AY 2009-2010

DATE: April 23, 2010

Per the last report, dated February 26, 2010, the Assessment Support Committee shared the rationale of our work (per review of WASC accreditation rubrics) and committed to a test run of the rubrics we developed at the WASC retreat in January.

Attachment A represents the data collected from our initial readings for the first 3 General Education Learning Outcomes: Critical Thinking, Information Literacy, and Communication.

We have assigned generic alphas to all of the courses to avoid negative representation of any one college's and/or instructor's curricula/um. We have included the generic labels for categories under each learning outcome (i.e. Critical Thinking has been broken down to 5 sub-categories). All three rubrics were created with research-based thesis-driven writing in mind. The numbers correspond to the following level of skills: (1) beginning, (2) emerging, (3) competent, and (4) advanced.

We are not releasing the characteristics of these at this time as we are still ironing out lingering problems in all three rubrics. The Committee will continue working on the language come the next academic year.

This is not to suggest that the rubrics the Committee develops will ever achieve perfection. No rubrics developed by any one entity have been or ever will be faultless; in fact, the ones developed by the AACU are themselves flawed and highly jargonistic. However imperfect our rubrics, they have generated some interesting information for the larger faculty body to consider:

- There is general agreement among classes as to what constitutes skills *appropriate* to the alpha level of courses in terms of Information Literacy and, to a lesser extent, Communication. Obviously, certain classes stress certain skills more than others. But the overall level of writing from the eleven (11) papers, which represent almost every college and discipline, show a consistent level of preparation with a few exceptions.

- Predictably, the numbers also indicate that there is less “skill” at the 100-level. However, what the rubric *cannot* show is if this is the result of poorly worded assignments, inattention to standards of academic writing by the instructors, poor student work ethic, or their actual level of skill (due to inadequate pre-collegiate education). We were not given syllabi, descriptions/parameters of assignments, the scheduling of the assignments (at what point in the semester assignment were given), nor were we given a range of papers in conjunction with any one assignment.

In the future, as we collect a larger base of assessable student work, syllabi and assignment details will be needed. Implicit in our need for more information is the importance of having faculty map skills and assignments in their syllabi with a rationale for how assignments help students develop these skills. The advantages to starting such practices on campus are three-fold: first, detailed descriptions and rationales can facilitate more accurate assessment; secondly, they also encourage better communication of expectations between faculty and students; and thirdly, such practice may encourage a more thoughtful and coherent approach to teaching GE-designated courses.

- While there is general consensus among most Committee members on what constitutes information literacy, there is less agreement on what constitutes an actual research-based paper, which explains the frequency of “NA” (Not Applicable) for a handful of assessed assignments. This further demonstrates the need to have assignment sheets and syllabi accompany submissions.
- There is also less consensus on what constitutes critical thinking. This is not unusual for any institution. In fact, a brief perusal of various agencies and experts reveals complex dissention among many schools and regions (see Attachment B). There is even more disagreement between disciplines (such as Comparative Literature versus Chemistry). This suggests a pressing need to have programs here at UHH begin discussions of how such skills are seen in the work of their majors. In other words, it is not enough for an English major to read the poetry of Frederick Douglas but s/he must also demonstrate critical thinking about the subject.

Per WASC/Benjamin Bloom, Critical Thinking is broadly defined (in increasing difficulty) as: knowledge (remembering previously learned material), comprehension (explaining or summarizing knowledge), application (using previously learned knowledge in a different context), analysis (breaking down and making inferences about a subject), evaluation (judging accuracy, consistency, logic of information, and/or argumentation), and synthesis (putting together various elements in a creative and unique manner). How various disciplines specifically teach these in conjunction with content, sequencing of courses, and national guidelines remains up to individual departments to weigh.

- One of the lingering problems facing the Committee is the difficulty in creating rubrics that can differentiate between summative and formative assessment. Final research papers may be good at evaluating the “end” result of a research project and is very appropriate in exhibiting synthesis of material and argumentation; they are not good at revealing the kinds of evaluation and weeding out of information that must take place before a final paper is drafted. An annotated bibliography is an excellent reflection on the process students undertake to evaluate information; it is not considered an exercise in argumentation nor can it show effective communication as it lacks a thesis.

Similarly, what some members of the Committee have argued is that Critical Thinking should not be solely understood as the end result of research. A final “thesis-driven” paper incorporating primary and secondary may not be appropriate for courses stressing creative arts; nevertheless, poetry and/or songs can reflect higher level skills—such as the synthesis of various poetic techniques—*provided* that a discussion (i.e. methodology) accompany them to allow students to demonstrate evaluation and judgment of which techniques work and why. While the Committee will be working over the summer and the next school year developing a wider range of rubrics for a wider range of assignments, we suggest that teachers keep in mind that skills can be developed at different times and per a variety of assignments. This brings us back to the second bullet in this report. Committee members are using the summer to generate syllabi for their own classes that map skills and assignments to further aid our revision of these three rubrics in the fall. We also look forward to working with other faculty in our respective colleges and departments on generating these much needed discussions of skills and descriptions of assignments.

ATTACHMENT A
RESULTS OF READINGS
GE SKILLS 1-3

GE 1: CRITICAL THINKING

Course Alpha #	Reader	Issues/ARG	Positions	Evidence	Interpretation	Conclusions	
AAA 100	Karla McDermid	2	1	2	1	2	
	Tara Ballard	2	3	3	3	2	
	Seri Luangphinith	3	2	3	3	2	
	Luke Bailey	3	4	4	3	3	
	Matt Haslam	1	2	2	2	2	
	Keola Donaghy	3	3	3	3	3	
	Lorna Tsutsumi	2	2	2	2	2	
	Hank Hennessey	3	3	3	3	3	
	Barbara Meguro	1	2	3	2	1	
	Michele Ebersole	3	3	3	3	4	
	Karla Hayashi	3	3	3	3	3	
	Anthony Escareno	*	*	*	*	*	
	BBB 100	Karla McDermid	1	1	1	1	1
		Tara Ballard	2	1	1	1	1
Seri Luangphinith		2	1	1	1	1	
Luke Bailey		3	1	1	1	1	
Matt Haslam		1	2	2	1	1	
Keola Donaghy		2	2	2	1	1	
Lorna Tsutsumi		2	2	2	2	2	
Hank Hennessey		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Barbara Meguro		1	1	2	1	1	
Michele Ebersole		3	2	2	2	2	
Karla Hayashi		2	1	1	1	1	
Anthony Escareno		1	2	2	1	1	
CCC 100		Karla McDermid	1	2	1	2	2
		Tara Ballard	1	1	1	1	1
	Seri Luangphinith	2	2	1	1	2	
	Luke Bailey	1	2	2	2	1	
	Matt Haslam	1	2	1	2	2	
	Keola Donaghy	2	2	2	2	2	
	Lorna Tsutsumi	2	2	3	2	2	
	Hank Hennessey	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Barbara Meguro	1	3	3	3	3	
	Michele Ebersole	2	2	2	2	2	
	Karla Hayashi	1	2	2	1	1	
	Anthony Escareno	1	1	3	1	3	

GE 1: CRITICAL THINKING

Course Alpha #		Issues/ARG	Positions	Evidence	Interpretation	Conclusions	
DDD 100	Karla McDermid	1	2	1	1	2	
	Tara Ballard	2	2	2	2	2	
	Seri Luangphinit	3	3	1	3	3	
	Luke Bailey	1	3	1	1	1	
	Matt Haslam	2	2	1	2	2	
	Keola Donaghy	3	3	2	3	3	
	Lorna Tsutsumi	3	3	2	3	3	
	Hank Hennessey	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Barbara Meguro	1	3	3	3	3	
	Michele Ebersole	3	3	3	3	3	
	Karla Hayashi	1	1	1	1	1	
	Anthony Escareno	3	4	3	3	3	
	ZZZ 100 (added after report issued)	Karla McDermid					
		Tara Ballard	3	3	3	3	3
Seri Luangphinit		4	2	2	3	3	
Luke Bailey							
Matt Haslam							
Keola Donaghy							
Lorna Tsutsumi		3	3	3	3	3	
Hank Hennessey		3	3	3	2	3	
Barbara Meguro							
Michele Ebersole							
Karla Hayashi							
Anthony Escareno							
EEE 200	Karla McDermid	4	4	4	3	4	
	Tara Ballard	3	3	3	3	3	
	Seri Luangphinit	4	3	4	4	4	
	Luke Bailey	4	4	3	4	3	
	Matt Haslam	4	4	3	3	4	
	Keola Donaghy	3	4	4	3	4	
	Lorna Tsutsumi	3	3	3	3	3	
	Hank Hennessey	3	3	2	2	3	
	Barbara Meguro	4	4	4	4	4	
	Michele Ebersole	4	4	4	4	4	
	Karla Hayashi	4	4	4	4	4	
Anthony Escareno	4	3	4	4	4		

GE 1: CRITICAL THINKING

Course Alpha #	Reader	Issues/ARG	Positions	Evidence	Interpretation	Conclusions	
FFF 200	Karla McDermid	2	1	2	1	2	
	Tara Ballard	3	2	3	2	1	
	Seri Luangphinit	2	1	2	1	1	
	Luke Bailey	3	2	1	1	1	
	Matt Haslam	2	1	2	1	1	
	Keola Donaghy	4	3	3	1	1	
	Lorna Tsutsumi	2	2	1	1	1	
	Hank Hennessey	2	1	2	1	1	
	Barbara Meguro	3	2	3	2	1	
	Michele Ebersole	2	1	2	2	1	
	Karla Hayashi	3	2	2	2	2	
	Anthony Escareno	2	2	2	2	2	
	GGG 300	Karla McDermid	1	3	4	4	1
		Tara Ballard	2	3	3	3	2
Seri Luangphinit		1	2	4	2	1	
Luke Bailey		1	1	2	2	1	
Matt Haslam		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Keola Donaghy		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Lorna Tsutsumi		1	3	3	3	3	
Hank Hennessey		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Barbara Meguro		1	3	2	3	1	
Michele Ebersole		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Karla Hayashi		1	2	2	2	1	
Anthony Escareno		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
HHH 300		Karla McDermid	3	2	2	2	1
		Tara Ballard	3	3	3	3	2
	Seri Luangphinit	3	2	3	2	1	
	Luke Bailey	4	3	3	3	3	
	Matt Haslam	2	2	2	2	2	
	Keola Donaghy	3	3	4	4	3	
	Lorna Tsutsumi	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Hank Hennessey	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Barbara Meguro	2	3	3	3	3	
	Michele Ebersole	3	3	3	3	4	
	Karla Hayashi	3	2	3	2	3	
	Anthony Escareno	4	4	4	3	4	

GE 1: CRITICAL THINKING

Course Alpha #	Reader	Issues/ARG	Positions	Evidence	Interpretation	Conclusions
JJJ 300	Karla McDermid	1	1	1	1	2
	Tara Ballard	2	1	2	1	1
	Seri Luangphinit	1	1	2	1	1
	Luke Bailey	1	1	1	1	1
	Matt Haslam	1	1	1	1	1
	Keola Donaghy	1	2	2	1	1
	Lorna Tsutsumi	1	2	2	2	2
	Hank Hennessey	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Barbara Meguro	1	1	1	1	2
	Michele Ebersole	2	1	2	1	1
	Karla Hayashi	1	1	1	1	1
	Anthony Escareno	2	2	2	2	2
LLL 400	Karla McDermid	4	3	3	3	4
	Tara Ballard	3	3	3	3	3
	Seri Luangphinit	4	3	2	3	4
	Luke Bailey	4	3	3	3	3
	Matt Haslam	3	2	2	2	3
	Keola Donaghy	4	3	2	3	3
	Lorna Tsutsumi	4	4	4	4	4
	Hank Hennessey	3	3	3	3	3
	Barbara Meguro	4	4	4	4	4
	Michele Ebersole	4	4	3	4	4
	Karla Hayashi	3	3	3	2	2
	Anthony Escareno	3	3	3	2	3
MMM 400	Karla McDermid	2	2	1	1	2
	Tara Ballard	2	2	2	2	2
	Seri Luangphinit	1	2	2	2	2
	Luke Bailey	2	1	1	1	2
	Matt Haslam	1	1	1	1	1
	Keola Donaghy	2	2	2	1	1
	Lorna Tsutsumi	2	2	3	2	2
	Hank Hennessey	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Barbara Meguro	1	1	2	1	1
	Michele Ebersole	2	1	2	1	1
	Karla Hayashi	2	1	2	1	1
	Anthony Escareno	1	2	2	1	1

GE 2: INFORMATION LITERACY

Course Alpha #	Reader	Documentation Conv	Appropriate Sources	Evaluating Sources	Integrating Sources
AAA 100	Karla McDermid	3	3	2	2
	Tara Ballard	2	2	3	3
	Seri Luangphinith	2	3	2	2
	Luke Bailey	3	4	4	4
	Matt Haslam	*	*	*	*
	Keola Donaghy	2	2	2	1
	Lorna Tsutsumi	2	2	2	2
	Hank Hennessey	3	4	4	4
	Barbara Meguro	2	3	3	3
	Michele Ebersole	2	3	3	3
	Karla Hayashi	3	2	2	2
BBB 100	Karla McDermid	1	1	1	1
	Tara Ballard	1	1	2	1
	Seri Luangphinith	1	1	1	1
	Luke Bailey	1	1	1	1
	Matt Haslam	*	*	*	*
	Keola Donaghy	1	1	1	1
	Lorna Tsutsumi	1	1	1	1
	Hank Hennessey	1	1	1	1
	Barbara Meguro	1	1	1	1
	Michele Ebersole	1	*	2	2
	Karla Hayashi	1	1	2	2
CCC 100	Karla McDermid	1	1	1	2
	Tara Ballard	1	1	2	1
	Seri Luangphinith	1	1	1	1
	Luke Bailey	1	1	2	2
	Matt Haslam	*	*	*	*
	Keola Donaghy	1	1	1	1
	Lorna Tsutsumi	1	1	1	1
	Hank Hennessey	1	1	1	1
	Barbara Meguro	1	1	1	1
	Michele Ebersole	1	*	2	2
	Karla Hayashi	1	1	1	1

GE 2: INFORMATION LITERACY

Course Alpha #	Reader	Documentation Conv	Appropriate Sources	Evaluating Sources	Integrating Sources
DDD 100	Karla McDermid	1	1	1	3
	Tara Ballard	1	1	1	1
	Seri Luangphinith	1	1	1	1
	Luke Bailey	1	1	1	1
	Matt Haslam	*	*	*	*
	Keola Donaghy	1	1	1	1
	Lorna Tsutsumi	1	1	1	1
	Hank Hennessey	1	1	1	1
	Barbara Meguro	1	1	1	1
	Michele Ebersole	1	*	3	3
	Karla Hayashi	1	1	1	1
ZZZ 100	Karla McDermid				
(submitted after report issued)	Tara Ballard	3	3	3	3
	Seri Luangphinith	4	3	3	3
	Luke Bailey				
	Matt Haslam				
	Keola Donaghy				
	Lorna Tsutsumi	3	3	3	3
	Hank Hennessey	3	4	1	3
	Barbara Meguro				
	Michele Ebersole				
	Karla Hayashi				
EEE 200	Karla McDermid	3	4	4	4
	Tara Ballard	2	4	3	3
	Seri Luangphinith	3	4	4	3
	Luke Bailey	4	4	4	4
	Matt Haslam	*	*	*	*
	Keola Donaghy	4	4	3	4
	Lorna Tsutsumi	2	2	3	3
	Hank Hennessey	3	4	4	4
	Barbara Meguro	3	4	4	4
	Michele Ebersole	3	4	4	4
	Karla Hayashi	3	3	3	3

GE 2: INFORMATION LITERACY

Course Alpha #	Reader	Documentation Conv	Appropriate Sources	Evaluating Sources	Integrating Sources	
FFF 200	Karla McDermid	2	3	1	1	
	Tara Ballard	2	3	2	2	
	Seri Luangphinit	2	3	2	3	
	Luke Bailey	2	3	2	2	
	Matt Haslam	*	*	*	*	
	Keola Donaghy	3	3	3	3	
	Lorna Tsutsumi	2	2	2	2	
	Hank Hennessey	2	3	2	2	
	Barbara Meguro	2	3	1	1	
	Michele Ebersole	2	2	2	2	
	Karla Hayashi	2	3	2	1	
	GGG 300	Karla McDermid	?	4	4	4
		Tara Ballard	2	3	2	2
		Seri Luangphinit	2	3	1	1
Luke Bailey		3	4	4	NA	
Matt Haslam		*	*	*	*	
Keola Donaghy		NA	NA	NA	NA	
Lorna Tsutsumi		1	3	3	1	
Hank Hennessey		4	4	3	1	
Barbara Meguro		3	3	3	1	
Michele Ebersole		4	4	4	*	
Karla Hayashi		NA	NA	NA	NA	
HHH 300		Karla McDermid	4	3	3	3
		Tara Ballard	3	4	3	3
		Seri Luangphinit	4	4	3	4
	Luke Bailey	2	3	2	2	
	Matt Haslam	*	*	*	*	
	Keola Donaghy	4	4	3	3	
	Lorna Tsutsumi	2	2	2	2	
	Hank Hennessey	4	4	3	4	
	Barbara Meguro	3	3	3	3	
	Michele Ebersole	3	3	3	3	
	Karla Hayashi	3	3	1	1	

GE 2: INFORMATION LITERACY

Course Alpha #	Reader	Documentation Conv	Appropriate Sources	Evaluating Sources	Integrating Sources	
JJJ 300	Karla McDermid	1	2	1	1	
	Tara Ballard	1	3	2	2	
	Seri Luangphinith	1	1	1	1	
	Luke Bailey	1	1	1	1	
	Matt Haslam	*	*	*	*	
	Keola Donaghy	1	2	1	1	
	Lorna Tsutsumi	1	2	1	1	
	Hank Hennessey	2	1	1	1	
	Barbara Meguro	2	1	1	1	
	Michele Ebersole	2	3	2	2	
	Karla Hayashi	1	2	1	1	
	LLL 400	Karla McDermid	2	2	2	2
		Tara Ballard	2	2	2	3
Seri Luangphinith		2	2	2	2	
Luke Bailey		2	3	2	2	
Matt Haslam		*	*	*	*	
Keola Donaghy		2	2	1	2	
Lorna Tsutsumi		2	2	2	3	
Hank Hennessey		3	3	2	3	
Barbara Meguro		3	2	2	3	
Michele Ebersole		4	3	4	4	
Karla Hayashi		1	2	1	1	
MMM 400		Karla McDermid	1	1	1	1
		Tara Ballard	2	1	2	1
	Seri Luangphinith	3	2	1	1	
	Luke Bailey	2	3	2	2	
	Matt Haslam	*	*	*	*	
	Keola Donaghy	1	2	1	1	
	Lorna Tsutsumi	2	3	3	3	
	Hank Hennessey	4	4	2	2	
	Barbara Meguro	1	1	1	1	
	Michele Ebersole	3	1	3	1	
	Karla Hayashi	3	1	1	2	

GE 3: COMMUNICATION

Course Alpha #	Reader	Line of Reasoning	ORG/Structure	Content	Mechanics	Style & Voice	
AAA 100	Karla McDermid	3	3	4	3	3	
	Tara Ballard	3	3	2	3	3	
	Seri Luangphinith	3	3	3	3	3	
	Luke Bailey	*	*	*	*	*	
	Matt Haslam	1	2	2	3	3	
	Keola Donaghy	3	3	4	4	4	
	Lorna Tsutsumi	2	2	3	3	3	
	Hank Hennessey	2	3	3	3	4	
	Barbara Meguro	2	2	3	3	3	
	Michele Ebersole	2	3	3	3	3	
	Karla Hayashi	3	3	3	3	3	
	Anthony Escareno	2	2	3	2	2	
	BBB 100	Karla McDermid	1	1	1	2	2
		Tara Ballard	2	2	2	2	2
Seri Luangphinith		2	2	3	3	3	
Luke Bailey		2	2	2	3	3	
Matt Haslam		2	2	1	3	2	
Keola Donaghy		2	3	2	2	2	
Lorna Tsutsumi		2	2	2	2	2	
Hank Hennessey		1	1	2	2	1	
Barbara Meguro		2	2	2	3	2	
Michele Ebersole		2	2	2	3	2	
Karla Hayashi		2	2	2	3	2	
Anthony Escareno		2	1	1	2	2	
CCC 100		Karla McDermid	3	2	3	3	3
		Tara Ballard	1	3	3	3	3
	Seri Luangphinith	1	2	2	3	3	
	Luke Bailey	1	4	2	4	*	
	Matt Haslam	1	1	2	3	2	
	Keola Donaghy	3	3	3	2	3	
	Lorna Tsutsumi	3	3	3	3	3	
	Hank Hennessey	1	3	4	4	4	
	Barbara Meguro	2	4	3	3	3	
	Michele Ebersole	2	3	2	3	2	
	Karla Hayashi	2	2	2	2	2	
	Anthony Escareno	1	3	2	3	2	

GE 3: COMMUNICATION

Course Alpha #	Reader	Line of Reasoning	ORG/Structure	Content	Mechanics	Style & Voice
DDD 100	Karla McDermid	2	3	2	3	2
	Tara Ballard	2	2	2	2	2
	Seri Luangphinith	2	2	2	2	2
	Luke Bailey	2	3	*	3	2
	Matt Haslam	2	3	3	3	2
	Keola Donaghy	2	2	2	2	1
	Lorna Tsutsumi	3	3	3	3	3
	Hank Hennessey	1	3	3	3	3
	Barbara Meguro	2	3	3	3	3
	Michele Ebersole	2	2	2	3	2
	Karla Hayashi	2	3	3	3	3
	Anthony Escareno	4	2	3	2	3
ZZZ 100 (added report issued)	Karla McDermid					
	Tara Ballard	3	3	3	3	3
	Seri Luangphinith	3	3	3	3	3
	Luke Bailey					
	Matt Haslam					
	Keola Donaghy					
	Lorna Tsutsumi	3	3	3	3	2
	Hank Hennessey	4	3	4	4	4
	Barbara Meguro					
	Michele Ebersole					
	Karla Hayashi					
	Anthony Escareno					
EEE 200	Karla McDermid	3	4	4	3	4
	Tara Ballard	4	3	4	3	3
	Seri Luangphinith	4	4	4	3	4
	Luke Bailey	*	*	*	*	*
	Matt Haslam	4	4	4	4	4
	Keola Donaghy	3	3	3	2	2
	Lorna Tsutsumi	3	2	2	2	2
	Hank Hennessey	4	4	4	4	4
	Barbara Meguro	4	3	4	4	4
	Michele Ebersole	4	4	4	4	4
	Karla Hayashi	4	4	4	3	3
	Anthony Escareno	4	4	3	3	3

GE 3: COMMUNICATION

Course Alpha #	Reader	Line of Reasoning	ORG/Structure	Content	Mechanics	Style & Voice	
FFF 200	Karla McDermid	3	2	2	3	3	
	Tara Ballard	2	3	3	3	3	
	Seri Luangphinit	3	2	2	2	3	
	Luke Bailey	*	*	2	3	2	
	Matt Haslam	2	2	2	3	3	
	Keola Donaghy	2	2	3	3	4	
	Lorna Tsutsumi	3	2	2	2	2	
	Hank Hennessey	2	2	2	2	2	
	Barbara Meguro	3	2	2	3	2	
	Michele Ebersole	2	2	2	2	2	
	Karla Hayashi	3	3	3	3	3	
	Anthony Escareno	2	2	2	2	2	
	GGG 300	Karla McDermid	NA	NA	4	3	4
		Tara Ballard	1	2	2	2	3
Seri Luangphinit		1	1	3	3	4	
Luke Bailey		NA	NA	NA	4	4	
Matt Haslam		1	1	3	2	2	
Keola Donaghy		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Lorna Tsutsumi		1	1	1	2	2	
Hank Hennessey		1	4	3	3	3	
Barbara Meguro		2	1	4	3	3	
Michele Ebersole		1	2	3	3	3	
Karla Hayashi		1	1	1	3	3	
Anthony Escareno		2	3	3	2	2	
HHH 300		Karla McDermid	3	3	2	3	2
		Tara Ballard	4	3	3	3	3
	Seri Luangphinit	3	2	3	2	3	
	Luke Bailey	4	3	3	4	3	
	Matt Haslam	2	2	2	2	2	
	Keola Donaghy	3	3	3	3	3	
	Lorna Tsutsumi	2	2	2	3	3	
	Hank Hennessey						
	Barbara Meguro	2	2	3	3	3	
	Michele Ebersole	4	4	3	4	4	
	Karla Hayashi	3	2	2	3	3	
	Anthony Escareno	4	3	3	2	3	

GE 3: COMMUNICATION

Course Alpha #	Reader	Line of Reasoning	ORG/Structure	Content	Interpretation	Style & Voice	
JJJ 300	Karla McDermid	1	1	1	3	3	
	Tara Ballard	3	2	2	2	2	
	Seri Luangphinith	1	1	2	3	3	
	Luke Bailey	3	2	2	2	1	
	Matt Haslam	2	2	2	2	2	
	Keola Donaghy	2	2	2	2	2	
	Lorna Tsutsumi	1	1	2	2	2	
	Hank Hennessey	1	2	2	3	2	
	Barbara Meguro	1	1	1	3	3	
	Michele Ebersole	1	2	2	2	2	
	Karla Hayashi	2	2	2	3	3	
	Anthony Escareno	1	2	1	2	1	
	LLL 400	Karla McDermid	3	3	3	3	3
		Tara Ballard	2	3	2	3	3
Seri Luangphinith		2	3	2	3	3	
Luke Bailey		4	4	3	2	2	
Matt Haslam		2	2	2	2	2	
Keola Donaghy		3	4	3	3	2	
Lorna Tsutsumi		4	4	4	4	4	
Hank Hennessey		3	3	3	3	3	
Barbara Meguro		4	4	4	4	3	
Michele Ebersole		4	4	3	3	3	
Karla Hayashi		3	3	2	3	3	
Anthony Escareno		4	4	4	3	3	
MMM 400		Karla McDermid	2	2	1	2	2
		Tara Ballard	2	2	2	2	2
	Seri Luangphinith	2	2	3	3	3	
	Luke Bailey	2	2	2	3	2	
	Matt Haslam	1	1	1	2	2	
	Keola Donaghy	2	2	2	2	2	
	Lorna Tsutsumi	2	2	2	2	3	
	Hank Hennessey	2	2	2	3	3	
	Barbara Meguro	2	1	2	1	2	
	Michele Ebersole	1	1	2	1	1	
	Karla Hayashi	3	3	2	3	3	
	Anthony Escareno	1	1	2	2	1	

ATTACHMENT B
VARYING DEFINITIONS OF CRITICAL THINKING

From The League of Innovation in the Community College per Allen (2006):

Critical thinking and problem solving skills (analysis, synthesis, evaluation, decision-making, creative thinking)

From the Council of Writing Program Administrators per Allen (2006):

Critical thinking, reading, and writing—such as developing papers in a systematic way and using writing and reading for multiple functions (e.g. learning, communicating)

From the website of the National Council for Teachers in English:

The NCTE Committee on Critical Thinking and the Language Arts defines critical thinking as "a process which stresses an attitude of suspended judgment, incorporates logical inquiry and problem solving, and leads to an evaluative decision or action." In a new monograph copublished by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills, Siegel and Carey (1989) emphasize the roles of signs, reflection, and skepticism in this process.

Ennis (1987) suggests that "critical thinking is reasonable, reflective thinking that is focused on deciding what to believe or do." However defined, critical thinking refers to a way of reasoning that demands adequate support for one's beliefs and an unwillingness to be persuaded unless the support is forthcoming.

From the website of the National Education Association:

The first characteristic of an ideal critical thinker, we might say, is that he or she has excellent pattern recognition skills. The critical thinker sees that two arguments are both disjunctive syllogisms, in much the same way that most people in our culture can see, without thinking much about it, that two cars are both Toyotas.

The second characteristic that distinguishes the critical thinker is vocabulary. Imagine how awful it would be if we lacked the vocabulary that would enable us to think and converse clearly about some important part of our lives, such as our emotions. People whose vocabularies did not include words like "anger," "envy," and "compassion" would have difficulty reflecting on their feelings and talking about their emotional states with others. But many people are in exactly this situation with regard to reasoning. It is impossible to think and converse about thinking without the help of terms such as "inductive," "deductive," and "valid," and the concepts expressed by those terms.

Third, and most important of all, becoming a rigorous and reflective thinker means adopting a certain ethical stance: habitual skepticism with respect to one's own views, a charitable attitude toward the views of others, and a recognition that getting to the bottom of things together always matters more than winning a dispute. Critical thinking is responsible thinking.

Addendum to the Final Report
of the Assessment Support Committee for AY 2009-2010 (April 23, 2010)

The following was generated on June 24, 2010 by Dr. Stephanie Juillerat, Associate Dean of Azusa Pacific University, in collaboration with Dr. Mary Allen of WASC.

The purpose of this exercise was to determine the efficacy of the rubrics we developed and to identify the level of faculty inconsistency in evaluating students' work. Twelve readers (including faculty and students) independently made from 4 to 5 judgments on three competencies (Critical Thinking, Information Literacy, and Communication). In some instances, there was a 3-point difference (on a 4-point rating scale), indicating some lack of agreement (especially on upper division papers); interestingly enough, there was a relatively high degree of consensus on what faculty considered to be poor levels of skill among all levels of papers.

The numbers below in the following table reflect these differences among faculty. But a closer look at the actual numbers reveals that the gaps between ratings is often the result of one or two outliers, indicating a need for much better calibration.

Analysis of Response Differentials among 13 Faculty Rating GE Skills 1-3

CRITICAL THINKING					
Component Evaluated	Lowest Score Assigned	Highest Score Assigned	Range	Mode	Mean
Issues/Arguments	1	4	3	3	2.31
Positions	1	4	3	2	2.28
Evidence	1	4	3	2	2.35
Interpretation	1	4	3	1	2.13
Conclusions	1	4	3	1	2.15
INFORMATION LITERACY					
Component Evaluated	Lowest Score Assigned	Highest Score Assigned	Range	Mode	Mean
Documentation Convention	1	4	3	1	2.05
Appropriate Sources	1	4	3	1	2.33
Evaluating Sources	1	4	3	1	2.04
Integrating Sources	1	4	3	1	2.02
COMMUNICATION					
Component Evaluated	Lowest Score Assigned	Highest Score Assigned	Range	Mode	Mean
Line of Reasoning	1	4	3	2	2.33
Org/Structure	1	4	3	2	2.46
Content	1	4	3	2	2.53
Mechanics	1	4	3	3	2.75
Style & Voice	1	4	3	3	2.66

