



CRITICAL THINKING ASSESSMENT REVIEW ANALYSIS 2020 CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY

Summary of Analysis

For AY 2019-2020, the Assessment Committee reviewed and rated 22 (of 49) critical thinking assessment reports. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the sudden transition to online learning format, many programs could not collect assessment data that they typically collect during the academic year (e.g., laboratory work, performances, etc.). These programs were provided the option to conduct an assessment check-up. For critical thinking assessment, 27 programs opted to conduct an assessment check-up for AY 2019-2020. These check-ups also were reviewed by the Assessment Committee. The Committee also scheduled a follow-up meeting with the program to discuss the program's assessment and curriculum.

2019-2020 Critical Thinking Assessment Review Ratings Table

	Process Section	Performance Section	Progress Section	Overall Ratings
# Met/Exceeded Expectations	18	11	10	10
# Needs Minor Improvement	3	8	10	10
# Needs Improvement	1	3	2	2
Average	3.23	2.92	2.71	2.95

Overall Analysis

Of the 22 critical thinking reports, the overall average rating was 2.95 (out of 4). Ten programs received a rating of three (i.e., meets requirement) or higher. Ten programs received a rating between 2 to 3 (i.e., needs minor improvement). And two programs received a rating of less than 2 (i.e., needs improvement). As mentioned, the assessment committee also provides qualitative responses to elaborate on the ratings and support program improvement on assessment. These individualized comments can be accessed through our assessment system.

Comparison to Previous Years Data

2018-2019 Critical Thinking Assessment Review Ratings Table

Critical Thinking	Process Section	Performance Section	Progress Section	Overall Ratings
# Met/Exceeded Expectations	25	17	21	22
# Needs Minor Improvement	16	19	14	14
# Needs Improvement	2	7	8	7
Average	3.09	2.71	2.78	2.86

This year's overall average (2.95) is slightly higher than last year's overall average (2.86). However, this slight increase is not statistically significant, and the difference in sample size does not warrant confidence in the improvement of the critical thinking assessment process since last year. Nevertheless, the similar overall average does highlight the efforts of many programs to ensure proper assessment of our students' critical thinking abilities despite having

to make extensive teaching and program adjustments. We look forward to next year's review ratings data to get a better year-over-year progress understanding.

Process Section Analysis

Of the 22 completed process section, the overall average rating was 3.23 (out of 4). Eighteen programs received a rating of three (i.e., meets requirement) or higher. Three programs received a rating between 2 to 3 (i.e., needs minor improvement). And one program received a rating of less than 2 (i.e., needs improvement).

This year's process average (3.23) is slightly higher than last year's process average (3.09). However, as stated above, the difference in sample size and degree of difference does not warrant confidence in the improvement of this section since last year. We look forward to next year's review ratings data to get a better year-over-year progress understanding.

Performance Section Analysis

Of the 22 completed performance sections, the overall average rating was 2.92 (out of 4). Eleven programs received a rating of three (i.e., meets requirement) or higher. Eight programs received a rating between 2 to 3 (i.e., needs minor improvement). And three programs received a rating of less than 2 (i.e., needs improvement).

This year's performance average (2.92) is slightly higher than last year's process average (2.71). However, as stated above, the difference in sample size and degree of difference does not warrant confidence in the improvement of this section since last year. We look forward to next year's review ratings data to get a better year-over-year progress understanding.

Progress Section Analysis

Of the 22 completed progress sections, the overall average rating was 2.71 (out of 4). Ten programs received a rating of three (i.e., meets requirement) or higher. Ten programs received a rating between 2 to 3 (i.e., needs minor improvement). And two programs received a rating of less than 2 (i.e., needs improvement).

This year's progress average (2.71) is slightly lower than last year's process average (2.78). However, as stated above, the difference in sample size and degree of difference do not warrant confidence in the setback of this section since last year. We look forward to next year's review ratings data to get a better year-over-year progress understanding.