

Question 1: Program Learning Outcomes

Q1.1. Which of the following Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals (BLGs) **did you assess in 2014-2015?** [Check all that apply]

- 1. Critical thinking
- 2. Information literacy
- 3. Written communication
- 4. Oral communication
- 5. Quantitative literacy
- 6. Inquiry and analysis
- 7. Creative thinking
- 8. Reading
- 9. Team work
- 10. Problem solving
- 11. Civic knowledge and engagement
- 12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
- 13. Ethical reasoning
- 14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
- 15. Global learning
- 16. Integrative and applied learning
- 17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
- 18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
- 19. Other, specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2014-2015 but not included above:

- a.
- b.
- c.

Q1.3. Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

Q1.4. Is your program externally accredited (other than through WASC)?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No (Go to **Q1.5**)
- 3. Don't know (Go to **Q1.5**)

Q1.4.1. If the answer to Q1.4 is yes, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

Q1.5. Did your program use the [Degree Qualification Profile](#) (DQP) to develop your PLO(s)?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No, but I know what the DQP is.
- 3. No, I don't know what the DQP is.
- 4. Don't know

Q1.6. Did you use action verbs to make each PLO measurable (See Attachment I)?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

<p>Q1.2. Please provide more detailed background information about EACH PLO you checked above and other information such as how your specific PLOs were explicitly linked to the Sac State BLGs:</p> <p>PLO 4: . Critical Thinking</p>	<p>Q1.2.1. Do you have rubrics for your PLOs?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes, for all PLOs</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. Yes, but for some PLOs</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3. No rubrics for PLOs</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 4. N/A, other (please specify):</p>
--	---

IN QUESTIONS 2 THROUGH 5, REPORT IN DETAIL ON ONE PLO THAT YOU ASSESSED IN 2014-2015

Question 2: Standard of Performance for the selected PLO

<p>Q 2.1. Specify one PLO here as an example to illustrate how you conducted assessment (be sure you checked the correct box for this PLO in Q1.1):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critical Thinking Value Rubric created by Association of American Colleges and Universities 	<p>Q2.2. Has the program developed or adopted explicit standards of performance for this PLO?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 2. No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 4. N/A</p>
--	--

Q2.3. Please provide the rubric(s) and standard of performance that you have developed for this PLO here or in the appendix: **[Word limit: 300]**

See the rubric in Appendix I-IV

Standards of performance and expectations: 70% of undergraduate students should reach the milestone in each. (data taken from random sample of five capstone papers from five seniors.)

Q2.4. Please indicate the category in which the selected PLO falls into.

- 1. Critical thinking
- 2. Information literacy
- 3. Written communication
- 4. Oral communication
- 5. Quantitative literacy
- 6. Inquiry and analysis
- 7. Creative thinking
- 8. Reading
- 9. Team work
- 10. Problem solving
- 11. Civic knowledge and engagement
- 12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
- 13. Ethical reasoning
- 14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
- 15. Global learning
- 16. Integrative and applied learning
- 17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
- 18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
- 19. Other PLO. Specify:

Please indicate where you have published the PLO, the standard of performance, and the rubric that measures the PLO:

	Q2.5	Q2.6	Q2.7
	PLO	Standards of Performance	Rubrics
1. In SOME course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO	1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3. <input type="checkbox"/>
2. In ALL course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO	1. <input type="checkbox"/>	2. <input type="checkbox"/>	3. <input type="checkbox"/>
3. In the student handbook/advising handbook	1. <input type="checkbox"/>	2. <input type="checkbox"/>	3. <input type="checkbox"/>
4. In the university catalogue	1. <input type="checkbox"/>	2. <input type="checkbox"/>	3. <input type="checkbox"/>
5. On the academic unit website or in newsletters	1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3. <input type="checkbox"/>
6. In the assessment or program review reports, plans, resources or activities	1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7. In new course proposal forms in the department/college/university	1. <input type="checkbox"/>	2. <input type="checkbox"/>	3. <input type="checkbox"/>
8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents	1. <input type="checkbox"/>	2. <input type="checkbox"/>	3. <input type="checkbox"/>
9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents	1. <input type="checkbox"/>	2. <input type="checkbox"/>	3. <input type="checkbox"/>
10. Other, specify:			

Question 3: Data Collection Methods and Evaluation of Data Quality for the Selected PLO

Q3.1. Was assessment data/evidence **collected** for the selected PLO in 2016-2017?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No (Skip to Q6)
- 3. Don't know (Skip to Q6)
- 4. N/A (Skip to Q6)

Q3.2. If yes, was the data **scored/evaluated** for this PLO in 2016-2017?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No (Skip to Q6)
- 3. Don't know (Skip to Q6)
- 4. N/A (Skip to Q6)

<p>Q3.1A. How many assessment tools/methods/measures in total did you use to assess this PLO? 1</p>	<p>Q3.2A Please describe how you collected the assessment data for the selected PLO. For example, in what course(s) or by what means were data collected (see Attachment II)? [Word limit: 300]</p> <p>Data was collected from Film/ComS 192, Senior Seminar in Film Five randomly selected research papers were selected by the instructor.</p>
---	--

Q3A: Direct Measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios)

<p>Q3.3. Were direct measures [key assignments, projects, portfolios, etc.] used to assess this PLO?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 2. No (Go to Q3.7) <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know (Go to Q3.7)</p>	<p>Q3.3.1. Which of the following direct measures were used? [Check all that apply]</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1. Capstone projects (including theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. Key assignments from required classes in the program <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Key assignments from elective classes <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Classroom based performance assessments such as simulations, comprehensive exams, critiques <input type="checkbox"/> 5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community based projects <input type="checkbox"/> 6. E-Portfolios <input type="checkbox"/> 7. Other portfolios <input type="checkbox"/> 8. Other measure. Specify:</p>
<p>Q3.3.2. Please attach the direct measure you used to collect data.</p> <p>Final papers selected from the Capstone Film Studies course, Senior Seminar in Film (see Appendix I).</p>	

<p>Q3.4. How was the data evaluated? [Select only one]</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (Go to Q3.4.3) <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Used rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Used rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Used rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty <input type="checkbox"/> 5. The VALUE rubric(s) <input type="checkbox"/> 6. Modified VALUE rubric(s) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 7. Used other means. Specify: AAC&U VALUES rubrics + multiple-choice exams + rubrics pilot-tested and modified by a group of faculty</p>		
--	--	--

<p>Q3.4.1. Was the direct measure (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly with the PLO? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes</p>	<p>Q3.4.2. Was the direct measure (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly with the rubric? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes</p>	<p>Q3.4.3. Was the rubric aligned directly and explicitly with the PLO? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes</p>
--	---	--

<input type="checkbox"/> 2. No <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know <input type="checkbox"/> 4. N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> 2. No <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know <input type="checkbox"/> 4. N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> 2. No <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know <input type="checkbox"/> 4. N/A
<p>Q3.5. How many faculty members participated in planning the assessment data collection of the selected PLO?</p> <p>4</p>	<p>Q3.5.1. If the data was evaluated by multiple scorers, was there a norming process (a procedure to make sure everyone was scoring similarly)? N/A</p> <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. No <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know	
<p>Q3.6. How did you select the sample of student work [papers, projects, portfolios, etc.]?</p> <p>5 randomly selected projects from the 2016/2017 academic year</p>	<p>Q3.6.1. How did you decide how many samples of student work to review?</p> <p>The faculty came to a <i>consensus</i> for a reasonable number of projects</p>	
<p>Q3.6.2. How many students were in the class or program?</p> <p>The program has roughly 200 students and the class had 20 students enrolled</p>	<p>Q3.6.3. How many samples of student work did you evaluate?</p> <p>Video rubric: 5 Research Papers</p>	<p>Q3.6.4. Was the sample size of student work for the direct measure adequate?</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 2. No <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Don't know
<p>Q3B: Indirect Measures (surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc.)</p>		
<p>Q3.7. Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?</p> <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. No (Skip to Q3.8)	<p>Q3.7.1. Which of the following indirect measures were used? [Check all that apply]</p> <input type="checkbox"/> 1. National student surveys (e.g., NSSE) <input type="checkbox"/> 2. University conducted student surveys (e.g. OIR) <input type="checkbox"/> 3. College/Department/program student surveys <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews <input type="checkbox"/> 5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews <input type="checkbox"/> 6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews <input type="checkbox"/> 7. Other, specify:	
<p>Q3.7.2 If surveys were used, how was the sample size decided?</p>	<p>Q3.7.4. If surveys were used, what was the response rate?</p>	
<p>Q3.7.3. If surveys were used, briefly specify how you selected your sample.</p>		

Q3C: Other Measures (external benchmarking, licensing exams, standardized tests, etc.)

Q3.8. Were external benchmarking data such as licensing exams or standardized tests used to assess the PLO?

1. Yes
 2. No (Go to **Q3.8.2**)

Q3.8.1. Which of the following measures was used?

1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams
 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g., CLA, CAAP, ETS PP, etc.)
 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g., ETS, GRE, etc.)
 4. Other, specify:

Q3.8.2. Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

1. Yes
 2. No (Go to **Q3.9**)
 3. Don't know (Go to **Q3.9**)

Q3.8.3. If other measures were used, please specify:

Q3D: Alignment and Quality

Q3.9. Did the data, including the direct measures, from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

1. Yes
 2. No
 3. Don't know

Q3.9.1. Were **ALL** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO?

1. Yes
 2. No
 3. Don't know

Question 4: Data, Findings and Conclusions

Q4.1. Please provide simple tables and/or graphs to summarize the assessment data, findings, and conclusions: (see Attachment III) [**Word limit: 600 for selected PLO**]

Data for the Video Production Rubric

Table 1: Critical Thinking Value Rubric

Five Criteria (Areas)	Capstone (4)	Milestone (3)	Milestone (2)	Benchmark (1)	Benchmark (0)
1Explanation of Issues	40%	20%	20%	20%	0%
2Evidence	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%
3Influence of Context and Assumptions	40%	40%	20%	0%	0%
4Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypotheses)	20%	80%	0%	0%	0%
5Conclusions and related outcomes	40%	20%	20%	20%	0%

Based on the standards and criteria from the Critical Thinking Value Rubric

4.1 40% of seniors in the Film program are clearly delivering all “relevant information for full understanding.” 40% of students are reaching the milestones in the area of issue explanation. 80% of students reached the milestone.

4.2 Student writing showed 80% reaching the capstone providing evidence for their investigations and 20% reached the milestone, placing 100% at or above milestone 3.

4.3 Context and assumptions: 100% of students reached the milestone-capstone

4.4 Student’s position (perspective, thesis/hypotheses) 100% of students reached the milestone-capstone

4.5 Conclusions and related outcomes 80% of students reached the milestone and 20% of students reached Benchmark 1

Generally, results show that students are meeting or exceeding expectations. All students reached at least the lowest benchmark in all areas. Since the results were so good, we are taking into consideration what went right in this class and how to continue student success in the area of critical thinking.

1. The class was very small
2. There were three graduate students in the class who participated in work groups with the undergrads throughout the semester. They assisted in facilitating small group discussions, helped workshop homework essays, and even provided help with undergrad students’ outlines.
3. Students were able to submit a draft of the paper to the instructor for feedback three weeks before the paper was due.
4. The Film program’s core has very challenging courses taught by consistent instructors who all encourage and demand critical thinking in their courses. For example: Film Theory and Criticism (Doug Rice/David Toise), Media Aesthetics (Michele Foss-Snowden), Avant Garde Cinema (Andrew Anker), and World Cinema (Roberto Pomo)

Q4.3. For **selected** PLO, the student performance:

- 1. **Exceeded** expectation/standard
- 2. **Met** expectation/standard
- 3. **Partially** met expectation/standard
- 4. Did not meet expectation/standard
- 5. No expectation or standard has been specified
- 6. Don’t know

Question 5: Use of Assessment Data (Closing the Loop)

Q5.1. As a result of the **assessment effort in 2015-2016** and based on the prior feedback from OAPA, do you anticipate making any changes for your program (e.g., course structure, course content, or modification of PLOs)?

1. Yes * (see Q5.1.1.)
 2. No (Go to **Q5.3**)
 3. Don't know (Go to **Q5.3**)

Q5.1.2. Do you have a plan to assess the impact of the changes that you anticipate making?

1. Yes
 2. No
 3. Don't know

Q5.1.1. Please describe what changes you plan to make in your program as a result of your assessment of this PLO. Include a description of how you plan to assess the impact of these changes. **[Word limit: 300 words]**

*These assessment data have to potential to inform curricular needs. As we move toward Program Review and with the consent of the full faculty, we can work toward addressing at least some of these assessment issues in the coming year (2015-2016). Specifics changes include:

1) Identify PLOs that are a priority, along with evaluating current criteria

Assessing the impact of this change can be evaluated at next year's assessment by the inclusion of new PLOs and evaluation criteria.

Q5.2. How have the assessment data from last year (2015 - 2016) been used so far? **[Check all that apply]**

	(1) Very Much	(2) Quite a Bit	(3) Some	(4) Not at all	(8) N/A
1. Improving specific courses	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Modifying curriculum	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Improving advising and mentoring	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Developing/updating assessment plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Annual assessment reports	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Program review	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
9. Prospective student and family information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10. Alumni communication	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. WASC accreditation (regional accreditation)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
12. Program accreditation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
13. External accountability reporting requirement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
15. Strategic planning	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Institutional benchmarking	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
17. Academic policy development or modification	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. Institutional Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
19. Resource allocation and budgeting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. New faculty hiring	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
21. Professional development for faculty and staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22. Recruitment of new students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
23. Other Specify:					

Q5.2.1. Please provide a detailed example of how you used the assessment data above.

The Department will use assessment data from 2015-2016 to consider the following changes.

1. We have asked for and have received another video production hire
2. We are (in the process) of working on some curriculum changes of our introductory courses to provide more preparation for the Capstone video course. (Professor Jenny Stark applied for and received a grant for curriculum redesign to address these issues)
3. We have submitted a program change proposal requiring that students take Writing Short Scripts for Film Video before the capstone

Additional Assessment Activities

Q6. Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspects of a program that are not related to PLOs (i.e., impacts of an advising center, etc.). **If** your program/academic unit has collected data on the program elements, please briefly report your results here. **[Word limit: 300]**

Q7. What PLO(s) do you plan to assess next year?

- 1. Critical thinking
- 2. Information literacy
- 3. Written communication
- 4. Oral communication
- 5. Quantitative literacy
- 6. Inquiry and analysis
- 7. Creative thinking
- 8. Reading
- 9. Team work
- 10. Problem solving
- 11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
- 12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
- 13. Ethical reasoning
- 14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
- 15. Global learning
- 16. Integrative and applied learning
- 17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
- 18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
- 19. Other, specify any PLOs **not included above**:
 - a.
 - b.
 - c.

Q8. Have you attached any appendices? If yes, please list them all here:

I Critical Thinking Value Rubric, Individual Scores and Average 3

P1. Film: Film Studies Concentration	P2. Report Authors: Jenny Stark
P3. Academic unit: Department, Program, or College: Film Program	P4. College: Arts & Letters
P5. Fall 2014 enrollment for Academic unit (<i>See Department Fact Book 2014 by the Office of Institutional Research for fall 2012 enrollment: 1544</i>)	P6. Program Type: [Select only one] <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Credential <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Master’s degree <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Doctorate (Ph.D./Ed.d) <input type="checkbox"/> 5. Other. Please specify:
Undergraduate Degree Program(s):	Master Degree Program(s):

P7. Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has: 2 P7.1. List all the name(s): ComS: Digital Video 107 Film: Digital Film/Video Production 114 P7.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program? 2				P8. Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has: 0 P8.1. List all the name(s): n/a P8.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program? n/a							
Credential Program(s): P9. Number of credential programs the academic unit has: 0 P9.1. List all the names: n/a				Doctorate Program(s) P10. Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: 0 P10.1. List the name(s): n/a							
When was your assessment plan?		1. Before 2007-08	2. 2007-08	3. 2008-09	4. 2009-10	5. 2010-11	6. 2011-12	7. 2012-13	8. 2013-14	9. 2014-15	10. No formal plan
P11. Developed		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
P12. Last updated		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
								1. Yes	2. No	3. Don't Know	
P13. Have you developed a curriculum map for this program?								<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
P14. Has the program indicated explicitly where the assessment of student learning occurs in the curriculum?								<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
P15. Does the program have any capstone class?								<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
P16. Does the program have ANY capstone project?								<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

CRITICAL THINKING VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org



The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

Definition

Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.

Framing Language

This rubric is designed to be transdisciplinary, reflecting the recognition that success in all disciplines requires habits of inquiry and analysis that share common attributes. Further, research suggests that successful critical thinkers from all disciplines increasingly need to be able to apply those habits in various and changing situations encountered in all walks of life.

This rubric is designed for use with many different types of assignments and the suggestions here are not an exhaustive list of possibilities. Critical thinking can be demonstrated in assignments that require students to complete analyses of text, data, or issues. Assignments that cut across presentation mode might be especially useful in some fields. If insight into the process components of critical thinking (e.g., how information sources were evaluated regardless of whether they were included in the product) is important, assignments focused on student reflection might be especially illuminating.

Glossary

The definitions that follow were developed to clarify terms and concepts used in this rubric only.

- **Ambiguity:** Information that may be interpreted in more than one way.
- **Assumptions:** Ideas, conditions, or beliefs (often implicit or unstated) that are "taken for granted or accepted as true without proof." (quoted from www.dictionary.reference.com/browse/assumptions)
- **Context:** The historical, ethical, political, cultural, environmental, or circumstantial settings or conditions that influence and complicate the consideration of any issues, ideas, artifacts, and events.
- **Literal meaning:** Interpretation of information exactly as stated. For example, "she was green with envy" would be interpreted to mean that her skin was green.
- **Metaphor:** Information that is (intended to be) interpreted in a non-literal way. For example, "she was green with envy" is intended to convey an intensity of emotion, not a skin color.

CRITICAL THINKING VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org



Definition

Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.

Film/Coms 192: Jessica Jeakins	Capstone	Milestones		Benchmark
	4	3	2	1
Explanation of issues: 4	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description.
Evidence <i>Selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion 2</i>	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly.	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning.	Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning.	Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/evaluation. Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question.
Influence of context and assumptions 3	Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.	Identifies own and others' assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.	Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa).	Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions). Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position.
Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) 3	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) are acknowledged. Others' points of view are synthesized within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue. Others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue.	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious.
Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences) 4	Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical and reflect student's informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order.	Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified.

CRITICAL THINKING VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org



Definition

Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.

Film/Coms 192: Ayrana Gooley	Capstone	Milestones		Benchmark
	4	3	2	1
Explanation of issues 4	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description.
Evidence <i>Selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion 4</i>	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly.	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning.	Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning.	Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/evaluation. Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question.
Influence of context and assumptions 4	Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.	Identifies own and others' assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.	Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa).	Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions). Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position.
Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis)4	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) are acknowledged. Others' points of view are synthesized within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue. Others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue.	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious.
Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences) 4	Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical and reflect student's informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order.	Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified.

CRITICAL THINKING VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org



Definition

Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.

Film/Coms 192: Miguel Vega	Capstone	Milestones		Benchmark
	4	3	2	1
Explanation of issues 3	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description.
Evidence 4 <i>Selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion</i>	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly.	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning.	Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning.	Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/evaluation. Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question.
Influence of context and assumptions 2	Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.	Identifies own and others' assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.	Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa).	Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions). Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position.
Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) 3	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) are acknowledged. Others' points of view are synthesized within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue. Others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue.	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious.
Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences) 3	Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical and reflect student's informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order.	Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified.

CRITICAL THINKING VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org



Definition

Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.

Film/Coms 192: Alma Garibay	Capstone	Milestones		Benchmark
	4	3	2	1
Explanation of issues 2	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description.
Evidence 3 <i>Selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion</i>	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly.	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning.	Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning.	Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/evaluation. Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question.
Influence of context and assumptions 4	Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.	Identifies own and others' assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.	Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa).	Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions). Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position.
Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) 3	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) are acknowledged. Others' points of view are synthesized within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue. Others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue.	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious.
Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences) 2	Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical and reflect student's informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order.	Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified.

CRITICAL THINKING VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org



Definition

Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.

Film/Coms 192 Richard Le	Capstone	Milestones		Benchmark
	4	3	2	1
Explanation of issues 1	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description.
Evidence 4 <i>Selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion</i>	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly.	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning.	Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning.	Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/evaluation. Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question.
Influence of context and assumptions 3	Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.	Identifies own and others' assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.	Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa).	Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions). Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position.
Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) 3	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) are acknowledged. Others' points of view are synthesized within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue. Others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue.	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious.
Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences) 1	Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical and reflect student's informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order.	Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified.

CRITICAL THINKING VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org



Definition

Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.

Average	Capstone 4	Milestones		Benchmark 1
		3	2	
Explanation of issues 2.8	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description.
Evidence <i>Selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion 3.8</i>	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly.	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning.	Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning.	Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/evaluation. Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question.
Influence of context and assumptions 3.2	Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.	Identifies own and others' assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.	Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa).	Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions). Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position.
Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) 3.2	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) are acknowledged. Others' points of view are synthesized within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue. Others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue.	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious.
Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences) 2.8	Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical and reflect student's informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order.	Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified.

