

**University Summary Report:
Critical Thinking
Assessment of Student Learning for**

| College | Programs Represented | # Programs Aligned to Written Communication ILO |
|----------------|---|--|
| CBE | Accountancy | 1 |
| CEAS | Counseling – Marriage and Family Therapy concentration Educational Leadership (EdD) Educational Technology Reading and Literacy Hospitality, Recreation, and Tourism Kinesiology | 6 |
| CLASS | Communication Healthcare Administration History Music Public Administration Social Work Speech Language Pathology | 7 |
| CSCI | Biological Sciences Environmental Geosciences Nursing | 3 |

No common process was specified for collecting or assessing data. Again, some programs were subject to assessment requirements from outside accrediting organizations. Others intended to gather data from small available samples of students completing theses, or from courses with large enrollment and multiple sections. As a result, each program was asked to specify their own assessment process and describe the process when reporting their results. Some programs assessed assignments from all students in an assessed class, and others chose a small number randomly. Most programs used a single assessor to assess each assignment.

RESULTS

Assessment of Graduate Level ILO Critical Thinking Student Work 2019-2020

Student Performance

their own rubrics or used the ones required by their accrediting bodies. The variations in rubric criteria and the number of criteria may exemplify wide variation in the outcomes specified by the graduate programs at CSUEB in terms of critical thinking skills or may be the result of discipline-specific terminology and proposed assessment methods in specifying those outcomes.

Table 2. Characterization of Rubrics for Critical Thinking ILO Assessment

| College | Program | Rubric | # Criteria | Scale |
|----------------|----------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------|
| CBE | Accountancy | Discipline-specific | 4 | 0-8 |

The results of the assessment of critical thinking performance for the Critical Thinking ILO on a per-program basis ranged between 3.21 to 3.91 on a 1-4 scale. The interpretation of the ranking values for the university rubric is given below. Only one program from CBE was aligned to the Critical Thinking ILO, and so those results have not been shown in the College view for confidentiality reasons.

Table 3. Average score on all Critical Thinking criteria on scale of 1-4

| | University | CBE | CEAS | CLASS | CSCI |
|----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| Average score | 3.54 | Withheld due to low N | 3.61 | 3.63 | 3.29 |

Example Challenges

“With a highly diverse student population, we have some students whose primary language is not English and they might not be able to express their viewpoints and to cite evidence in clear academic language. This could be why we have some scores of 2s in use of evidence and alternative viewpoints.”

“One important finding is that most students struggle with APA formatting, despite explicit instruction and access to multiple online resources. The program will need to reevaluate how APA is presented; a competency-based module may be in order.”

“... scores indicate there is room for improvement across each of the four criteria (see Instrument). These can be addressed through curricular and co-curricular efforts.”

“While the majority of students performed well on this assignment and all students passed comprehensive exams, there are indicators that our students continue to need explicit clinical instruction and practice in critical thinking as applied to clinical decision-making.”

STUDENT LIFE AT CSUEB IN 2019-2020

The [University Summary Report](#) on Critical Thinking assessment includes extensive information regarding the impact of COVID-19, the resulting quarantine, the Black Lives Matter movement and other social justice movements on the well-being and mental state of CSUEB students. Graduate students underwent the same stressors as CSUEB university students as a whole. In addition, due to the larger proportion of graduate students who are international, they also were subjected to uncertainties regarding visa status and international travel, and possible racial discrimination. Graduate students are more likely to be the heads of households and to hold full-time jobs, leading to greater consequences if their employment was reduced or eliminated. Finally, graduate students are more likely to be conducting research than undergraduates. As almost all lab-based research and research that was to be conducted in the field was suspended for the last half of Spring 2020, many graduate students were unable to complete capstone course requirements.

CSUEB faculty and staff were greatly impacted and affected by COVID-19 and social justice movements as well, both personally, and in their efforts to support CSUEB students. The f n f n f n f n f many

Specifying responsibility for ensuring that program annual reports are submitted to CAPR by the due date.

Specifying responsibility for ensuring that program annual reports contain the required ILO assessment results.

For programs undergoing five-year review, who are eligible to submit truncated annual reports, that those reports include ILO assessment results.

For programs which are accredited by discipline-specific accreditation organizations, that a clear mapping of accreditation organization

Support for College and Graduate Advisory Council Discussions

Please see University Summary Report for contacts and potential meeting format. Possible