



Integrative Leadership Studies | 2016-2017 Assessment Report

1. Please give a brief overview of the assessment data you collected this year.

AAC&U VALUE Rubric for Critical Thinking was adapted and used to gather data from ILS 300 Integrative Leadership Seminar II Synthesis of Viewpoints Assignment (formerly Research Paper assignment). These 26 papers were stored in the students' e-Portfolios for easy access for assessment. Mean scores are out of a possible best score of 4.

Note: Criteria for "Position" criterion is now included in "Conclusions/Implications"; "Writing" criterion was added in 2016-2017 to evaluate academic writing competence.

	2015-2016	2016-2017
Explanation of Issue	3.92	3.96
Evidence	3.15	3.81
Analysis	3.18	3.81
Position	3.15	-----
Conclusions/Implications	3.38	3.69
Writing	-----	3.96

Analysis of Data

- Overall, students improved in all aspects of the Critical Thinking rubric demonstrating their ability to think critically.
- Students were still better able to explain the issue thoroughly and set the issue in context than they were at critically analyzing the evidence and stating their position based on that evidence, but that gap has been reduced.
- Changes made to the assignment in 2016-2017, based on 2015-2016 assessment report, resulted in improved scores in all categories.

2. How will you use what you've learned from the data that was collected?

We will continue to use the adapted AAC&U VALUE rubric for Critical Thinking to gather Program data and to grade this course assignment. We will also:

- Use the adapted AAC&U VALUE rubric for Critical Thinking for one more year to make sure improvement is sustainable.
- Use assessment results as evidence to support adding ILS 300 as a required course in the ILS major core.

CRITICAL THINKING IN RESEARCH RUBRIC

	4	3	2	1	0
Explanation of Issue <i>(Research Paper Issue Statement)</i>	Issue is stated clearly and described thoroughly.	Issue is stated clearly and described adequately.	Issue is stated clearly, but lacks description.	Issue is stated, but lacks clarity and description.	Issue is not stated.
Evidence <i>(Literature Review and Annotated Bibliography)</i>	Information is taken from multiple and varied sources, and analyzed carefully; others' viewpoints are questioned thoroughly.	Information is taken from multiple sources and analyzed; others' viewpoints are acknowledged and questioned.	Information is taken from sources and interpreted, but not thoroughly enough to develop a coherent analysis of the issue; viewpoints of experts are accepted mostly as fact.	Information is taken from sources with little analysis; viewpoints are accepted as fact.	Information is taken from sources, but not analyzed; viewpoints are accepted as fact, without question.
Analysis <i>(Literature Review and Annotated Bibliography)</i>	Perspectives on the issue are carefully analyzed; own and others' assumptions are questioned; relevance of context is addressed.	Identifies own and others' assumptions and addresses relevant contexts.	Questions some assumptions and identifies several relevant contexts.	Shows an emerging awareness of assumptions and context.	Shows no awareness of assumptions and context when addressing the issue.
Position <i>(Research Paper Synthesis)</i>	Position takes into account the complexities of the issue; others' perspectives are synthesized within the position.	Position takes into account the complexities of the issue, and acknowledges others' points of view.	Position acknowledges different points of view on the issue.	Position is stated in simplistic and obvious terms.	Position is not stated.
Conclusions and Implications <i>(Position Paper Conclusion)</i>	Conclusions, consequences, and implications are logical and reflect an informed evaluation of information, as well as the ability to prioritize evidence and perspectives.	Conclusion follows from a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; consequences and implications are stated clearly.	Conclusion mostly follows from information specifically chosen to support desired conclusion; some implications are identified.	Conclusion is inconsistently tied to information discussed; implications are oversimplified.	Conclusion is not consistent with information discussed; implications are not stated.

Notes: Keep Discussion 2: Validity of Sources (Mozart Effect)
 Revise Critical Reflection 2: Change to annotated bibliography exercise (provide 2 examples)
 Combine Research Paper and Annotated Bibliography
 Assign Research Topics
 Revise Research Paper Outline