GEC Learning Outcomes (GLOs) Assessment Critical Thinking

Assessment Type: GEC   **Year/Term:** AY18

Course: ANTH 100

Learning Outcome: Critical Thinking

Assessment Method/Tool: Common Rubric-EPCC

Measurement Scale: 3-1

Sample Size: 19

	Proficient (# of students|%)		Adequate (# of students|%)		Developing (# of students|%)	
Identifies and explains Issues	10	53%	9	47%	0	0%
Recognizes contexts and assumptions	12	63%	2	11%	5	26%
Acknowledges multiple perspectives	7	37%	9	47%	3	16%
Effectively evaluates evidence to reach conclusions	2	11%	7	37%	10	53%
Median % (based on 19 student sample size)		45%		42%		21%

Benchmark: **85%**   Institutional benchmark goal for median percentage of students to meet "Proficient" or "Adequate" levels in the GEC

Median % Achieving Benchmark: **87%** median percentage of students meeting "Adequate" or "Proficient" levels

Closing the Loop:

The median percentage of student samples scoring a "3" or "2" is 87%, slightly above the GLO Threshold of 85% for institutional effectiveness. However, with an n of 19, we have to be careful with conclusions, although a pattern does emerge.

The four analytical skills were assessed in students' Critical Thinking Essays on Ruth Gomberg-Muñoz's ethnography, *Becoming Legal.* The highest scores came students' ability to identify and explain social and cultural issues and to acknowledge multiple perspectives. These are analytical skills focused on heavily in this 100-level Introduction to Anthropology (ANTH 100) class. Slightly lower are the scores in recognizing the historical and social contexts. The lowest scores were on students' ability to evaluate the evidence utilized in the ethnography.

Action Plan:

Evaluation of the nature and strengths of evidence is, in retrospect, the skill that was discussed the least in this introductory class. More emphasis should be placed on this aspect of this disciplinary survey to set a strong foundation for evidence evaluation later in students' programs.

Program faculty should discuss issues associated with evaluating evidence and best practices for addressing them.