<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2011-12 | • Command of Language (Reading & Writing)  
          • Quantitative Literacy |
| 2012-13 | • Interpersonal Communication and Command of Language (Listening)  
          • Command of Language (Speaking)  
          • Biological & Physical Sciences |
| 2013-14 | • Critical Thinking  
          • Information Literacy  
          • Second Language & Culture |
| GULL WEEK BEGINS                  |
| Spring 2015 | • Visual & Performing Arts and Aesthetic Values-JMU Arts & Humanities Questionnaire  
          • Health & Wellness-National College Health Assessment  
          • Literature and Command of Language (Reading & Writing)-CBASE English Subject Exam  
          • Civilization, Contemporary Global Issues, and Social & Behavioral Sciences-CBASE Social Studies Subject Exam  
          • Reassessment of Scientific Literacy-CBASE Science Subject Exam & JMU Natural World, Version 9  
          • Reassessment of Quantitative Literacy-CBASE Math Subject Exam & JMU Natural World, Version 9 |
| 2015-16 | • Information Literacy-Project SAILS  
          • Interpersonal Communication-Conversational Skills Rating Scale  
          • Social Responsibility-Defining Issues Test  
          • Humane Values-Defining Issues Test  
          • Intellectual Curiosity-California Critical Thinking Disposition Inventory (CCTDI)  
          • Critical Thinking-California Critical Thinking Skills Test (CCTST)  
          • Interdependence Among Disciplines-CCTDI & CCTST  
          • Second Culture-Global Perspectives Inventory |
| 2016-17 | • Reassessment of Command of Language (Reading & Writing)-ETS HEIghten Written Communication Assessment |
| Fall 2017 | • Reassessment of Information Literacy-JMU Information Literacy Test  
          • Reassessment of Critical Thinking-ETS HEIghten Critical Thinking Assessment  
          • Pilot assessments of potential GenEd Student Learning Goals:  
            o ETS HEIghten Civic Competency & Engagement Assessment  
            o ETS HEIghten Intercultural Competency & Diversity Assessment |
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Information Literacy
2013-14 Course-embedded Assessment Results:
- Student writing samples demonstrated that the majority of students lacked the ability to evaluate the appropriateness of resources as well as identify key concepts and sources.

2015-16 GULL Week Testing (Project SAILS) Results:
- Average % Correct: 55% (SU); 50% (National)
- Benchmark Values for Average % Correct: 70–84% (Proficiency); 85% (Mastery)
- While SU students scored above the national average, they scored well below the “proficient” score identified by Project SAILS. Faculty should consider a proficiency level they feel is representative of the skill level expected of the average SU student. If this is above the 55% correct average score achieved by SU students, faculty should consider the potential benefits of some form of curricular intervention. Specifically, transfer students and freshmen had the lowest scores on the assessment. Interventions that focus on improving the Information Literacy skills of these groups may be the most beneficial.

Critical Thinking
2013-14 Course-embedded Assessment Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1. Critical Thinking GenEd Outcomes</th>
<th>Rubric Categories</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Spring 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1. Analyze, synthesize, and/or evaluate ideas, concepts, and/or evidence.</td>
<td>Analysis &amp; Evaluation</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Synthesis</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2. Describe diverse aspects of a discipline using discipline-specific concepts.</td>
<td>Discipline Assumptions</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discipline-specific Concepts</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3. Apply appropriate problem-solving strategies to discipline-specific issues.</td>
<td>Problem-solving Strategy</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.4. Compare and contrast theories within a discipline.</td>
<td>Comparing &amp; Contrasting Theories</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- While students were weak in most areas of critical thinking, students struggled most with applying appropriate problem-solving strategies.

2015-16 GULL Week Testing (CCTDI & CCTST) Results:
- CCTST – for the Overall and all subscale scores (Analysis, Inference, Evaluation, Deduction, Induction, Interpretation, and Explanation) the students’ average scores indicate moderate critical thinking skills. Curricular interventions should focus on subscales with the highest percentages of students in the “Needs Improvement” category: Evaluation (45%), Deduction (42%), and Explanation (47%).
- CCTDI – for the Overall and most subscale scores (Open-mindedness, Analyticity, Confidence in Reasoning, Inquisitiveness, and Maturity of Judgment) the students’ average scores indicate “positive” critical thinking dispositions; however, improvement is needed in the Truthseeking and Systematicity aspects of critical thinking, as determined by the lower average scores (“inconsistent/ambivalent”) and higher percentages of students in the “Needs Improvement” category on those subscales. Truthseekers strive to follow reasons and evidence to make decisions, while thinking systematically demonstrates an ordered and disciplined approach to thinking. The CCTDI results mirror those found on SU’s course-embedded assessment. SU students struggle to use suitable problem-solving strategies.

Written Communication
2011-12 Course-embedded Assessment Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.2b. Command of Language (Writing) GenEd Outcomes</th>
<th>Rubric Categories</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Spring 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2b.3. Construct thesis-driven arguments that marshal appropriate evidence and counter-arguments.</td>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counter-arguments</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2b.4., 1.4a.2, 1.4b.2. Select, evaluate, and cite reputable and appropriate sources.</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Students need assistance with the development of skills to construct arguments and counter-arguments and appropriately select, evaluate and cite sources (replicated in the information literacy assessment).

Spring 2015 GULL Week Testing (CBASE-English Subject Test) Results:
- The multiple-choice exam results showed that students scored above the national median on overall English skills (261 vs. 260), below the national median on reading and literature (260 vs. 262), and above the national median for writing (279 vs 272).

2016-17 GULL Week Testing (HEIghten-Written Communication) Results:
- The assessment, which includes a written essay and selected response items, results showed that SU students scored above the current comparison group. Further analyses will be performed.