



CRITICAL THINKING ASSESSMENT REVIEW ANALYSIS 2021 CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY

Summary of Analysis

For AY 2020-2021, the Assessment Committee reviewed and rated 39 (of 50) critical thinking assessment reports. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the continuation of online learning format, many programs were still unable to collect assessment data that they typically collect during the academic year (e.g., laboratory work, performances, etc.). These programs were provided the option of submitting their assessment reports with missing data, as long as they provided explanation. Of the 39 reports, 30 reports were able to provide critical thinking assessment report data.

2020-2021 Critical Thinking Assessment Review Ratings Table

	Process Section	Performance Section	Progress Section	Overall Ratings
# Met/Exceeded Expectations	25	18	14	16
# Needs Minor Improvement	6	11	14	14
# Needs Improvement	8	10	11	9
Average	2.80	2.46	2.49	2.59

Overall Analysis

Of the 39 critical thinking reports, the overall average rating was 2.59 (out of 4). Sixteen 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 nine programs received a rating of less than 2 (i.e., needs improvement). 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

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

This year's overall average (2.59) is lower than last year's overall average (2.95). However, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, this decrease is not statistically significant, and the difference in sample size does not warrant 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.

Process Section Analysis

Of the 39 completed process sections, the overall average rating was 2.80 (out of 4). Twenty-Five programs received a rating of three (i.e., meets requirement) or higher. Six 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).

This year's process average (2.80) is lower than last year's process average (3.23). However, as stated above, due to the COVID pandemic, 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 39 completed performance sections, the overall average rating was 2.46 (out of 4). Eighteen programs received a rating of three (i.e., meets requirement) or higher. Eleven programs received a rating between 2 to 3 (i.e., needs minor improvement). And ten programs received a rating of less than 2 (i.e., needs improvement).

This year's performance average (2.46) is lower than last year's process average (2.92). However, as stated above, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, this decrease is not statistically significant, and the difference in sample size does not warrant 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.

Progress Section Analysis

Of the 39 completed progress sections, the overall average rating was 2.49 (out of 4). Fourteen 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 eleven programs received a rating of less than 2 (i.e., needs improvement).

This year's progress average (2.49) is lower than last year's process average (2.71). However, as stated above, due to the COVID pandemic, 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.