Planning Objective Report

Objective Report:

Objective ID: 1548 **Objective Title:** QEP Direct Measure of Critical Thinking

Unit Manager: DeLuca, Eileen **Planning Unit:** 00330 - First Year Experience and Academic Success

Obj. Status: Implementing **Obj. Purpose:** Assessment Outcome

Unit Purpose:

Objective Description:

Upon successful completion of the Cornerstone Experience course, students will demonstrate their acquisition of analytical and evaluation skills; students will apply these acquired skills to guide their thinking, behavior, and attitude.

Institutional Goals	Objective Types	Planning Priorities
A. Develop a robust program review model	No Objective Types to Display	No Planning Priorities to Display

Tasks

Due Date	Status	Priority	Task
03/19/2012	In Progress	High	During the inaugural semester, the SLS 1515 lead faculty member, Myra Walters will lead a rubric standardization/norming session for the Critical Thinking Journal Rubric. Faculty will collect the first-two journal entries to provide formative feedback to the students. A random sample of student entries (IRPE office will stratify to ensure representation from across campuses) will be copied, names will be redacted, and faculty scoring teams will score entries. Inter-rater reliability will be established. Faculty will also provide feedback towards making any necessary modifications.
05/21/2012	In Progress	High	During the inaugural semester, the SLS 1515 lead faculty member, Myra Walters will lead a rubric standardization session for the Success Strategies Presentation Rubric.

Assessment Measures

Date	Assessment Measure
09/27/2011	Critical Thinking Journal-Scored with Critical Thinking Rubric
09/27/2011	Final Essay-Scored with Critical Thinking Rubric
09/27/2011	California Critical Thinking Skills Test scores

Intended Results

Date	Intended Results
09/27/2011	By the end of the Spring 2012 semester, 70% of students who complete the course will achieve a 3 (accomplished) or higher on all relevant aspects of the Critical Thinking Journal rubric (10% should achieve a 4: exemplary)
09/27/2011	By the end of the Spring 2012 semester, 70% of students who complete the course will achieve a 3 (accomplished) or higher on all relevant aspects of the rubric (20% should achieve a 4: exemplary)
09/27/2011	By the end of the Spring 2012 semester, baseline data will be established for comparison and goal setting for the 2012-2013 academic year..

Status Reports

Report Date	Status Report
3/26/2012	Six faculty have volunteered to attend the International Critical Thinking Conference in July 2012.
3/26/2012	Steve Piscitelli will lead a two-day Critical Thinking Workshop at ESC on June 28 and June 29. All faculty, staff, and administrators will be invited to attend.
3/26/2012	On March 26, the Cornerstone Faculty reviewed the qualitative and quantitative rubric data from the March 3rd standardization session (see attached minutes). Based on the data and discussions, the curriculum committee is revising the rubric. The revised rubric will be used as a summative instrument by all faculty for the final journal submission.
3/21/2012	On March 20, Dr. DeLuca sent an email to SLS1515 faculty and QEP Response Team members alerting them about the upcoming International Critical Thinking Conference (July 2012). She has invited five participants to attend. So far six faculty and administrators have expressed an interest.
3/20/2012	On March 3, nine faculty and the Dean of College and Career Readiness engaged in a rubric standardization session. The session will provided an opportunity for instructors to engage in a formative assessment of student artifacts, discuss the clarity of the Critical Thinking Journal assignment guidelines, practice using the rubric for scoring, and provide feedback for revising the rubric for clarity and efficacy. Both qualitative and quantitative data were collected. The qualitative responses were summarized and sent to all SLS 1515 faculty on March 14. The inter-rater correlations were provided by the IRPE on and disseminated to the Dean and Lead faculty on March 19. Both the qualitative and quantitative data will be reviewed with all SLS 1515 faculty on March 26 to inform revisions to the rubric.
3/20/2012	In March 2012, A QEP “Standardized Assessment” committee was established. Monica Moore and Professor Freida Miller are chairing this committee. They are reviewing “California Critical Thinking Test” data and ensuring that the post-assessment will be ready for the target date. They are also reviewing related assessments (based on faculty input) that may prove to be a more suitable assessment tool (in terms of readability) for the students.
2/19/2012	Before the Critical Thinking rubric is used as an overall summative instrument of achievement, the faculty will engage in a rubric standardization session. In February 2012, the QEP Implementation Team asked instructors to collect initial journal entries from students. A representative sample was collected from all campuses. Upon collection, the journal entries were photocopied, and names were redacted. A rubric standardization session will be held on March 3, 2012. Ten of the fourteen SLS 1515 faculty have agreed to participate. The session will provide an opportunity for instructors to engage in a formative assessment of student artifacts, discuss the clarity of the Critical Thinking Journal assignment guidelines, practice using the rubric for scoring, and provide feedback for revising the rubric for clarity and efficacy.
1/28/2012	The inaugural SLS 1515 sections began on January 9, 2012.

Actual Results

Date	Actual Results
01/28/2012	This is the course’s inaugural semester. Baseline rubric scores will be available after May 2012

Use of Results

Date	Use of Results
01/28/2012	Results of the standardization/norming session in March 2012, will be used to revise the rubric for implemenntation at the end of the spring 2012 semester. After May, 2012 The lead faculty, Myra Walters, will review the baseline data with the other SLS 1515 faculty. The analysis and discussion will inform instructional delivery and assessment of critical thinking.

Gap Analysis

SWOT

Units Impacted

No Units Impacted data

Associated Standards

Associated Outcomes

Documents

File Name	File Size	Date Modified
Correlations_March_3.pdf	2.02 MB	3/21/2012
Criteria_Correlations_March_3.pdf	168.312 KB	3/28/2012
Minutes_Community_of_Practice_032612.pdf	223.569 KB	3/26/2012
SLS_1515_Rubric_Standardization_Qualitative_Responses_SLS 1515.pdf	109.345 KB	3/21/2012

Minutes

Cornerstone Community of Practice

S-117

March 26, 2012, 3:00-4:00

Dr. Eileen DeLuca	***Present***	Elaine Schaeffer	***Present***
Myra Walters	***Present***	Terri Heck	***Present***
Freida Miller	***Present***	Martin Tawil	***Present***
David Hoffman	***Present***	Gary Rodgers	***Present***
Jaime Marecz	***Present***	Dr. Rebecca Gubitti	***Present***
Lisa Wroble	***Present***	Dr. Katie Paschall	***Present***

1. Critical Thinking Test: Freida Miller reviewed the procedures for the Critical Thinking post-test. She will send the guidelines and pass codes to the group.

2. Dr. DeLuca and the faculty reviewed the qualitative and quantitative data from the rubric standardization session.

Qualitative responses:

- The faculty discussion and written responses indicate that the group may lack a shared understanding of the elements of the Elder-Paul Critical Thinking Model. The faculty agreed that they would like to engage in more Critical Thinking Training. Steve Piscitelli will lead a two-day Critical Thinking workshop at ESC on June 28 and 29. Six faculty agreed to attend the International Critical Thinking Conference in July 2012. Regular Critical Thinking Community of Practice sessions are planned for 2012-2013, to be led by faculty who have attended the International Critical Thinking Conference. Rubric training will be built into the QEP Cornerstone Instructor Training Modules.
- One specific rubric criterion that there was disagreement on was “Relevancy.” Many faculty disagreed on how to interpret the levels of performance for this criterion.
- There were many comments on how to tweak the wording in some items to make the levels of performance more specific and measurable.

Quantitative data:

- While reliability was established in the inter-rater correlations, in some areas it was a low correlation. The criterion with the lowest correlation was “Relevancy.” This supports the faculty’s assertion that they lacked a shared understanding of this criterion. Myra will give the faculty guidance on how to score the “Relevancy” criterion.

- There were many criteria that seemed to correlate strongly with others. “Accuracy” was one that seemed to correlate strongly with many of the other criterion. Faculty may consider whether or not this criterion needs to be measured separately from others.

3. The group discussed the results and what changes they would make based on the results. Myra Walters and the curriculum subcommittee will revise the rubric based on the data and discussion. The revised rubric will be used by all faculty as a summative instrument for the final journal submission.

Minutes submitted by Eileen DeLuca

The SAS System

The CORR Procedure

10 Variables:	AC1
	AC2
	AC3
	AC4
	AC5
	BC1
	BC2
	BC3
	BC4
	BC5

Simple Statistics

Variable	N	Mean	Std Dev	Sum	Minimum	Maximum	Label
AC1	110	2.78182	0.93241	306	1	4	AC1
AC2	110	2.88182	0.84302	317	1	4	AC2
AC3	110	2.77273	0.89503	305	1	4	AC3
AC4	110	2.67273	0.81397	294	1	4	AC4
AC5	110	2.51818	0.91603	277	1	4	AC5
BC1	110	2.71818	0.92995	299	1	4	BC1
BC2	110	2.7	0.87315	297	1	4	BC2
BC3	110	2.67273	0.99641	294	1	4	BC3
BC4	110	2.52727	0.89555	278	1	4	BC4
BC5	110	2.63636	0.94556	290	1	4	BC5

Pearson Correlation Coefficients, N = 110 Prob > |r| under H0: Rho=0										
	AC1	**AC2**	**AC3**	**AC4**	**AC5**	**BC1**	**BC2**	**BC3**	**BC4**	**BC5**
AC1	1	0.78391	0.61063	0.69078	0.68139	0.18237	0.15551	0.07056	0.2489	0.14852
AC1		<.0001	<.0001	<.0001	<.0001	0.0565	0.1047	0.4639	0.0087	0.1215
AC2	0.78391	1	0.62066	0.74531	0.56712	0.26139	0.25052	0.18289	0.28988	0.23333
AC2	<.0001		<.0001	<.0001	<.0001	0.0058	0.0083	0.0558	0.0021	0.0142
AC3	0.61063	0.62066	1	0.69032	0.37995	0.14279	0.15848	0.07014	0.19666	0.03154
AC3	<.0001	<.0001		<.0001	<.0001	0.1367	0.0982	0.4665	0.0395	0.7436
AC4	0.69078	0.74531	0.69032	1	0.51252	0.2164	0.29948	0.21739	0.37734	0.2254
AC4	<.0001	<.0001	<.0001		<.0001	0.0232	0.0015	0.0225	<.0001	0.0179
AC5	0.68139	0.56712	0.37995	0.51252	1	0.18377	0.20761	0.11714	0.26779	0.21954
AC5	<.0001	<.0001	<.0001	<.0001		0.0546	0.0295	0.2229	0.0047	0.0212
BC1	0.18237	0.26139	0.14279	0.2164	0.18377	1	0.79882	0.68173	0.67579	0.80053
BC1	0.0565	0.0058	0.1367	0.0232	0.0546		<.0001	<.0001	<.0001	<.0001
BC2	0.15551	0.25052	0.15848	0.29948	0.20761	0.79882	1	0.75081	0.79079	0.72229
BC2	0.1047	0.0083	0.0982	0.0015	0.0295	<.0001		<.0001	<.0001	<.0001
BC3	0.07056	0.18289	0.07014	0.21739	0.11714	0.68173	0.75081	1	0.79147	0.70022
BC3	0.4639	0.0558	0.4665	0.0225	0.2229	<.0001	<.0001		<.0001	<.0001
BC4	0.2489	0.28988	0.19666	0.37734	0.26779	0.67579	0.79079	0.79147	1	0.68354
BC4	0.0087	0.0021	0.0395	<.0001	0.0047	<.0001	<.0001	<.0001		<.0001
BC5	0.14852	0.23333	0.03154	0.2254	0.21954	0.80053	0.72229	0.70022	0.68354	1
BC5	0.1215	0.0142	0.7436	0.0179	0.0212	<.0001	<.0001	<.0001	<.0001	

Criteria 1 and 2 are strongly correlated. (Clarity and Logic-Accuracy)

Criteria 2 and 4 are strongly correlated. (Accuracy-Significance)

Other Criteria with notable correlations

Criteria 1 and 5 (Clarity and Logic-Format, Mechanics, Grammar)

Criteria 2 and 3 (**Accuracy**-Relevance)

Criteria 2 and 5 (**Accuracy**-Format, Mechanics, Grammar)

Criteria 3 and 4 (Relevance-Significance)

Correlation Analysis

The CORR Procedure

6 With Variables:	R2C1	R2C2	R2C3	R2C4	R2C5	R2total
6 Variables:	R1C1	R1C2	R1C3	R1C4	R1C5	R1total

Simple Statistics

Variable	N	Mean	Std Dev	Sum	Minimum	Maximum
R2C1	25	2.88000	0.52599	72.00000	2.00000	4.00000
R2C2	25	2.92000	0.49329	73.00000	2.00000	4.00000
R2C3	25	2.72000	0.67823	68.00000	2.00000	4.00000
R2C4	25	2.60000	0.50000	65.00000	2.00000	3.00000
R2C5	25	2.92000	0.64031	73.00000	2.00000	4.00000
R2total	25	14.04000	2.00998	351.00000	10.00000	18.00000
R1C1	25	2.64000	0.75719	66.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R1C2	25	2.48000	0.71414	62.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R1C3	25	2.32000	0.90000	58.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R1C4	25	2.24000	0.66332	56.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R1C5	25	2.52000	0.71414	63.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R1total	25	12.20000	2.50000	305.00000	7.00000	16.00000

Pearson Correlation Coefficients, N = 25
Prob > |r| under H0: Rho=0

	R1C1	R1C2	R1C3	R1C4	R1C5	R1total
R2C1	0.30548	0.38158	0.26053	0.32483	0.17304	0.43093
	0.1375	0.0598	0.2085	0.1131	0.4081	0.0315
R2C2	0.14279	0.23182	0.15392	0.44314	0.12301	0.31760
	0.4959	0.2648	0.4626	0.0265	0.5580	0.1219
R2C3	-0.04219	0.03097	-0.39318	0.06298	0.05506	-0.11304
	0.8413	0.8832	0.0519	0.7649	0.7938	0.5906
R2C4	0.37419	0.21004	0.11111	0.42714	0.25672	0.40000
	0.0654	0.3136	0.5970	0.0332	0.2154	0.0476
R2C5	0.19594	0.26971	0.04627	0.34139	0.18588	0.29673
	0.3479	0.1923	0.8262	0.0949	0.3737	0.1498
R2total	0.25625	0.30537	0.01566	0.43002	0.21713	0.34660
	0.2163	0.1377	0.9408	0.0319	0.2972	0.0896

Correlation Analysis

The CORR Procedure

6 With Variables:	R4C1	R4C2	R4C3	R4C4	R4C5	R4total
6 Variables:	R3C1	R3C2	R3C3	R3C4	R3C5	R3total

Simple Statistics

Variable	N	Mean	Std Dev	Sum	Minimum	Maximum
R4C1	21	3.28571	0.78376	69.00000	2.00000	4.00000
R4C2	21	3.33333	0.91287	70.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R4C3	21	3.61905	0.58959	76.00000	2.00000	4.00000
R4C4	21	3.23810	0.94365	68.00000	2.00000	4.00000
R4C5	21	3.09524	0.83095	65.00000	2.00000	4.00000
R4total	21	16.57143	3.41426	348.00000	10.00000	20.00000
R3C1	21	2.52381	0.67964	53.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R3C2	21	2.90476	0.62488	61.00000	2.00000	4.00000
R3C3	21	3.00000	0.44721	63.00000	2.00000	4.00000
R3C4	21	2.71429	0.64365	57.00000	2.00000	4.00000
R3C5	21	2.47619	0.81358	52.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R3total	21	13.61905	2.71065	286.00000	8.00000	19.00000

Pearson Correlation Coefficients, N = 21
Prob > |r| under H0: Rho=0

	R3C1	R3C2	R3C3	R3C4	R3C5	R3total
R4C1	0.17432	0.26252	0.14265	-0.02832	0.32485	0.21854
	0.4498	0.2503	0.5373	0.9030	0.1508	0.3412
R4C2	0.18804	0.23374	0.24495	0.34039	0.38150	0.33677
	0.4143	0.3078	0.2845	0.1311	0.0879	0.1355
R4C3	0.39810	0.30374	0.37926	0.48938	0.50133	0.49908
	0.0739	0.1807	0.0900	0.0243	0.0206	0.0213
R4C4	0.49747	0.46434	0.47392	0.69385	0.49621	0.62365
	0.0218	0.0340	0.0300	0.0005	0.0221	0.0025
R4C5	0.17286	0.30722	0.13455	0.05342	0.37332	0.26110
	0.4537	0.1755	0.5609	0.8181	0.0955	0.2530
R4total	0.33860	0.37832	0.32746	0.37379	0.49115	0.46231
	0.1332	0.0908	0.1473	0.0951	0.0238	0.0349

Correlation Analysis

The CORR Procedure

6 With Variables:	R6C1	R6C2	R6C3	R6C4	R6C5	R6total
6 Variables:	R5C1	R5C2	R5C3	R5C4	R5C5	R5total

Simple Statistics

Variable	N	Mean	Std Dev	Sum	Minimum	Maximum
R6C1	20	2.75000	1.01955	55.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R6C2	20	2.65000	0.74516	53.00000	2.00000	4.00000
R6C3	20	2.65000	0.93330	53.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R6C4	20	2.30000	0.86450	46.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R6C5	20	2.50000	0.94591	50.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R6total	20	12.85000	3.99045	257.00000	6.00000	20.00000
R5C1	20	2.20000	1.15166	44.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R5C2	20	2.45000	0.94451	49.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R5C3	20	2.60000	0.94032	52.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R5C4	20	2.35000	1.08942	47.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R5C5	20	1.80000	1.05631	36.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R5total	20	11.40000	4.92470	228.00000	5.00000	20.00000

Pearson Correlation Coefficients, N = 20
Prob > |r| under H0: Rho=0

	R5C1	R5C2	R5C3	R5C4	R5C5	R5total
R6C1	0.80684	0.72418	0.65878	0.65155	0.73306	0.75473
	<.0001	0.0003	0.0016	0.0019	0.0002	0.0001
R6C2	0.76049	0.75902	0.69105	0.74235	0.84251	0.80030
	<.0001	0.0001	0.0007	0.0002	<.0001	<.0001
R6C3	0.60719	0.60601	0.55174	0.59270	0.61929	0.62752
	0.0045	0.0046	0.0117	0.0059	0.0036	0.0031
R6C4	0.62379	0.66391	0.54385	0.66501	0.64551	0.66262
	0.0033	0.0014	0.0132	0.0014	0.0021	0.0015
R6C5	0.62809	0.67747	0.53255	0.58735	0.57943	0.63271
	0.0030	0.0010	0.0156	0.0065	0.0074	0.0028
R6total	0.77419	0.77292	0.67046	0.72701	0.76666	0.78257
	<.0001	<.0001	0.0012	0.0003	<.0001	<.0001

Correlation Analysis

The CORR Procedure

6 With Variables:	R8C1	R8C2	R8C3	R8C4	R8C5	R8total
6 Variables:	R7C1	R7C2	R7C3	R7C4	R7C5	R7total

Simple Statistics

Variable	N	Mean	Std Dev	Sum	Minimum	Maximum
R8C1	22	3.00000	0.92582	66.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R8C2	22	2.81818	0.79501	62.00000	2.00000	4.00000
R8C3	22	2.90909	0.75018	64.00000	2.00000	4.00000
R8C4	22	2.72727	0.82703	60.00000	2.00000	4.00000
R8C5	22	3.09091	0.81118	68.00000	2.00000	4.00000
R8total	22	14.54545	3.63485	320.00000	9.00000	20.00000
R7C1	22	3.27273	0.70250	72.00000	2.00000	4.00000
R7C2	22	3.54545	0.59580	78.00000	2.00000	4.00000
R7C3	22	2.86364	1.12527	63.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R7C4	22	3.22727	0.52841	71.00000	2.00000	4.00000
R7C5	22	2.77273	0.75162	61.00000	2.00000	4.00000
R7total	22	15.68182	2.69720	345.00000	11.00000	20.00000

Pearson Correlation Coefficients, N = 22
Prob > |r| under H0: Rho=0

	R7C1	R7C2	R7C3	R7C4	R7C5	R7total
R8C1	0.21965	0.17266	0.04571	0.19468	0.27373	0.22883
	0.3260	0.4423	0.8399	0.3853	0.2177	0.3057
R8C2	0.43407	0.31988	0.13065	0.44311	0.32601	0.41588
	0.0435	0.1467	0.5622	0.0389	0.1387	0.0542
R8C3	0.32036	0.22277	0.26667	0.41498	0.21497	0.38511
	0.1461	0.3190	0.2303	0.0548	0.3367	0.0767
R8C4	0.38000	0.21964	0.26514	0.36652	0.27856	0.40754
	0.0811	0.3260	0.2331	0.0934	0.2094	0.0597
R8C5	0.20511	-0.00896	-0.03794	0.17169	0.42601	0.18797
	0.3598	0.9684	0.8669	0.4449	0.0481	0.4022
R8total	0.34924	0.20789	0.14712	0.35386	0.34384	0.36340
	0.1111	0.3532	0.5135	0.1062	0.1172	0.0964

Correlation Analysis

The CORR Procedure

6 With Variables:	R10C1 R10C2 R10C3 R10C4 R10C5 R10total
6 Variables:	R9C1 R9C2 R9C3 R9C4 R9C5 R9total

Simple Statistics

Variable	N	Mean	Std Dev	Sum	Minimum	Maximum
R10C1	22	1.68182	0.47673	37.00000	1.00000	2.00000
R10C2	22	1.77273	0.61193	39.00000	1.00000	3.00000
R10C3	22	1.50000	0.74001	33.00000	1.00000	3.00000
R10C4	22	1.77273	0.68534	39.00000	1.00000	3.00000
R10C5	22	1.54545	0.50965	34.00000	1.00000	2.00000
R10total	22	8.27273	2.33364	182.00000	5.00000	13.00000
R9C1	22	3.22727	0.92231	71.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R9C2	22	3.04545	0.84387	67.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R9C3	22	3.13636	0.71016	69.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R9C4	22	2.86364	0.71016	63.00000	2.00000	4.00000
R9C5	22	2.95455	0.89853	65.00000	1.00000	4.00000
R9total	22	15.22727	3.58478	335.00000	7.00000	20.00000

Pearson Correlation Coefficients, N = 22
Prob > |r| under H0: Rho=0

	R9C1	R9C2	R9C3	R9C4	R9C5	R9total
R10C1	0.28060	0.27440	0.41557	0.28770	0.18696	0.32297
	0.2059	0.2165	0.0544	0.1942	0.4048	0.1426
R10C2	0.34900	0.48203	0.51302	0.47318	0.24013	0.45882
	0.1114	0.0231	0.0146	0.0261	0.2817	0.0317
R10C3	0.17442	0.19064	0.13592	0.13592	0.17904	0.18848
	0.4375	0.3954	0.5464	0.5464	0.4253	0.4009
R10C4	0.23628	0.18339	0.06671	0.22681	0.21441	0.21585
	0.2898	0.4140	0.7680	0.3101	0.3380	0.3347
R10C5	0.23024	0.16105	0.17941	0.34686	0.36868	0.29382
	0.3026	0.4740	0.4243	0.1138	0.0913	0.1844
R10total	0.32382	0.33194	0.32129	0.36831	0.30142	0.37362
	0.1415	0.1312	0.1448	0.0917	0.1728	0.0867

SLS 1515

Critical Thinking Rubric Feedback

Comments from the Rubric Standardization session, Saturday, March 3, 2012

1. **Please comment on how you believe the Critical Thinking Rubric worked for you in scoring essays today.**

   It was helpful; however I had some difficulty between levels, especially between 3 and 4. I also had some difficulty separating what I know about developmental students from the rating scale.

   It gave guidelines.

   For the most part it was helpful because it forced continuity in scoring. I did find myself waiting to select a score between score levels for some essays.

   Worked pretty well. One challenging one was relevancy. The levels of performance may need to be reworded.

   It was helpful, but I was confused by some of the wording. Looking at the prompts sometimes made it difficult to apply the rubric.

   I experienced some frustration when applying the rubric.

   Too many horizontal and vertical columns. We need broader categories.

   There is no quantity listed in terms of error. “Nearly Flawless” “Few Errors” How many is a “few”?

   It worked fine.

   Before discussing with my partner, I felt the rubric worked well; after our discussion, I realized the line between 2 and 3 for Relevance, Significance and Mechanics need to be clarified, quantified and refined.

2. **Looking at the levels on the Rubric, are any too similar? E.g., is 4 too similar to 3? Explain.**

   Yes, I think more revision is needed.

   Based on experiences today, I think “organization structure” should move from Format, Mechanics, and Grammar to Clarity and Logic. I also felt the levels for Accuracy 2 and 3 were too similar and significance 3 and 4 were so close that I wanted to select a “between” score.

Relevance -level 2- use of word “appropriate” sometimes is unclear. Maybe add “appropriate or fully-developed”.

I did not have a problem with the levels.

Yes, 4 is too similar to 3.

It is difficult for a student to incorporate all 5 levels in a 100 word essay.

First, criteria should include the organizational structure—that seems to be a large part of clarity.

3. **Examine the five criteria listed. Is there any overlap; do you believe you may be scoring students more than once for the same criterion?**

I do not think there is overlap; however there may be a need to include “meets minimum word count”.

A part of Clarity and Logic, I am looking at how the journal entry is organized. (Format <u>is</u> part of final category for set up, typing, etc.)

We see overlap with “relevance”, accuracy, and significance.

I see overlap between Relevance, Accuracy and Significance. If the entry isn’t relevant, can it be accurate or significant?

Yes, I do know that each is distinctive, but sometimes relevancy and significance are blurred.

Yes, we could agree on the defining differences of Accuracy, Relevance and Significance.

No!

Five criteria make sense—do not change.

4. **In what ways would you change the Rubric for ease of use? Use the attached form to be specific.**

Changing the word appropriate or adding well-developed to number 2 in relevance. Include organizational structure in the clarity part of the rubric.

Add a “middle” grade level—perhaps <u>advanced</u> to show the student is progressing during the semester.

Are 10 entries too many? Reword relevancy, but also think about changing prompts to encourage students to focus on topics and use real-life examples. Change prompts so that all prompts include language about writing a paragraph. Think about how much students should en encouraged to use vocabulary. Do we always want a paragraph? Is the word count useful?

The wording needs to be redesigned. Ambiguous language.

I think we should consider using three standards: Accomplished, Developing and Beginning.

Too few categories.

Add "Met the minimum word requirement" to the format section.
Add one more grading level: 5-Exemplary 4-Accomplished 3-Advanced 2-Developing 1-Beginning

5. **Thinking about translating the Rubric into a grade, what weighing should be assigned to each individual criterion? Please provide specific examples of what you would do.**

   I believe significance should hold more importance than Grammar/ Mechanics.

   I'd weigh them all equal.

   25 points total, clarify each categories wording. I break the grid into equal points for each "square" and then total points.

   20% for each. 25 points and 5 points fo0r completion.

   I am currently assigning 25 points to each entry. The student gets 5 points for an attempt. The categories can then be given up to 4 points apiece.

   3 Grades- A, C, D

Clarity	20%
Accuracy	20%
Relevance	20%
Significance	20%
Format	20%

6. **Do you have any other comments or suggestions about the Critical Thinking Rubric as a tool for scoring journal entries?**

Relevance was hard to grade between 3 and 2. If we require a word count, should there be mention of that in the rubric?

Overall, some tweaking of current rubric is needed so each instructor is interpreting it in the same way.

Show students the rubric before they write the first entry. Give formative feedback along the way based on the rubric. Maybe have an electronic rubric in canvas that students could receive a score for each one.

Be specific and/or consistent about the call for paragraphs or format.

I believe that I would delete the current minimum word count and change each to one page. Students who appear to write more can be evaluated in most of the areas.

It is close but needs work.

I do think it is a valuable tool for consistency.