The University gathered the most current available data from several relevant sources (Table 1). Additionally, colleges integrated relevant program data into college discussions as appropriate (e.g. program reviews, college surveys).

Table 1. Sources of key data and dates of collection for ILO Critical Thinking assessment

Key Data Sources	Date
Pilot Assessment of GE A3 (Critical Thinking)	2019-2020
Assessment of Undergraduate Senior Level Student Work for ILO Critical Thinking	2019-20
Assessment of Graduate Level Student Work for ILO Critical Thinking	2019-20
Student Center For Academic Achievement (SCAA):	2019-20
Student Life at CSUEB during a pandemic: Findings from a Spring 2020 Survey	Spring 2020
National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)	2017
Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement (BCSSE) First Year Institutional Report, Transfer Student Institutional Report	2019
AAC&U Report: On Solid Ground	2017

Pilot Assessment of GE A3 (Critical Thinking)
Refer to the *General Education Assessment of Student Learning Area A3 Critical Thinking* report which will be posted on the GE Assessment website.

for any assignment instructed by the Office of Faculty Development based on their Engaging Assignments video tutorial and companion handout. The second part of the workshop was faculty peer coaching on strengthening their assignment to further align it to the Critical Thinking ILO using an adapted model based on the NILOA Assignment Charrette. Four (4) faculty from the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences and the College of Education and Allied Studies with an undergraduate upper division course being assessed for the ILO of Critical Thinking attended the funded professional development workshop finding the workshop creative, collaborative, and engaging. As part of their attendance, they submitted changes to pedagogy, the assignment or assessment planned as a result of the workshop.

Assessment of Undergraduate Senior Level Student Work for ILO Critical Thinking 2019- 2020
Undergraduate courses aligned to ILO Critical Thinking: Twenty-four (24) senior level course sections were aligned to the ILO of Critical Thinking (Table 2). These courses represented 16 disciplines from the four colleges: College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences (CLASS), College of Science (CSCI), College of Education and Allied Studies (CEAS), and the College of Business (CBE).

ILO Critical Thinking Courses Assessed 2019-20 by College			
CEAS	CBE	CSCI	CLASS
2 courses	1 course	6 courses	15 courses

Table 2. Numbers of courses assessed by college for ILO Critical Thinking 2019-20.

College	Departments Represented	# Courses Assessed
CEAS	Hospitality Kinesiology	2
CBE	Economics	1
CSCI	Health Sciences Industrial Engineering Nursing Psychology Statistics	6
CLASS	Anthropology Criminal Justice English History International Studies Philosophy Political Science Sociology	15

Faculty Assessed Student Work: For each course section being assessed, four student samples were randomly selected using Blackboard Outcomes, an electronic assessment platform within Blackboard. Each student work sample was assessed by two trained faculty assessors . Assessment and Calibration training was provided to the participating faculty representing the four colleges and Library Services. Trained faculty

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) Report 2017
The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) collects information from four-year colleges and universities about first-year and senior students' participation in programs and activities that institutions provide for their learning and personal development. Among other areas, the survey captures questions related to student engagement experiences with higher-order learning. The survey data is presented in comparison with peer institutions regionally and nationwide.

Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement (BCSSE) Institutional Reports, 2019
The Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement (BCSSE) collects data related to students' academic expectations and perceptions for the coming year. It is generally administered to first-year students and new transfer students towards the start of the first term they enter the University. Content collected about student engagement and experiences include learning strategies related to critical thinking. The survey data presents student responses by first generation status and self-reported previous grade levels.

RESULTS

Pilot Assessment of GE A2 (First-year Composition)
Refer to the *Area A3 Critical Thinking* GE Assessment summary posted on the GE Assessment website.

Assessment of ILO Critical Thinking Student Work at Graduation for Undergraduates 2019- 2020
Special note about academic assessment data: Comprehensive excel workbooks with results from undergraduate senior level work academic assessments completed in 2019-2020 for the ILOs of Quantitative Reasoning and Critical Thinking have been provided by Institutional Effectiveness and Research to college Associate Deans with the understanding that any data shared would be based on prior agreements about sharing academic assessment information. Only data that cannot identify a single course section or faculty member can be distributed. Additionally faculty who had their course assessed can receive the data that shows their course compared to others without identifier data and may use their own data as they see appropriate (e.g.program review, course improvement).

Student Performance Critical Thinking
The results of assessment for the six categories of student writing performance in the ILO Critical Thinking Rubric (Explanation of issues, Use of evidence, Context, assumptions, Alternative viewpoints, Statement of position, Conclusions, Implications and Consequences) ranged between 57% and 89% competent (Level 3) and fully competent (Level 4). Critical Thinking was strongest in the category of Explanation of Issues and weakest in the category of Alternative Viewpoints (Fig. 1).

1 Major Gaps   2 Some Gaps   3 Competent   4 Fully Competent/Exemplary

Figure 1. Student performance for critical thinking indicated by percent of students in each performance level (1 Major Gaps to 4 Fully Competent/Exemplary) on each of the six categories (Explanation of issues, Use of Evidence, Context, assumptions, Alternative viewpoints, Statement of position, and Conclusions, implications, and and consequences). N = 96 students.

In 2009, the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) led VALUE (Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education) a campus-based assessment approach developed and led by AAC&U. VALUE rubrics provide tools to assess students' own authentic work, produced across students' diverse learning pathways, fields of study and institutions, to determine whether and how well students are meeting graduation level achievement in learning outcomes that both employers and faculty consider essential. The VALUE rubrics include Critical Thinking and Quantitative Literacy,

Cal State East Bay adapted best practices for rubric development and assessment using the VALUE Rubrics for Improvement of Learning and Authentic Assessment and Assessing Outcomes and Improving Achievement: Tips and TdFp dgd for U[-)]TJETQq0.00000912 0 612 792 reW*nBT/F1 11.04 Tf1 0 0044)213 36n102.02

Psychological distress (PHQ-9, 9-item depression screener) was strongly associated with difficulty concentrating on schoolwork (R^2 = .31).

Using the PHQ-9's established cut points, 49% of CSUEB students scored in the moderate depression range or higher. This compares to 9% for U.S. adults, 30% among undergraduate students pre-Covid, and 41% among seven universities the American College Health Association surveyed between March and May, 2020.

Sixty-five percent of students agreed that they could reach out for help from their professors if they were struggling academically

Perceived professor support was strongly associated with students' academic performance (beta = .30 in bivariate regression with both variables scaled 0 to 1.0).

Latinx students were 2.2 times more likely than white students (22% to 10%) to disagree that they could reach out for help from their professors. Middle Eastern (17%), African American (15%), and Asian American (15%) students were also more likely than white students to disagree that they seek help from professors.

Here is a related pre-print of an article under review for publication: *Examining the Impact of COVID-19 related disruptions, dislocations, and stressors on the academic performance of undergraduates at a diverse public university.*

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) 2017
Institutional Effectiveness and Research administered the NSSE to all first-year and senior undergraduate students in the spring of 2017. CSUEB student responses to critical thinking-related NSSE questions demonstrate that our student population engages with critical thinking concepts and skills at levels generally on par with comparison institutions (see NSSE Summary) The results from the NSSE show growth in all areas of critical thinking skills and concepts from first-year to senior-level students (see NSSE Detailed Results by student level).

Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement (BCSSE) Institutional Reports 2019
Institutional Effectiveness and Research administered the BCSSE to incoming first-year and incoming transfer students in 2019. CSUEB student responses to BCSSE questions show lower levels of self-reported preparedness to think critically from both first year and transfer-level first generation students (see BCSSE Summary). In addition, first-year, first generation students reported less frequent experiences with critical thinking strategies during their senior year of high school (see BCSSE detailed results by student level).

COLLEGE DISCUSSIONS

Role of ILO Subcommittee
The ILO Subcommittee will review calibration results and faculty feedback in order to recommend potential changes to the ILO Critical Thinking rubric and the ILO Assessment process.

College/Unit Discussions
Led by associate deans, each college/unit will decide their own approach to reviewing results and conducting discussions generally following the schedules outlined in ILO Long Term Assessment Plan and EEC

Communication Plan focused on discussions in fall of 2020 and implementation in Spring 2021. This includes reviewing those results that add meaning to their discussions about student performance in critical thinking.

Support for College Discussions

Planning and meeting facilitation support is available from Academic Programs and Services and the Office of Faculty Development:

Academic Programs and Services
Maureen Scharberg, maureen.scharberg@csueastbay.edu
Julie Stein, julie.stein@csueastbay.edu
Caron Inouye, caron.inouye@csueastbay.edu

Office of Faculty Development
Jessica Weiss, jessica.weiss@csueastbay.edu

Department of Sociology
Carl Stempel, carl.stempel@csueastbay.edu

College reports have been provided to Associate Deans. As individual faculty and students are not identified in this institutional assessment, disaggregated results will not be provided in the event that individual faculty can be identified.

Possible Meeting Format

Brief <u>overview</u> and purpose of wide-scale assessment
<u>Presentation</u> of key critical thinking results for the college/unit
<u>Discussion</u> in large or smaller groups: consider questions that fit your college/unit and record discussion results:

First discuss results:
How does this information fit with our experience of students' development of critical thinking skills at Cal State East Bay?
How do the results compare with program/college for programmatic assessment of critical thinking skills?
What are our students' strengths?
What are the most noticeable gaps?

Next, discuss possible/tentative course of action
What seems to be working well that we can further support for building student competency for critical thinking?
What can we do to improve?
How can we better meet students' needs for building critical thinking skills at critical junctures for their learning?

<u>Summarize </u>key topics and possible action steps and review next steps.