



Clemson Thinks<sup>2</sup>  
Faculty Institute  
June 2015

# CT<sup>2</sup> Faculty Institute Outcomes

- Design and develop a communication-intensive CT<sup>2</sup> Seminar on the topic or subject the faculty member chooses and that integrates targeted student learning outcomes related to critical thinking.
- Redesign and redevelop existing faculty members' course(s) to integrate the targeted student learning outcomes related to *Clemson Thinks<sup>2</sup>*.
- Develop and integrate activities and assignments into faculty members' courses that will develop the targeted CT<sup>2</sup> skills in their students and enhance academic and engagement experiences.
- Develop strategies for engaging students and ensuring they comprehend assignments and are achieving CT<sup>2</sup> learning outcomes.
- Identify alternatives for assessing student CT<sup>2</sup> skills.
- Monitor and assess students' competency in CT<sup>2</sup> skills using multiple assessment instruments.

# CT<sup>2</sup>: Development of the Program

Development of the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) that would become CT<sup>2</sup> began in September 2011.

President Barker charged the Steering Committee with responsibility to select, plan, and implement the QEP on behalf of Clemson University. In his instructions to the Steering Committee, President Barker outlined six requirements for the QEP:

1. It must align with Clemson's 2020 Road Map (Appendix B).
2. It must be campus wide.
3. It must be open to all.
4. It must involve engagement.
5. It must be transformative.
6. It must be sustainable.

# CT<sup>2</sup>: Development of the Program

The Steering Committee began its deliberations by soliciting QEP proposals from across Clemson University. Students, faculty, and staff were invited to submit five-page pre-proposals.

Groups from across campus submitted 21 proposals. Steering Committee members read all 21 proposals and scored them based upon alignment with the Clemson 2020 plan and potential to encourage broad-based university involvement as well as identification of specific and measurable student learning outcomes. Team members also scored each proposal on six qualitative attributes: innovation, degree of daring, transformative potential, uniqueness, relevance, and focus.

# CT<sup>2</sup>: Development of the Program

As the result of this process, six of the 21 proposals were selected as “finalists.” Each of these is summarized briefly below:

- **Clemson Grand Challenges**
- **CU in the World**
- **Enduring Questions Seminars**
- **Reinventing General Education**
- **Research Skills and Critical Thinking**
- **Stewards of Place**

# CT<sup>2</sup>: Development of the Program

As the result of this process, six of the 21 proposals were selected as finalists. Each of these is summarized briefly below:

- **Clemson Grand Challenges**
- **CU in the World**
- **Enduring Questions Seminars**
- **Reinventing General Education**
- **Research Skills and Critical Thinking**
- **Stewards of Place**

# CT<sup>2</sup>: Development of the Program

## Linking Finalist Proposals to Assessment Data:

Once the six finalist proposals were identified, the team turned to evidence from assessment data in order to identify areas of student achievement that would most likely benefit from a quality enhancement plan. Three types of data were central to this evaluation: Graduate Record Examination (GRE) scores, Educational Testing Service (ETS) Proficiency Profile data, and artifacts from the ePortfolios required of all graduating seniors at Clemson.

After evaluating the assessment data, the Steering Committee concluded that critical thinking was the area of intellectual development most conducive to broad-based university participation and most likely to benefit from the kind of sustained focus available through the QEP process.

# CT<sup>2</sup>: Development of the Program

## Faculty Development

An important component of the QEP will be the development of a formal faculty development program focused on critical thinking to complement the opportunities for professional development through Clemson's Office of Teaching Effectiveness and Instruction (OTEI). This program will pursue multiple, related goals:

- provide thought-provoking discussions of critical thinking
- learn best practices in critical thinking pedagogy
- build and nurture a community of "CT<sup>2</sup> Scholars" committed to improving the teaching of critical thinking skills
- deliver necessary resources to assess students' mastery of critical thinking skills.

The Faculty Development Program has a primary goal to develop the "community of faculty scholars committed to and prepared for instruction in critical thinking." This community will form around a shared interest in critical thinking and will encompass instructional faculty, co-curricular activities, and mentoring relationships. **Clemson Thinks<sup>2</sup> seeks the engagement of the entire university.**



# CT<sup>2</sup>: Where We Are Today

## Spring 2015 CT<sup>2</sup> Courses Conducted

PREFIX	NUMBER	COURSE	INSTRUCTOR	
AGED	4160	Ethics and Issues in Agriculture and the Food and Fiber System	Thomas Kirby	Dobbins Player
ANTH and BIOL (cross-listed)	3510	Biological Anthropology	Katherine	Weisensee
BIOL	2000	Biology in the News	Christine	Minor
BIOL	2000	Biology in the News	David	Tonkyn
COMM	2010	Introduction to Communication Studies	Brenden	Kendall
CSM	1500-001	Construction Problem Solving and Critical Thinking	Jason	Lucas
CSM	1500-002	Construction Problem Solving and Critical Thinking	Jason	Lucas
CSM	1500-003	Construction Problem Solving and Critical Thinking	Jason	Lucas
CU	2010	Sustainability	Jennifer	Goree
ENGL	2120-009	It's a Wonderful World?: Utopia/Dystopia	Joshua	Waggoner
ENGL	2120-010	It's a Wonderful World?: Utopia/Dystopia	Joshua	Waggoner
ENGL	2120-017	It's a Wonderful World?: Utopia/Dystopia	Joshua	Waggoner
ENGL	2120-011	Doubles, Reflections, and Twins in Folklore, Fairytale, and Literary Adaptation	Karen	Kettnich
ENGL	2120-012	Doubles, Reflections, and Twins in Folklore, Fairytale, and Literary Adaptation	Karen	Kettnich
ENGR	1900	Special Projects in Engineering	Laura	Shick
ENGR	2200	Evaluating Innovations: Fixtures, Fads, and Flops	Sarah	Grigg

# CT<sup>2</sup>: Where We Are Today

## Spring 2015 CT<sup>2</sup> Courses Conducted

ENSP	2000	Introduction to Environmental Science and Policy	Scott	Brame
GEOG	1030	World Regional Geography	Lance	Howard
HON	2060	Introduction to Nanotechnology	Christopher	Kitchens
MATH	1010	Essential Mathematics for the Informed Society	Marilyn	Reba
MATH	3190	Introduction to Proof	Michael	Burr
PHIL	1020	Logic	Kelly	Smith
POSC	3890	Religious Liberty and the Constitution	Daniel	Frost
PRTM	3450	Tourism Management	Lauren	Duffy
PSYC	3100	Advanced Experimental Psychology	Ben	Stephens
REL	3000	Studying Religion: Theories and Methods	Ben	White
SOC	2020	Social Problems	Stephanie	Southworth
SOC	2020	Social Problems	Stephanie	Southworth
SOC	2010	Introduction to Sociology	Mary	Barr
SOC	4600	Race and Ethnicity	Brenda	Vander Mey
STS	2150	A Critical Approach to the Global Challenge of Technological Revolutions	Thomas	Oberdan
THEA	2100	Theatre Appreciation	Shannon	Robert

**Total student enrollment: 1040**

**Total Credit Hours: 96**



# CT<sup>2</sup>: Where We Are Today

## Faculty Institute Participants' Disciplines

### Department:

Accounting\*  
Animal and Veterinary Science  
Architecture\*  
Biological Sciences  
Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering  
Chemistry\*  
Civil Engineering  
Communication Studies  
Construction Science  
Electrical and Computer Engineering  
Electrical Engineering  
English  
Graphic Communications  
History & Geography  
Languages\*  
Libraries\*  
Nursing  
Performing Arts  
Philosophy & Religion  
Physics and Astronomy\*  
Sociology & Anthropology



\* = new departments represented in Faculty Institute 2015

# CT<sup>2</sup>: Where We Are Today

## Faculty Institute Participants' Disciplines: 2013-15

Department	First Year Attended
Accounting*	2015
Animal and Veterinary Science	2015
Architecture*	2015
Art	2014
Bioengineering	2014
Biological Sciences	2013
Biological Sciences & Materials Science and Engineering	2014
Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering	2014
Chemistry*	2015
Civil Engineering	2013
Communication Studies	2014
Construction Science & Management	2013
Electrical and Computer Engineering	2015
English	2013
Environmental Engineering and Earth Sciences	2013
Food, Nutrition and Packaging Science	2014
General Engineering	2014
Graphic Communications	2013
History & Geography	2015
Institute of Environmental Toxicology	2013
Institute on Family and Neighborhood Life/HEHD	2014
Languages*	2015
Libraries*	2015
Mathematical Sciences	2013
Nursing	2014
Parks, Recreation and Tourism Management	2014
Performing Arts	2013
Philosophy	2013
Physics and Astronomy*	2015
Political Science	2014
Psychology	2013
Public Health Sciences	2013
SAFES/Environmental Horticulture	2013
Sociology & Anthropology	2013
STS (Dean, Arch, Art, & Humanities)	2013
Student Affairs	2013
Teacher Education	2013
Undergraduate Studies	2013

\* = first time attended 2015



**38 Departments!**

# CT<sup>2</sup>: Where We Are Today

## Faculty Institute Participants' Testimonials: 2013-14

*The Clemson Think<sup>2</sup> Faculty Institute is an effective faculty development program. Below are some testimonials from those who attended the 2014 Institute.*

- I would like to acknowledge that this workshop was organized in a very professional way. There was a lot of attention to detail in materials to be used and resources. It is obvious that organizers worked very hard to provide a very rich learning experiences for us. All instructors were very well-prepared and engaging. Moreover, the teaching dynamics used gave us the opportunity to share ideas and opinions in a very respectful environment. I am sure that this learning experience will generate positive results for my development as a faculty, as well as a human being. Thanks so much for this wonderful opportunity. Great job!
- I really enjoyed all the presentations. We had an excellent variety of perspectives, and I feel more grounded in the critical thinking approach. I know that to really understand this pedagogy, I need to teach using the approach myself, but I feel prepared to try it. I also enjoyed the fine group of people who were part of the conference. I made several new contacts, and I am really excited about ways that we might network in the future.
- I think that you guys did a great job this year, and I really enjoyed the institute. I felt challenged and inspired throughout the week.
- I really enjoyed the Institute and I received a lot of extremely useful information.
- I learned much about critical thinking, including its conceptualization and operationalization. The institute was interactive, informative, and well-done overall. I'm much more excited and informed about deliberately emphasizing critical thinking in my classes.
- I really enjoyed all the presentations. We had an excellent variety of perspectives, and I feel more grounded in the critical thinking approach. I know that to really understand this pedagogy, I need to teach using the approach myself, but I feel prepared to try it. I also enjoyed the fine group of people who were part of the conference. I made several new contacts, and I am really excited about ways that we might network in the future.
- I found almost all of the Institute to be very helpful and I came out of it even more enthusiastic (maybe even "evangelical") about the creation and dissemination of CT courses at CU.

# CT<sup>2</sup>: Where We Want to Go in 2015-16

- Increase the diversity of disciplines participating in CT<sup>2</sup> (*currently 38*)
- Increase the number of students participating in CT<sup>2</sup>
- Increase the number of CT<sup>2</sup> sections taught (*Plan calls for 120 sections 2015-16*)
- Build CT<sup>2</sup> Faculty Scholars community (*14 Faculty Scholars appointed 2014-15*)
- Increase involvement of wider University community (*speakers, events etc.*)
- Increase development and diffusion of pedagogical techniques
- Create mini-Faculty Institutes

# CT<sup>2</sup>: Where We Want to Go in 2015-16

Pre-Test		Post-Test	
OVERALL	23	OVERALL	30
Percentile	85	Percentile	98
Analysis	5	Analysis	7
Inference	12	Inference	13
Evaluation	6	Evaluation	10
Induction	13	Induction	15
Deduction	10	Deduction	15
Minutes on test	38	Minutes on test	42

**More pre and post-test results like this!**

# Welcome to the 2015 CT<sup>2</sup> Faculty Institute!