



CRITICAL THINKING ASSESSMENT REVIEW ANALYSIS 2019 CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY

Summary of Analysis

For AY 2018-2019, the Assessment Committee reviewed and rated 43 (of 49) critical thinking assessment reports. Of the 43 reports, 38 reports satisfactorily completed all three sections (i.e., process, performance, and progress) of the critical thinking assessment reports. When the Committee identifies missing sections, they are rated as incomplete and responded to as such. The institution expects all undergraduate programs to participate in the core competencies assessment.

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

Overall Review

Of the 43 critical thinking reports, the overall average rating was 2.86 (out of 4). Twenty-two programs received a rating of three (i.e., meets requirement) or higher. Fourteen programs received a rating between 2 to 3 (i.e., needs minor improvement). And seven 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.

Given that this is the first year of aggregated analysis, there is no previous year's data for comparison. In the future, we plan to include year-over-year analysis.

Process Section Review

The overall average rating for the process section was 3.09 (out of 4). Twenty-five programs received a rating of three (i.e., meets requirement) or higher. Sixteen 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.

Given that this is the first year of aggregated analysis, there is no previous year's data for comparison. In the future, we plan to include year-over-year analysis.

Performance Section Review

The overall average rating for the performance section was 2.71 (out of 4). Seventeen programs received a rating of three (i.e., meets requirement) or higher. Nineteen programs received a rating between 2 to 3 (i.e., needs minor improvement). And eight 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.

Given that this is the first year of aggregated analysis, there is no previous year's data for comparison. In the future, we plan to include year-over-year analysis.

Progress Section Review

The overall average rating for the progress section was 2.78 (out of 4). Twenty-one programs received a rating of three (i.e., meets requirement) or higher. Fourteen programs received a rating between 2 to 3 (i.e., needs minor improvement). And eight 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.

Given that this is the first year of aggregated analysis, there is no previous year's data for comparison. In the future, we plan to include year-over-year analysis.