

1) Title of Proposal:

Yes, we do have intellectual standards in college!
How to help students join the higher education community.

2) Abstract:

This session demonstrates a lesson which introduces students to nine universal intellectual standards (Paul & Elder, 2010). These same intellectual standards are useful when commenting on student work both to reinforce the concepts and help bring the students into the intellectual quality traditions of the higher education community. In addition to the initial reading, an in-class exercise will be demonstrated complete with answer sheet. Finally, this session will demonstrate how these same words can be used individually in providing feedback to students and when grouped together, into rubrics which can save time in grading written work done by students.

3) Keywords:

Use three or four keywords to describe your session.

intellectual quality standards, critical thinking, rubrics

4) Format

- Activity or exercise
- Discussion roundtable (60 minute only)
- General discussion session

5) Time Requested:

- 30 Minutes
- 60 Minutes (*Roundtables must select 60 minutes*)
- 90 Minutes

6) Planning Details:

No specific room requirements. It would be nice if there is something to write upon for the participants (i.e. chair desks or tables).

7) Learning Objectives or Goals for the Session:

What are 2-4 specific learning outcomes that participants will get from your session?

- 1: DEMONSTRATE AN UNDERSTANDING OF EACH OF THE NINE UNIVERSAL INTELLECTUAL STANDARD DEFINITIONS.
- 2: SUCCESSFULLY CLASSIFY DESCRIPTIVE WORDS INTO THEIR APPROPRIATE UNIVERSAL INTELLECTUAL STANDARD CATEGORIES.
- 3: USE UNIVERSAL INTELLECTUAL STANDARD QUESTIONS TO EVALUATE THE INTELLECTUAL STANDARD LEVEL (QUALITY) OF OTHER'S WORK.

8) Management or Teaching Topics:

Thinking is integral to many management topics but especially to decision making and problem solving. Whether it is in gathering information, organizing and analyzing it, or applying the new understanding to a problem, quality matters. Such quality typically involves including critical thinking (Tomlinson, 2003). Critical thinking requires active thinking that goes beyond a surface response also requires that students understand what standards are expected to be met (Scriven & Paul, 1987).

Many students have not been adequately exposed to the higher standards required at college level work in a consistent fashion and do not really understand how to apply or transfer understandings across disciplines (Linn & Shore, 2008). Because of this lack of background understanding, it is very important to be explicit as we explain to students our standards. Furthermore, because students have been inculcated to believe that standards are relative and what they want to do is good enough, it is important for them to realize that there are outside standards which must be met.

However, just seeing that there are standards will not impact students unless those standards can be shown to matter. One way to demonstrate this to the students is to use these intellectual standards in our own interactions with students as we grade their work (Arum & Roksa, 2008). However, before we can use these words to indicate where there is a lack or where standards have been met, students must understand what those standards mean. Furthermore, there are critical resource constraints which make it difficult to even assign writing assignments to larger and larger classes of undergraduates (Cullen, 2011). Having terms that the students demonstrably understand and using those terms in rubrics help to address this problem too!

This in-class exercise is designed to be done after students have read about the standards and seen questions associated with determining if the standards have been met (Paul & Elder, 2010, pgs 10-12 and 18-19).

9) Session Description and Plan:

30 minute session

Minutes Used	Activity Description
0 – 5	Pair up participants as they enter the classroom. In pairs, the participants will examine a hand out of the “homework” information (pgs 10-12 from Paul and Elder, 2010)
6-11	Facilitators will present a quick summary of the material that the participants were examining. Mini-Lecture Covers <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Intellectual Standards Definition Check List for Critical Thinking
11 – 16	In Class Exercise (5 MINUTES) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vocabulary Classification Exercise <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instructions: Collaboratively assign each of the words to the correct universal intellectual standard category. (See Appendix B.)
16-21	Exercise Debriefing (5 MINUTES) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have each group share the words that they classified for one of the 9 universal intellectual standards.
21-26	Mini-Lecture: Use of words in Grading and Grading Rubrics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How to use the questions in short answers and case questions Example Rubrics that incorporate failure to use standards
26-30	Final Debriefing and handout of Lesson Plans for Use of Exercise and Paul & Elder, 2010.

10) For Activities and Exercises:

Handout: Initial “homework” handed out to each of the participants:

The handout consists of three pages from a guide titled "The Mini-Lecture Guide to Critical Thinking Concepts and Tools" by Paul and Elder (2010). The pages are numbered 10, 11, and 12.

- Page 10:** Titled "Universal Intellectual Standards: And questions that can be used to apply them". It defines universal intellectual standards as standards which must be applied to thinking whenever one is interested in checking the quality of reasoning about a problem, issue, or situation. It lists nine standards: Clarity, Accuracy, Precision, Relevance, Depth, Breadth, Logic, Significance, and Fairness. Each standard is followed by a set of questions to help students apply the standard.
- Page 11:** Continues the list of standards and their associated questions. It includes sections for Relevance, Depth, Breadth, and Logic.
- Page 12:** Continues the list of standards and their associated questions. It includes sections for Significance and Fairness.

In-Class Assignment: Categorize each word in the following list according to its best placement to reveal the associated intellectual standard by placing its number in a cell below the associated

intellectual standard category.

Words:

- | | | | | |
|---------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| 1. adequate | 8. detailed | 15. points of | 21. reasoned | 28. verifiable |
| 2. unbiased | 9. essential | view | 22. specific | 29. vital |
| 3. boundaries | 10. exact | 16. necessary | 23. substantial | 30. negatives or |
| 4. coherent | 11. exceptions | 17. obvious | 24. suitable | cons |
| 5. correct | 12. explicit | 18. parts | 25. true | included |
| 6. critical | 13. factual | 19. perceptible | 26. useful | |
| 7. defined | 14. fitting | 20. pertinent | 27. variation | |

Clarity	Accuracy	Precision	Relevance	Depth	Breadth	Logic	Significance/ Importance	Fairness

11) Implications for Teaching or for Teachers:

This session does two things. 1) it provides a simple exercise that is collaborative and interactive for students to use to demonstrate their understanding of the vocabulary of intellectual standards and 2) it provides a list of words for faculty to use as they critique and provide feedback to students across the term. Furthermore, it does so in the context of actively using critical thinking and demonstrating that critical thinking applies and is vital to business management topics (i.e. failure to understand and apply these standards will negatively impact their grades).

12) Application to Conference theme:

While not explicitly addressing the theme of community it does implicitly address it by noting that there are norms in higher education which both define college level thinking and work and which are well established. Thus, if students wish to “join” this community or to demonstrate to others that they belong, they will need to actively apply these standards to their own work.

13) Unique Contribution to OBTC:

This exercise in the context of an overview module using critical thinking has been shared at the campus of Coastal Carolina University. However, the explicit use and demonstration for both student values and as a guide to grading has not been shared before.

14) References and/or Additional Materials:

The answer sheet for the handout used in this session is:

In-Class Assignment: Categorize each word in the following list according to its best placement to reveal the associated intellectual standard by placing its number in a cell below the associated intellectual standard category.

Words:

- | | | | | |
|---------------|----------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. adequate | 8. defined | 15. fitting | 21. reasoned | 28. verifiable |
| 2. unbiased | 9. detailed | 16. points of view | 22. specific | 29. reliable |
| 3. boundaries | 10. essential | 17. necessary | 23. substantial | 30. negatives or cons included |
| 4. coherent | 11. exact | 18. parts | 24. suitable | |
| 5. conclusive | 12. exceptions | 19. perceptible | 25. true | |
| 6. correct | 13. explicit | 20. pertinent | 26. useful | |
| 7. critical | 14. factual | | 27. plausible | |

<i>Clarity</i>	<i>Accuracy</i>	<i>Precision</i>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Depth</i>	<i>Breadth</i>	<i>Logic</i>	<i>Significance/Importance</i>	<i>Fairness</i>
explicit (13)	correct (6)	defined (8)	fitting (15)	boundaries (3)	adequate (1)	coherent (4)	critical (7)	unbiased (2)
perceptible (19)	factual (14)	exact (11)	pertinent (20)	detailed (9)	conclusive (5)	reasoned (21)	essential (10)	reliable (29)
	true (25)	specific (22)	suitable (24)	exceptions (12)	points of view (16)	plausible (27)	necessary (17)	Negative or cons included (30)
			useful (26)	parts (18)		verifiable (28)	substantial (23)	

REFERENCES

- Arum, R., & Roksa, J. (2008). *Learning to Reason and Communicate in College: Initial Report Findings from the CLA Longitudinal Study*. New York: Social Science Research Council.
- Cullen, J. (2011) The writing skills course as an introduction to critical practice for larger business undergraduate classes, *International Journal of Management Education*, 9(4): 25 – 37.
- Linn, B., & Shore, B. M. (2008). Critical Thinking. In J. A. Plucker & C. M. Callahan (Eds.), *Critical Issues and Practices in Gifted Education* (pp. 155-166). Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.
- Paul, R., & Elder, L. (2010). *The Miniature Guide to Critical Thinking: Concepts and Tools*. Dillon Beach: Foundation for Critical Thinking Press.
- Scriven, M. & Paul, R. (1987). *Defining Critical Thinking*, 8th Annual International Conference on Critical Thinking and Education Reform, Summer 1987 accessed on January 20, 2015 at <http://www.criticalthinking.org/pages/defining-critical-thinking/766>
- Tomlinson, C. (2003). *Fulfilling the promise of the differentiated classroom: Strategies and tools for responsive teaching*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development