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Executive Summary of Assessment of Student Learning

Plan ➔ Assess ➔ Improve

M State is dedicated to creating a culture of continuous improvement regarding the assessment of student learning.

Why do we do assessment?
- Improve student learning and engagement
- Align course activities and materials with course competencies, program outcomes and core abilities
- Provide evidence for programmatic and institutional accreditation
- Ensure we are meeting the needs of our stakeholders
- Uphold high standards of academic integrity and excellence
- Promote faculty professional development
Assessment of Student Learning Cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual</th>
<th>Every 3rd Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Program Review*</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Assessment</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Action Plan for Course or Program/Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Ability Assessment</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Outcome Survey**</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Visit the Employee Portal > Files and Forms > Assessment of Student Learning for more information on your program’s comprehensive review cycle. *Program outcome surveys may not apply to some general education faculty.

Comprehensive Program Review
This is a 3 year comprehensive review process. During the year of the comprehensive program review, the review process uses a committee of peers and administrators to examine the academic program’s successes and challenges. Specific action items are generated that will include work for the next 2-3 years. That work will be reviewed and updated annually. Using the annual assessment action plan process as a tool to advance action items from program review is encouraged, as noted below.

Annual Assessment Action Plan
This supports the comprehensive program review process and/or departmental or course assessment action plans. Faculty meet with their dean yearly to discuss assessment action plans and other program factors. During the annual assessment, action items from the last comprehensive review, or from other course or departmental assessment efforts are discussed and may be updated.

Every year, faculty develop action plans that (1) support student learning at the course or departmental level, AND/OR (2) support action items from the previous comprehensive program review process. Annual assessment may build upon the previous years’ assessments.

Core Ability Assessment
This annual process assesses student learning of M State’s core abilities. Each program requiring 30 or more credits will conduct core ability assessment.

Program Outcome Survey
Graduates of the AAS, AS, Diploma and Certificate programs complete a program outcome survey upon graduation each academic year. These surveys are indirect assessments designed to help programs reflect upon student perceptions of meeting their program outcomes.

Employee Portal Assessment Resources
- Assessment of Student Learning Course/Department/Program Action Plan Forms
- Assessment Glossary
- Assessment of Student Learning Work Group Members
- M State Core Abilities
- AACU Value Rubrics to Use for Core Ability Assessment
- Program Review Schedule, Forms and Checklists
Alignment: “Critical course elements working together to ensure that students achieve the desired outcomes.” Alignment needs to be present at every level of curriculum - elements of a course to a course → course to program → program to institutional → and carried through to → industry, licensure, and/or transfer standards.¹

Bloom’s Taxonomy²

Core Abilities: Broad-based learning goals that serve as the foundation of the educational experience at M State. The core abilities are linked to our mission and vision statements and are the focus of institutional assessment.

Course Competency (often referred to as course outcome): Broad statement of knowledge, skills, or behaviors that a student should demonstrate upon course completion.³

- Competencies should begin with an action verb.
- Competencies are assessed at a Bloom’s level appropriate for the course.
- Each course should be mapped to at least one core ability.
- All competencies should be mapped to one or more of the program outcomes and all program outcomes need to be mapped to at least one competency.

Criteria: The qualitative or quantitative guidelines, rules, principles, or statements by which learner responses, work products, or mastery are evaluated.¹
Learning Objective: Narrow, specific knowledge, skill, or ability demonstrated by the student - the “how” of student learning.

Learning Objective(s)  →  Course Competency(ies)  →  Program Outcome(s)  →  Core Ability

Classroom assessment  →  Institutional assessment

NOTE: A single tool may be used for all levels of assessment (see course-embedded assessment).

This is also the model for instructional alignment which includes learning objective, course competency, program outcome, and core ability assessment.

Program Outcome: A robust statement that encompasses the knowledge, skills, and behaviors developed over the duration of the program through a wide range of courses and educational experiences. The program outcomes describe the competencies demonstrated by the ideal program graduate.³

- Outcomes should begin with an action verb and are assessed at the higher levels of Bloom’s taxonomy (see below).
- All outcomes should be mapped to one or more core abilities.
- All core abilities should be mapped to at least one program outcome.
- Core ability assessment should align with industry or transfer standards.

Quantitative Measures: Include numerical evidence of student learning such as an exam score or percentage of students passing a licensure exam.⁸

Qualitative Measures: Include narratives such as responses to open-ended survey questions or information gathered from focus groups.⁸

Rubrics: Provide specific, objective, and consistent performance criteria to evaluate student work. They outline the knowledge, skills, and behaviors indicative of various levels of learning. Rubrics may be shared with students before an assignment to provide expectations and allow opportunities for student self-assessment.⁸

Scaffolding: A process whereby instructors and learners interact with each other and with the subject matter in a way that provides students with guided support and practice as they learn a particular concept or skill. In a comprehensive community college it helps to remember that, “Because scaffolding is such a dynamic intervention finely tuned to the learner’s ongoing progress, the support given by the teacher during scaffolding strongly depends upon the characteristics of the situation like the type of task (e.g., well-structured versus ill-structured) and the responses of the student. Therefore, scaffolding does never look the same in different situations and it is not a technique that can be applied in every situation in the same way.”⁴
Assessment Types

Authentic Assessment: Assessments that are “more authentically related to later uses of learning than are conventional tests. Simulations, hands-on field or laboratory exercises, research projects, and juried presentations” are examples of authentic assessments. Authentic assessments will vary by subject and are designed to assess students’ abilities to perform or problem solve as they will need to in their chosen career or discipline.5

Course-embedded Assessment: Involves multi-layer assessment. Student work is evaluated for a grade, as well as to determine whether course competencies have been met. The work may also be used to assess program outcomes and/or core abilities.7

Course-embedded assessments may include exams, research papers, projects, lab reports, etc.

Course-embedded assessments may also include formative techniques used throughout the course to improve teaching and learning.7

Direct Assessment: Includes student products that demonstrate that specific learning has taken place. Examples of direct assessment include comprehensive exams, research papers, portfolios, field experiences, licensure exams, industry certifications, etc.8

Formative Assessment: Monitors student learning to provide ongoing feedback that can be used by instructors to improve their teaching and by students to improve their learning. Formative assessments are low stakes with little or no point value.6

Formative assessments may include concept maps, clicker questions, short summaries to identify main topics, etc.

Indirect Assessment: Implies that learning has taken place, but does not demonstrate that learning or skill. Examples of indirect assessment include student surveys and interviews; course evaluations; retention, graduation and job-placement rates, etc.8

Summative Assessment: Evaluates student learning at the end of a course or program. It is used to determine if, and at what level, the competencies have been met. Summative assessments are high stakes with high point value.6

Summative assessments may include a midterm exam, a paper, a recital, a skills test, etc.

1 Quality Matters Glossary
College-wide Core Abilities and AAC&U Value Rubrics

The M State core abilities are broad-based learning goals that serve as the foundation of the educational experience at M State. The core abilities are linked to our mission and vision statements and are the focus of institutional assessment.

If your assessment does not fit with the AAC&U rubrics listed, email assessment@minnesota.edu for guidance.

A Core Ability: Demonstrate Effective Communication

Indicators:
1. Learner writes clearly, concisely and accurately in appropriate context and format.
2. Learner speaks clearly, concisely and accurately in a variety of contexts and formats.
3. Learner comprehends written and verbal communication.

AAC&U Value Rubrics
- Written Communication (p.8)
- Oral Communication (p.10)
- Reading Value (p.12)

B Core Ability: Demonstrate Critical Thinking

Indicators:
1. Learner draws conclusions based on evidence.
2. Learner distinguishes between facts, fallacies, inferences and judgments.
3. Learner considers multiple perspectives in problem solving.

AAC&U Value Rubrics
- Critical Thinking (p.14)
- Inquiry and Analysis (p.16)
- Problem Solving (p.18)
Core Ability: Demonstrate Quantitative and Logical Reasoning

Indicators

1. Learner performs computations using appropriate methods.
2. Learner demonstrates numerical and logical reasoning.

AAC&U Value Rubrics

- Problem Solving (p.18)
- Quantitative Literacy (p.20)

Core Ability: Demonstrate Personal and Social Responsibility

Indicators

1. Learner demonstrates personal integrity and professional ethical practices.
2. Learner demonstrates respect for the rights, views and work of others.
3. Learner demonstrates personal accountability.
4. Learner demonstrates multicultural and global awareness.
5. Learner demonstrates the ability to work in a team.

AAC&U Value Rubrics

- Civic Engagement (p.22)
- Ethical Reasoning (p.24)
- Global Learning (p.26)
- Intercultural Knowledge and Competence (p.28)
- Teamwork (p.30)

Core Ability: Demonstrate Effective Use of Information Technology

Indicators

1. Learner applies technology to create solutions.
2. Learner uses technology to communicate.

AAC&U Value Rubrics

- Information Literacy (p.32)
- Inquiry and Analysis (p.16)
- Problem Solving (p.18)
Sources: Texts (written, oral, behavioral, visual, or other) that writers draw on as they work for a variety of purposes -- to extend, argue with, develop, define, or shape their ideas, for example.

• Genre conventions: Formal and informal rules for particular kinds of texts and/or media that guide formatting, organization, and stylistic choices, e.g. lab reports, academic papers, poetry, webpages, or personal essays.

• Disciplinary conventions: Formal and informal rules that constitute what is seen generally as appropriate within different academic fields, e.g. introductory strategies, use of passive voice or first person point of view, expectations for communication and surface conventions, and citational systems used in the writing? This will enable evaluators to have a clear sense of how writers understand the assignments and take it into consideration as they evaluate the writing.

• Context of and purpose for writing: The context of writing is the situation surrounding a text: who is reading it? who is writing it? Under what circumstances will the text be shared or circulated? What social or political factors might affect how the text is composed or interpreted? The purpose for writing is the writer's intended effect on an audience. Writers might want to persuade or inform; they might want to report or summarize information; they might want to argue with other writers, or connect with other writers; they might want to convey urgency or amuse; they might write for themselves or for an assignment or to remember.

• Content Development: The ways in which the text explores and represents its topic in relation to its audience and purpose.

Written communication is the development and expression of ideas in writing. Written communication involves learning to work in many genres and styles. It can involve working with many different writing technologies, and mixing and blending those technologies.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATION VALUE RUBRIC

The VAL UE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The VAL UE rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VAL UE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual institutions and institutional contexts.

For more information, please contact value@aacu.org.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context of and Purpose for Writing</th>
<th>Source and Evidence</th>
<th>Control of Syntax and Mechanics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Includes considerations of audience, purpose, and the circumstances surrounding the writing task(s).</td>
<td>Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing.</td>
<td>Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.</td>
<td>Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are situated within the discipline and genre of the writing.</td>
<td>Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the portfolio has few errors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing.</td>
<td>Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the writing.</td>
<td>Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).</td>
<td>Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).</td>
<td>Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Context of and Purpose for Writing**

- Includes considerations of audience, purpose, and the circumstances surrounding the writing task(s).
- Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.
- Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).
- Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).

**Source and Evidence**

- Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing.
- Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are situated within the discipline and genre of the writing.
- Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing.
- Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the writing.

**Control of Syntax and Mechanics**

- Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free.
- Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the portfolio has few errors.
- Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors.
- Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.
ORAL COMMUNICATION VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org

The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialogue and understanding of student success.

The type of oral communication most likely to be included in a collection of student work is an oral presentation and therefore is the focus for the application of this rubric.

Definition

Oral communication is a prepared, purposeful presentation designed to increase knowledge, to foster understanding, or to promote change in the listeners' attitudes, values, beliefs, or behaviors.

Framing Language

Oral communication takes many forms. This rubric is specifically designed to evaluate oral presentations of a single speaker at a time and is best applied to live or video-recorded presentations. For panel presentations or group presentations, it is recommended that each speaker be evaluated separately. This rubric best applies to presentations of sufficient length such that a central message is conveyed, supported by one or more forms of supporting materials and includes a purposeful organization. An oral answer to a single question not designed to be structured into a presentation does not readily apply to this rubric.

Glossary

The definitions that follow were developed to clarify terms and concepts used in this rubric only.

- Central message: The main point/thesis/“bottom line”/“take-away” of a presentation. A clear central message is easy to identify; a compelling central message is also vivid and memorable.
- Delivery techniques: Posture, gestures, eye contact, and use of the voice. Delivery techniques enhance the effectiveness of the presentation when the speaker stands and moves with authority, looks more often at the audience than at his/her speaking materials/notes, uses the voice expressively, and uses few vocal fillers (“um,” “uh,” “like,” “you know,” etc.).
- Language: Vocabulary, terminology, and sentence structure. Language that supports the effectiveness of a presentation is appropriate to the topic and audience, grammatical, clear, and free from bias. Language that enhances the effectiveness of a presentation is also vivid, imaginative, and expressive.
- Organization: The grouping and sequencing of ideas and supporting materials in a presentation. An organizational pattern that supports the effectiveness of a presentation typically includes an introduction, one or more identifiable sections in the body of the speech, and a conclusion. An organizational pattern that enhances the effectiveness of the presentation reflects a purposeful choice among possible alternatives, such as a chronological pattern, a problem-solution pattern, an analysis-of-parts pattern, etc., that makes the content of the presentation easier to follow and more likely to accomplish its purpose.
- Supporting material: Explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities, and other kinds of information or analysis that support the principal ideas of the presentation. Supporting material is generally credible when it is relevant and derived from reliable and appropriate sources. Supporting material is highly credible when it is also vivid and varied across the types listed above (e.g., a mix of examples, statistics, and references to authorities). Supporting material may also serve the purpose of establishing the speaker's credibility. For example, in presenting a creative work such as a dramatic reading of Shakespeare, supporting evidence may not advance the ideas of Shakespeare, but rather serve to establish the speaker as a credible Shakespearean actor.
**Definition**

Oral communication is a prepared, purposeful presentation designed to increase knowledge, to foster understanding, or to promote change in the listeners' attitudes, values, beliefs, or behaviors.

**Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capstone</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentation and Speaker</strong></td>
<td><strong>Content, Organization, and Delivery</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker is well-prepared and speaks confidently</td>
<td>Speaker is confident and delivers the content and core understandings clearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of the presentation is engaging and effective</td>
<td>Delivery of the presentation is clear and consistent with the content and core understandings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and delivery of the presentation is structured and coherent</td>
<td>Organization and delivery of the presentation is clear and consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation is appropriately paced and timed</td>
<td>Presentation is appropriately paced and timed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central message is compelling (precisely stated, appropriately repeated, memorable, and strongly supported.)</td>
<td>Central message is clear and consistent with the supporting material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that generally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.</td>
<td>Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that generally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more information, please contact value@aacu.org.
BOUNDARIES ARE PERMEABLE, AND THE CRITERIA OF THE RUBRIC ARE, TO A DEGREE, INTERRELATED.

CONTINUUM. OUR INTENTION IN CREATING THIS RUBRIC IS TO SUPPORT AND PROMOTE THE TEACHING OF UNDERGRADUATES AS READERS TO TAKE ON INCREASINGLY HIGHER LEVELS OF CONCERNS WITH TEXTS AND TO READ AS ONE OF "THOSE WHO COMPREHEND." THIS RUBRIC PROVIDES SOME INITIAL STEPS TOWARD FINDING WAYS TO MEASURE UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS' PROGRESS ALONG THE COLLEGE HAVE NOT LEARNED WHAT THEY NEED TO KNOW AND DO TO MAKE SENSE OF TEXTS IN THE CONTEXT OF PROFESSIONAL AND LOCAL COMPLIANCE BASED ON READING NECESSITY OTHER THAN AS A "BASIC SKILL" IN WHICH STUDENTS MAY REQUIRE "REMEDICATION." THEY HAVE ASSUMED THAT STUDENTS COME WITH COLLEGE KNOWLEDGE AND ARE ABLE TO READ AND HAVE PLACED RESPONSIBILITY FOR ITS ABSENCE ON TEACHERS IN ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS.

THE USE OF EXPECTATIONS AND CRITERIA TO ASSESS AND RANK STUDENT PERFORMANCES NATURALLY DURING THE UNDERGRADUATE YEARS AND BEYOND AS A CONSEQUENCE OF MEETING THE REQUIREMENTS OF LEARNING, AND THE ABILITY TO READ, PROCESS, AND UNDERSTAND INFORMATION, IS A CRITICAL ASPECT OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES. THE VALUE RUBRICS WERE DEVELOPED BY TEAMS OF FACULTY EXPERTS REPRESENTING COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES ACROSS THE UNITED STATES THROUGH A PROCESS THAT EXAMINED MANY CURRICULUM STANDARDS AND RELATED DOCUMENTS FOR EACH LEARNING OUTCOME AND REPORTED THE RESULTS OF THEIR EVALUATIONS TO THE VALUE NETWORK FOR FURTHER DEVELOPMENT. THEY ARE SUPPLEMENTED BY THE VALUE RUBRICS, WHICH ARE A FRAMEWORK FOR EVALUATING THEkład 1

DEFINITION

READING

THE PROCESS OF READING AND UNDERSTANDING AND COMMUNICATING MEANING THROUGH COMMUNICATION AND INTEGRATION WITH OTHER INFORMATION.

FRAMING LANGUAGE

THE DEFINITIONS THAT FOLLOW WERE DEVELOPED TO CLARIFY TERMS AND CONCEPTS USED IN THE RUBRIC.

ANALYSIS: THE PROCESS OF RECOGNIZING AND USING FEATURES OR ELEMENTS OF A TEXT TO BUILD AN ADVANCED UNDERSTANDING OF THE MEANING OF A TEXT (USUALLY IN A BLACK BOX EVALUATION OF GAVE LANGUAGE) BASED ON PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES OR A MARKET TOPIC INCLUDING FOCUS ON CRITICAL THINKING, REASONING, AND EVIDENCE-BASED REASONING. HISTORICAL, ETHICAL, AND SOCIAL CONTEXTS.

COMPREHENSION: THE EXTENT TO WHICH A READER "GETS" THE MEANING OF THE TEXT, BOTH LITERALLY AND FIGURATIVELY. ACQUIRED READER SKILLS WILL HAVE MOVES FROM THE MEANING OF THE TEXT TO BEING ABLE TO IDENTIFY THEMSELVES IN THE TEXT AND HOW TO USE THEM.

INTERPRETATION: THE DETERMINATION OR CONSTRUING OF THE MEANING OF A TEXT OR PART OF A TEXT IN A PARTICULAR WAY BASED ON TEXTUAL AND CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION.

INTERPRETIVE STRATEGIES: PURPOSEFUL APPROACHES FROM DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES, WHICH INCLUDES ASKING AND CONSIDERING QUESTIONS, HAVING A PURPOSEFUL APPROACH TO THE TEXT, AND BUILDING KNOWLEDGE OF THE CONTEXT IN WHICH THE TEXT WAS WRITTEN AND THE MEANS BY WHICH IT CAN BE APPLIED TO OTHER AREAS OF STUDY OR REAL-WORLD SITUATIONS.

INTERPRETATION: THE DETERMINATION OR CONSTRUING OF THE MEANING OF A TEXT OR PART OF A TEXT IN A PARTICULAR WAY BASED ON TEXTUAL AND CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION.

INTERPRETIVE STRATEGIES: PURPOSEFUL APPROACHES FROM DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES, WHICH INCLUDE ASKING AND CONSIDERING QUESTIONS, HAVING A PURPOSEFUL APPROACH TO THE TEXT, AND BUILDING KNOWLEDGE OF THE CONTEXT IN WHICH THE TEXT WAS WRITTEN AND THE MEANS BY WHICH IT CAN BE APPLIED TO OTHER AREAS OF STUDY OR REAL-WORLD SITUATIONS.

EPISTEMOLOGICAL LENS: THE KNOWLEDGE FRAMEWORK A READER DEVELOPS IN A SPECIFIC DISCIPLINE AS SHE MOVES THROUGH A SPECIFIC COURSE OR PROGRAM. THIS LENS INCLUDES KNOWLEDGE ABOUT THE NATURE OF KNOWLEDGE, REASONING, AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT AS THEY CONTRIBUTE TO THE MEANING OF A TEXT.

COMPREHENSION: THE EXTENT TO WHICH A READER "GETS" THE MEANING OF THE TEXT, BOTH LITERALLY AND FIGURATIVELY. ACQUIRED READER SKILLS WILL HAVE MOVES FROM BEING ABLE TO IDENTIFY THEMSELVES IN THE TEXT AND HOW TO USE THEM.

INTERPRETATION: THE DETERMINATION OR CONSTRUING OF THE MEANING OF A TEXT OR PART OF A TEXT IN A PARTICULAR WAY BASED ON TEXTUAL AND CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION.

INTERPRETIVE STRATEGIES: PURPOSEFUL APPROACHES FROM DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES, WHICH INCLUDE ASKING AND CONSIDERING QUESTIONS, HAVING A PURPOSEFUL APPROACH TO THE TEXT, AND BUILDING KNOWLEDGE OF THE CONTEXT IN WHICH THE TEXT WAS WRITTEN AND THE MEANS BY WHICH IT CAN BE APPLIED TO OTHER AREAS OF STUDY OR REAL-WORLD SITUATIONS.

EPISTEMOLOGICAL LENS: THE KNOWLEDGE FRAMEWORK A READER DEVELOPS IN A SPECIFIC DISCIPLINE AS SHE MOVES THROUGH A SPECIFIC COURSE OR PROGRAM. THIS LENS INCLUDES KNOWLEDGE ABOUT THE NATURE OF KNOWLEDGE, REASONING, AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT AS THEY CONTRIBUTE TO THE MEANING OF A TEXT.

RELATIONSHIP TO TEXT: THE SET OF EXPECTATIONS AND CRITERIA THAT DRIVE EVENTS OR ASSESSMENTS BASED ON THE TEXT.

PARTS: TITLES, HEADINGS, MEANING OF VOCABULARY FROM CONTEXT, STRUCTURE OF THE TEXT, IMPORTANT IDEAS AND RELATIONSHIPS AMONG THOSE IDEAS.

FRAMING LANGUAGE

THE DEFINITIONS THAT FOLLOW WERE DEVELOPED TO CLARIFY TERMS AND CONCEPTS USED IN THIS RUBRIC.
**Definition**

Reading is “the process of simultaneously extracting and constructing meaning through interaction and involvement with written language” (Snow et al., 2002). (From www.rand.org/pubs/research_briefs/RB8024/index1.html)

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.

### Comprehension

**Recognizes possible implications of the text for contexts, perspectives, or issues beyond the assigned task within the classroom or beyond the author’s explicit message** (e.g., might recognize broader issues at play, or might pose challenges to the author’s message and presentation).

**Uses the text, general background knowledge, and/or specific knowledge of the author’s context to draw more complex inferences about the author’s message and attitude.**

**Evaluates how textual features (e.g., sentence and paragraph structure or tone) contribute to the author’s message; draws basic inferences about context and purpose of text.**

**Apprehends vocabulary appropriately to paraphrase or summarize the information the text communicates.**

### Genres

**Uses ability to identify texts within and across genres, monitoring and adjusting reading strategies and expectations based on generic nuances of particular texts.**

**Articulates distinctions among genres and their characteristic conventions.**

**Reflects on reading experiences across a variety of genres, reading both with and against the grain experimentally and intentionally.**

**Applies tacit genre knowledge to a variety of classroom reading assignments in productive, if unreflective, ways.**

### Relationship to Text

**Making meanings with texts in their contexts**

**Evaluates texts for scholarly significance and relevance within and across the various disciplines, evaluating them according to their contributions and consequences.**

**Uses texts in the context of scholarship to develop a foundation of disciplinary knowledge and to raise and explore important questions.**

**Engages texts with the intention and expectation of building topical and world knowledge.**

**Approaches texts in the context of assignments with the intention and expectation of finding right answers and learning facts and concepts to display for credit.**

### Analysis

**Interacting with texts in parts and as wholes**

**Evaluates strategies for relating ideas, text structure, or other textual features in order to build knowledge or insight within and across texts and disciplines.**

**Identifies relations among ideas, text structure, or other textual features, to evaluate how they support an advanced understanding of the text as a whole.**

**Recognizes relations among parts or aspects of a text, such as effective or ineffective arguments or literary features, in considering how these contribute to a basic understanding of the text as a whole.**

**Identifies aspects of a text (e.g., content, structure, or relations among ideas) as needed to respond to questions posed in assigned tasks.**

### Interpretation

**Making sense with texts as blueprints for meaning**

**Provides evidence not only that s/he can read by using an appropriate epistemological lens but that s/he can also engage in reading as part of a continuing dialogue within and beyond a discipline or a community of readers.**

**Articulates an understanding of the multiple ways of reading and the range of interpretive strategies particular to one’s discipline(s) or in a given community of readers.**

**Demonstrates that s/he can read purposefully, choosing among interpretive strategies depending on the purpose of the reading.**

**Can identify purpose(s) for reading, relying on an external authority such as an instructor for clarification of the task.**

### Reader’s Voice

**Participating in academic discourse about texts**

**Discusses texts with an independent intellectual and ethical disposition so as to further or maintain disciplinary conversations.**

**Elaborates on the texts (through interpretation or questioning) so as to deepen or enhance an ongoing discussion.**

**Discusses texts in structured conversations (such as in a classroom) in ways that contribute to a basic, shared understanding of the text.**

**Comments about texts in ways that preserve the author’s meanings and link them to the assignment.**

---

**Prompts:**

For more information, please contact value@aacu.org

---

**Reading Value Rubric**
The VAL UE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VAL UE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VAL UE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

**Definition**

Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events by accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion after the consideration of information that may be interpreted in more than one way.

**Framing Language**

Critical thinking is designed to be transdisciplinary, reflecting the recognition that success in all disciplines requires habits of inquiry and analysis that share common attributes. Further, research suggests that successful critical thinkers from all disciplines increasingly need to be able to apply those habits in various and changing situations encountered in all walks of life.

This rubric is designed for use with many different types of assignments and the suggestions here are not an exhaustive list of possibilities. Critical thinking can be demonstrated in assignments that require students to complete analyses of text, data, or issues. Assignments that cut across presentation mode might be especially useful in some fields. If insight into the process components of critical thinking (e.g., how information sources were evaluated regardless of whether they were included in the product) is important, assignments focused on student reflection might be especially illuminating.

**Glossary**

The definitions that follow were developed to clarify terms and concepts used in this rubric only.

- **Ambiguity**: Information that may be interpreted in more than one way.
- **Assumptions**: Ideas, conditions, or beliefs (often implicit or unstated) that are “taken for granted or accepted as true without proof.” (quoted from www.dictionary.reference.com/browse/assumptions)
- **Context**: The historical, ethical, political, cultural, environmental, or circumstantial settings or conditions that influence and complicate the consideration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events.
- **Literal meaning**: Interpretation of information exactly as stated. For example, “she was green with envy” would be interpreted to mean that her skin was green, not that she was feeling jealous.
- **Metaphor**: Information that is (intended to be) interpreted in a non-literal way. For example, “she was green with envy” is intended to convey an intensity of emotion, not a skin color.
### Critical Thinking Value Rubric

#### Definition
Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.

#### Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue.</td>
<td>Limits of position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) are acknowledged.</td>
<td>Others' points of view are synthesized within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).</td>
<td>Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.</td>
<td>Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.</td>
<td>Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified.</td>
<td>Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implication of issue</td>
<td>Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences) are logical and reflect student's informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order.</td>
<td>Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.</td>
<td>Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified.</td>
<td>Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more information, please contact value@aacu.org.
The VALUe rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

**Definitions**

**Inquiry** is a systematic process of exploring issues, objects or works through the collection and analysis of evidence that results in informed conclusions or judgments.

**Analysis** is the process of breaking complex topics or issues into parts to gain a better understanding of them.

**Framing Language**

This rubric is designed for use in a wide variety of disciplines. Since the terminology and process of inquiry and analysis are discipline-specific, an effort has been made to use broad language which reflects multiple approaches and assignments while addressing the fundamental elements of sound inquiry and analysis (including topic selection, existing knowledge, design, analysis, etc.). The rubric language assumes that the inquiry and analysis process carried out by the student is appropriate for the discipline required. For example, if a student is expected to use a discipline-appropriate process for any criterion, that work should receive a performance rating of 4 or 5 for that criterion. In addition, this rubric addresses the products of analysis and inquiry, not the processes themselves. The complexity of inquiry and analysis tasks is determined in part by how much information or guidance is provided to a student and how much the student constructs. The more the student constructs, the more complex the inquiry process. For this reason, while the rubric can be used if the assignments or purposes for work are unknown, it will work most effectively when those are known.

**Glossary**

- **Conclusions**: A synthesis of key findings drawn from research evidence.
- **Limitations**: Critique of the process or evidence.
- **Implications**: How inquiry results apply to a larger context or the real world.
- **Performance Descriptors**: Key phrases used to describe levels of attainment.

For more information, please contact value@aacu.org.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic Selection</td>
<td>Benchmark</td>
<td>Milestones</td>
<td>Capstone</td>
<td>Limitations and Implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic is clearly defined and manageable</td>
<td>Synthesizes information from relevant sources</td>
<td>Synthesizes information from relevant sources</td>
<td>Synthesizes information from relevant sources</td>
<td>Synthesizes information from relevant sources and is followed through to demonstrate alignment with the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not sufficiently address the topic</td>
<td>Presentations of key points are clear and coherent</td>
<td>Presentations of key points are clear and coherent</td>
<td>Presentations of key points are clear and coherent</td>
<td>Presentations of key points are clear and coherent and demonstrate alignment with the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence is well organized and presented in a logical manner</td>
<td>Evidence is well organized and presented in a logical manner</td>
<td>Evidence is well organized and presented in a logical manner</td>
<td>Evidence is well organized and presented in a logical manner</td>
<td>Evidence is well organized and presented in a logical manner and demonstrates alignment with the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence is sufficient to support conclusions</td>
<td>Conclusions are clearly stated and logically developed</td>
<td>Conclusions are clearly stated and logically developed</td>
<td>Conclusions are clearly stated and logically developed</td>
<td>Conclusions are clearly stated and logically developed and demonstrate alignment with the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence is not sufficient to support conclusions</td>
<td>Conclusions are not clearly stated or logically developed</td>
<td>Conclusions are not clearly stated or logically developed</td>
<td>Conclusions are not clearly stated or logically developed</td>
<td>Conclusions are not clearly stated or logically developed and demonstrate alignment with the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence is not relevant to the topic</td>
<td>Conclusions are not clearly stated or logically developed</td>
<td>Conclusions are not clearly stated or logically developed</td>
<td>Conclusions are not clearly stated or logically developed</td>
<td>Conclusions are not clearly stated or logically developed and demonstrate alignment with the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence is insufficient to support conclusions</td>
<td>Conclusions are not clearly stated or logically developed</td>
<td>Conclusions are not clearly stated or logically developed</td>
<td>Conclusions are not clearly stated or logically developed</td>
<td>Conclusions are not clearly stated or logically developed and demonstrate alignment with the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence is not relevant to the topic</td>
<td>Conclusions are not clearly stated or logically developed</td>
<td>Conclusions are not clearly stated or logically developed</td>
<td>Conclusions are not clearly stated or logically developed</td>
<td>Conclusions are not clearly stated or logically developed and demonstrate alignment with the topic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inquiry and Analysis Value Rubric**

For more information, please contact value@aacu.org.
The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

Definition
Problem solving is the process of designing, evaluating and implementing a strategy to answer an open-ended question or achieve a desired goal.

Glossary
• Contextual Factors: Constraints (such as limits on cost, nature of problem, and desired additional knowledge) which affect how the problem can be best solved in the real world.
• Framing Language: Terms and phrases (e.g., process vs. procedures) and word choices that affect how well the rubric reflects the intended framework.

Problem solving covers a wide range of activities that may vary significantly across disciplines. This rubric employs the same expectations across disciplines while allowing for individual differences among learners. It is broad-based enough to allow for individual differences among learners, yet is concise and descriptive in its scope to determine how well students have maximized their abilities to practice thinking through problems in order to reach solutions.

This rubric is designed to measure the quality of a process, rather than the quality of an end-product. As a result, work samples or collections of work will need to include some evidence of the individual's thinking about a problem-solving task (e.g., reflections on the process from problem to proposed solution; steps in a problem-based learning assignment; record of think-aloud protocol while solving a problem). The final product of an assignment that required problem resolution is insufficient without insight into the student's problem-solving process. Because the focus is on institutional level assessment, scoring team projects, such as those developed in capstone courses, may be appropriate as well.

Support: Provide multiple evidence of solution or selection of solution.
• Does the student provide sufficient evidence of selecting the problem-solving approach or strategy? If more than one approach is possible, does the student provide sufficient evidence of selecting the best approach for the problem at hand?
• Does the student provide sufficient evidence of selecting the most feasible approach or strategy? Does the student provide sufficient evidence of selecting a realistic approach or strategy that is appropriate for the problem at hand?
• Does the student provide sufficient evidence of selecting a well-reasoned approach or strategy? Does the student provide sufficient evidence of selecting a well-reasoned approach or strategy that is appropriate for the problem at hand?
• Does the student provide sufficient evidence of selecting a well-considered approach or strategy? Does the student provide sufficient evidence of selecting a well-considered approach or strategy that is appropriate for the problem at hand?
• Does the student provide sufficient evidence of selecting a well-thought-out approach or strategy? Does the student provide sufficient evidence of selecting a well-thought-out approach or strategy that is appropriate for the problem at hand?

Framing Language: Terms and phrases (e.g., process vs. procedures) and word choices that affect how well the rubric reflects the intended framework.

Problem solving covers a wide range of activities that may vary significantly across disciplines. This rubric employs the same expectations across disciplines while allowing for individual differences among learners. It is broad-based enough to allow for individual differences among learners, yet is concise and descriptive in its scope to determine how well students have maximized their abilities to practice thinking through problems in order to reach solutions.

This rubric is designed to measure the quality of a process, rather than the quality of an end-product. As a result, work samples or collections of work will need to include some evidence of the individual's thinking about a problem-solving task (e.g., reflections on the process from problem to proposed solution; steps in a problem-based learning assignment; record of think-aloud protocol while solving a problem). The final product of an assignment that required problem resolution is insufficient without insight into the student's problem-solving process. Because the focus is on institutional level assessment, scoring team projects, such as those developed in capstone courses, may be appropriate as well.
**Problem Solving Value Rubric**

For more information, please contact value@aacu.org

**Definition**

Problem solving is the process of designing, evaluating, and implementing a strategy to answer an open-ended question or achieve a desired goal.

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Milestone 1</th>
<th>Milestone 2</th>
<th>Milestone 3</th>
<th>Milestone 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Define Problem</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates the ability to construct a clear and insightful problem statement with evidence of all relevant contextual factors.</td>
<td>Demonstrates the ability to construct a problem statement with evidence of most relevant contextual factors, and problem statement is adequately detailed.</td>
<td>Begins to demonstrate the ability to construct a problem statement with evidence of most relevant contextual factors, but problem statement is superficial.</td>
<td>Demonstrates a limited ability in identifying a problem statement or related contextual factors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identify Strategies</strong></td>
<td>Identifies multiple approaches for solving the problem that apply within a specific context.</td>
<td>Identifies multiple approaches for solving the problem, only some of which apply within a specific context.</td>
<td>Identifies only a single approach for solving the problem that applies within a specific context.</td>
<td>Identifies only a single approach for solving the problem that does not apply within a specific context.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Propose Solutions/Hypotheses</strong></td>
<td>Proposes one or more solutions/hypotheses that indicates a deep comprehension of the problem. Solutions/hypotheses are sensitive to contextual factors as well as all of the following: ethical, logical, and cultural dimensions of the problem.</td>
<td>Proposes one or more solutions/hypotheses that indicates comprehension of the problem. Solutions/hypotheses are sensitive to contextual factors as well as one of the following: ethical, logical, or cultural dimensions of the problem.</td>
<td>Proposes one solution/hypothesis that is &quot;off the shelf&quot; rather than individually designed to address the specific contextual factors of the problem.</td>
<td>Proposes a solution/hypothesis that is difficult to evaluate because it is vague or only indirectly addresses the problem statement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluate Potential Solutions</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation of solutions is deep and elegant (for example, contains thorough and insightful explanation) and includes, deeply and thoroughly, all of the following: considers history of problem, reviews logic/reasoning, examines feasibility of solution, and weighs impacts of solution.</td>
<td>Evaluation of solutions is adequate (for example, contains thorough explanation) and includes the following: considers history of problem, reviews logic/reasoning, examines feasibility of solution, and weighs impacts of solution.</td>
<td>Evaluation of solutions is brief (for example, explanation lacks depth) and includes the following: considers history of problem, reviews logic/reasoning, examines feasibility of solution, and weighs impacts of solution.</td>
<td>Evaluation of solutions is superficial (for example, contains cursory, surface level explanation) and includes the following: considers history of problem, reviews logic/reasoning, examines feasibility of solution, and weighs impacts of solution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implement Solution</strong></td>
<td>Implements the solution in a manner that addresses thoroughly and deeply multiple contextual factors of the problem.</td>
<td>Implements the solution in a manner that addresses multiple contextual factors of the problem in a surface manner.</td>
<td>Implements the solution in a manner that addresses the problem statement but ignores relevant contextual factors.</td>
<td>Implements the solution in a manner that does not directly address the problem statement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluate Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Reviews results relative to the problem defined with thorough, specific considerations of need for further work.</td>
<td>Reviews results relative to the problem defined with some consideration of need for further work.</td>
<td>Reviews results in terms of the problem defined with little, if any, consideration of need for further work.</td>
<td>Reviews results superficially in terms of the problem defined with no consideration of need for further work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Identify Stages**

1. Define Problem
2. Identify Strategies
3. Propose Solutions/Hypotheses
4. Evaluate Potential Solutions
5. Implement Solution
6. Evaluate Outcomes

**Evidence**

- Make sure to address the problem statement thoroughly and deeply.
- Consider all relevant contextual factors.
- Propose multiple solutions/hypotheses.
- Evaluate solutions thoroughly.
- Implement solutions effectively.
- Evaluate outcomes critically.

**4-Milestone**

- Milestone 1: Basic
- Milestone 2: Competitive
- Milestone 3: Outstanding
- Milestone 4: Exceptional
The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

Definition

Quantitative Literacy (QL) – also known as Numeracy or Quantitative Reasoning (QR) – is a “habit of mind,” competency, and comfort in working with numerical data. Individuals with strong QL skills possess the ability to reason and solve quantitative problems from a wide array of authentic contexts and everyday life situations. They understand and can create sophisticated arguments supported by quantitative evidence and they can clearly communicate those arguments in a variety of formats (using words, tables, graphs, mathematical equations, etc., as appropriate).

Quantitative Literacy Across the Disciplines

Current trends in general education reform demonstrate that faculty are recognizing the steadily growing importance of Quantitative Literacy (QL) in an increasingly quantitative and data-dense world. AAC&U's recent survey showed that concerns about QL skills are shared by employers, who recognize that many of today's students will need a wide range of high level quantitative skills to complete their work responsibilities. This rubric provides for faculty a definition for QL and a rubric describing four levels of QL achievement which might be observed in work products within work samples or collections of work. Members of AAC&U's rubric development team for QL hope that these materials will aid in the assessment of QL – but, equally important, we hope that they will help institutions and individuals in the effort to more thoroughly embed QL across the curriculum of colleges and universities.

Framing Language

This rubric has been designed for the evaluation of work that addresses quantitative literacy (QL) in a substantive way. QL is not just computation, not just the citing of someone else's data. QL is a habit of mind, a way of thinking about the world that relies on data and on the mathematical analysis of data to make connections and draw conclusions. Teaching QL requires us to design assignments that address authentic, data-based problems. Such assignments may call for the traditional written paper, but we can imagine other alternatives: a video of a PowerPoint presentation, perhaps, or a well designed series of web pages. In any case, QL is a way of thinking about the world that relies on data and on the mathematical analysis of data to make connections and draw conclusions.

Qualitative Literacy Across the Disciplines

Qualitative Literacy (QL) – also known as Critical Thinking or Critical Reasoning (CR) – is a “habit of mind,” competency, and comfort in working with information. Individuals with strong QL skills possess the ability to reason and solve qualitative problems from a wide array of authentic contexts and everyday life situations. They understand and can create sophisticated arguments supported by qualitative evidence and they can clearly communicate those arguments in a variety of formats (using words, tables, graphs, mathematical equations, etc., as appropriate).

The VALUE rubrics developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

For more information, please contact value@aacu.org.
### QUANTITATIVE LITERACY VALUE RUBRIC

For more information, please contact value@aacu.org

#### Definition
Quantitative Literacy (QL) – also known as Numeracy or Quantitative Reasoning (QR) – is a "habit of mind," competency, and comfort in working with numerical data. Individuals with strong QL skills possess the ability to reason and solve quantitative problems from a wide array of authentic contexts and everyday life situations. They understand and can create sophisticated arguments supported by quantitative evidence and they can clearly communicate those arguments in a variety of formats (using words, tables, graphs, mathematical equations, etc., as appropriate).

**Examples:**
- **Attempts to explain information presented in mathematical forms, but draws incorrect conclusions about what the information means.**
- **Provides somewhat accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms, but occasionally makes minor errors related to computations or units.**
- **Provides accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms. Makes appropriate inferences based on that information.**

#### Application / Analysis
- **Ability to convert relevant information into various mathematical forms (e.g., equations, graphs, diagrams, tables, words)**
- **Skillfully converts relevant information into an insightful mathematical portrayal in a way that contributes to a further or deeper understanding.**
- **Explicitly describes assumptions and provides compelling rationale for why each assumption is appropriate. Shows awareness that confidence in final conclusions is limited by the accuracy of the work.**

#### Communication
- **Communication beyond the mathematical context.**
- **Explicitly describes assumptions. Attempts to describe assumptions.**
- **Uses quantitative information, but does not effectively connect it to the argument or purpose of the work.**

#### Representation
- **Calculations attempted are essentially all successful and sufficiently comprehensive to solve the problem. Calculations are also presented elegantly (clearly, concisely, etc.).**
- **Calculations attempted are either unsuccessful or represent only a portion of the calculations required to comprehensively solve the problem.**
- **Calculations are attempted but are both unsuccessful and are not comprehensive.**

#### Interpretation
- **Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for deep and thoughtful judgments, drawing insightful, carefully qualified conclusions from this work.**
- **Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for competent judgments, drawing reasonable and appropriately qualified conclusions from this work.**
- **Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for tentative, basic judgments, although is hesitant or uncertain about drawing conclusions from this work.**

#### Assumptions
- **Uses quantitative information, but does not effectively connect it to the argument or purpose of the work.**
- **Uses quantitative information in connection with the argument or purpose of the work, though data may be presented in a less than completely effective format or some parts of the explication may be uneven.**
- **Uses quantitative information in connection with the argument or purpose of the work (in terms of what evidence is used and how it is formatted, presented, and contextualized) consistently high quality.**

#### Reflection
- **Provides evidence of critical thinking about the work.**
- **Provides evidence of critical thinking about the work.**
- **Provides evidence of critical thinking about the work.**

#### Evaluation / Judgement
- **Provides evidence of critical thinking about the work.**
- **Provides evidence of critical thinking about the work.**
- **Provides evidence of critical thinking about the work.**

#### Conclusion
- **Provides evidence of critical thinking about the work.**
- **Provides evidence of critical thinking about the work.**
- **Provides evidence of critical thinking about the work.**
Civic Engagement Value Rubric

Framing Language

Definition

Glossary

Civic Engagement is "working to make a difference in the civic life of our communities and developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values and motivation to make that difference. It means promoting the quality of life in a community through active and informed participation by its members.

Preparing graduates for their public lives as citizens, members of communities, and professionals in society has historically been a responsibility of higher education. Yet the outcome of a civic-minded graduate is a complex concept.

The VAL UE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning domain. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses.

Rubrics are designed to provide a shared language for describing and understanding of student success.

Civic/ community contexts: Organizations, movements, campaigns, a place or locus where people and/or living creatures inhabit, which may be defined by a locality (school, national park, non-profit organization, town, state, nation), shared history and culture, or social institutions (churches, community service organizations).

Civic identity: When one sees herself or himself as an active participant in society with a strong commitment and responsibility to work with others towards public purposes.

Civic learning outcomes are framed by personal identity and commitments, disciplinary frameworks and traditions, pre-professional norms and practice, and the mission and values of colleges and universities. This rubric is designed to make the civic learning outcomes more explicit.

Civic engagement can take many forms, from individual volunteerism to organizational involvement to electoral participation. For students this could include community-based learning through service-learning classes, internships, or research projects.

Service-learning class: A course-based educational experience in which students participate in an organized service activity and reflect on the experience in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader or defined by shared identity (i.e., African-Americans, North Carolinians, Americans, the Republican or Democratic Party, refugees, etc.). In addition, contexts for civic engagement may be defined by a variety of approaches intended to model processes that engage others in deliberative democracy, in having a voice, participating in democratic processes, and taking specific actions to affect an issue.

Government: "The formal institutions of a society with the authority to make and implement binding decisions about such matters as the distribution of resources, allocation of benefits and burdens, and the management of human and natural resources necessary to maintain civil society."

Politics: “A process by which a group of people, whose opinions or interests might be divergent, reach collective decisions that are generally regarded as binding on the group and enforced as common policy. Political life enables the individual and group to achieve collective goals and values when they differ from individual goals."

Communication skills: Listening, deliberation, negotiation, consensus building, and productive use of conflict.

The student integrates their academic work with community engagement, producing a tangible product (piece of legislation or policy, a business, building or civic infrastructure, water quality or scientific assessment, needs survey, etc.).

The student researches, organizes, and carries out a deliberative democracy forum on a particular issue, one that includes multiple perspectives on that issue and how best to make positive change through various courses of public action. As a result, other students, faculty, and community members are engaged to take action on an issue.

The student creates and manages a service program that engages others (such as youth or members of a neighborhood) in learning about and taking action on an issue they care about. In the process, the student also teaches and models processes that engage others in deliberative democracy, in having a voice, participating in democratic processes, and taking specific actions to affect an issue.

The student works on and takes a leadership role in a complex campaign to bring about tangible changes in the public’s awareness or education on a particular issue, or even a change in public policy. Through this process, the student models processes that engage others in deliberative democracy, in having a voice, participating in democratic processes, and taking specific actions to affect an issue.

The student takes action on an issue as a result of personal reflection and study. The activity is consistent with and reinforces personal identity, values and commitments.

The student takes action on an issue that is part of the civic identity of the community. The student demonstrates a commitment to the values and beliefs of the community, and takes action on an issue that is meaningful to the community.

The student provides leadership in an organization's or project's efforts to achieve a common goal.

The student provides leadership in a political campaign or advocacy effort.

The student engages in volunteer work that demonstrates multiple types of civic action and skills.

The student engages in volunteer work that demonstrates multiple types of civic action and skills.

The student engages in volunteer work that demonstrates multiple types of civic action and skills.

The student engages in volunteer work that demonstrates multiple types of civic action and skills.
Civic engagement is "working to make a difference in the civic life of our communities and developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values, and motivation to make that difference. It means promoting the quality of life in a community through both political and non-political processes." (Excerpted from Civic Contexts/Structures, edited by Thomas E. Ehrlich, published by Oryx Press, 2000, Preface, page vi.) In addition, civic engagement encompasses...
The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

**Definition**

Ethical Reasoning is reasoning about right and wrong human conduct. It requires students to be able to assess their own ethical values and the social context of problems, recognize ethical issues in a variety of settings, think about how different ethical perspectives might be applied to ethical dilemmas and consider the ramifications of alternative actions. Students' ethical self-identity evolves as they practice ethical decision-making skills and learn how to describe and analyze positions on ethical issues. Ethical Reasoning is reasoning about right and wrong human conduct. It requires students to be able to assess their own ethical values and the social context of problems, considering the impact of their actions on others.

**Framing Language**

Ethical Reasoning is reasoning about right and wrong human conduct. It requires students to be able to assess their own ethical values and the social context of problems, considering the impact of their actions on others. Ethical Reasoning is reasoning about right and wrong human conduct. It requires students to be able to assess their own ethical values and the social context of problems, considering the impact of their actions on others. Ethical Reasoning is reasoning about right and wrong human conduct. It requires students to be able to assess their own ethical values and the social context of problems, considering the impact of their actions on others.
# ETHICAL REASONING VALUE RUBRIC

## Definition

Ethical Reasoning is reasoning about right and wrong human conduct. It requires students to be able to assess their own ethical values and the social context of problems, recognize ethical issues in a variety of settings, think about how different ethical perspectives might be applied to ethical dilemmas, and consider the ramifications of alternative actions. Students' ethical self-identity evolves as they practice ethical decision-making skills and learn how to describe and analyze positions on ethical issues.

---

### Table: Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Self-Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student discusses in detail/analyzes both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs and discussion has greater depth and clarity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student discusses in detail/analyzes both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student states both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student states either their core beliefs or articulates the origins of the core beliefs but not both.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student names the theory or theories, can present the gist of said theory or theories, and accurately explains the details of the theory or theories used.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student can name the major theory or theories she/he uses, can present the gist of said theory or theories, and attempts to explain the details of the theory or theories used, but has some inaccuracies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student can name the major theory she/he uses, and is only able to present the gist of the named theory.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student only names the major theory she/he uses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Issue Recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student can recognize ethical issues when presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context AND can recognize cross-relationships among the issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student can recognize ethical issues when issues are presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context OR can grasp cross-relationships among the issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues and grasp (incompletely) the complexities or interrelationships among the issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues but fails to grasp complexity or interrelationships.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student can independently apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, accurately, and is able to consider full implications of the application.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student can independently (to a new example) apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, accurately, but does not consider the specific implications of the application.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student can apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, independently (to a new example) and the application is inaccurate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student can apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question with support (using examples, in a class, in a group, or a fixed-choice setting) but is unable to apply ethical perspectives/concepts independently (to a new example).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of and can reasonably defend against the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/concepts, and the student's defense is adequate and effective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of, and respond to the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/concepts, but the student's response is inadequate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/concepts but does not respond to them (and ultimately objections, assumptions, and implications are compartmentalized by student and do not affect student's position.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student states a position but cannot state the objections to and assumptions and limitations of the different perspectives/concepts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Note: This rubric is designed to support educators in evaluating their students' ethical reasoning skills. It encourages students to critically analyze ethical issues and articulate their positions and reasoning.*
GLOBAL LEARNING VALUE RUBRIC

Definition

Global learning is a critical analysis of and an engagement with complex, interdependent global systems and legacies (such as natural, physical, social, cultural, economic, and political) and their implications for people's lives and the earth's sustainability. Through global learning, students should: 1) become informed, open-minded, and responsible people who are attentive to diversity across the spectrum of differences, 2) seek to understand their actions and their implications for local and global contexts, and 3) address the world's most pressing and enduring issues collaboratively and equitably.

Framing Language

Effective and transformative global learning offers students meaningful opportunities to analyze and explore complex global challenges, collaborate respectfully with diverse others, apply learning to take responsible action in contemporary global contexts, and evaluate the goals, methods, and consequences of that action. Global learning should enhance students' sense of identity, community, ethics, and perspective-taking. Global learning is based on the principle that the world is a collection of interconnected yet inequitable systems and that higher education has a vital role in expanding knowledge of human and natural systems, privilege and stratification, and sustainability and development to foster individuals' ability to advance equity and justice at home and abroad. Global learning cannot be achieved in a single course or a single experience but is acquired cumulatively across students' entire college career through an institution's curricular and co-curricular programming. As this rubric is designed to assess global learning on a programmatic level across time, the benchmarks (levels 1-4) may not be directly applicable to a singular course or assignment. Depending on the context, there may be development within one level rather than growth from level to level.

We encourage users of the Global Learning Rubric to also consult three other closely related VALUE Rubrics: Civic Engagement, Intercultural Knowledge and Competence, and Ethical Reasoning.

Glossary

The definitions that follow were developed to clarify terms and concepts used in this rubric only.

Global Self-Awareness: in the context of global learning, the continuum through which students develop a mature, integrated identity with a systemic understanding of the interrelationships among the self, local and global communities, and the natural and physical world. This requires developing competence in self-awareness and understanding, which operate in observable patterns and often are the result of human design and construction. Global Self-Awareness is a complex and overlapping worldview that includes personal, social, and cultural aspects.

Perspective Taking: the ability to engage and learn from perspectives and experiences different from one's own and to understand how one's place in the world both informs and limits one's knowledge. The goal is to develop the capacity to understand and appreciate diverse perspectives on human and non-human experiences and to critically analyze the implications of those differences. Global Self-Awareness is the ability to recognize the origins and influences of one's own cultural heritage and to reflect on the ways in which cultural differences influence how we understand and approach the world. Students need to understand how cultural systems operate in observable patterns and often are the result of human design and construction.

Cultural Diversity: the ability to recognize the origins and influences of one's own cultural heritage along with the limitations of providing a single cultural framework for understanding the world. This includes the capability to learn about and appreciate the cultural diversity of others and to reflect on the ways in which cultural differences influence how we approach and understand the world. Students need to understand how cultural systems operate in observable patterns and often are the result of human design and construction. Global Self-Awareness is the ability to recognize the origins and influences of one's own cultural heritage and to reflect on the ways in which cultural differences influence how we understand and approach the world. Students need to understand how cultural systems operate in observable patterns and often are the result of human design and construction.

Personal and Social Responsibility: the ability to recognize one's responsibilities to society—local, national, and international—and to develop a perspective on ethical and moral reasoning and action. This requires developing competence in ethical and moral reasoning and action. Global Self-Awareness is the ability to recognize the origins and influences of one's own cultural heritage and to reflect on the ways in which cultural differences influence how we understand and approach the world. Students need to understand how cultural systems operate in observable patterns and often are the result of human design and construction.

Global Systems: the complex and overlapping systems of human and non-human systems (those systems associated with the natural world including biological, chemical, and physical sciences) that operate in observable patterns and often are the result of human design and construction. These systems influence our actions and our understanding of the world. Global Self-Awareness is the ability to recognize the origins and influences of one's own cultural heritage and to reflect on the ways in which cultural differences influence how we understand and approach the world. Students need to understand how cultural systems operate in observable patterns and often are the result of human design and construction.

Knowledge Application: in the context of global learning, the application of integrated and systemic understanding of the interrelationships between multiple perspectives, such as personal, social, cultural, disciplinary, environmental, local, and global. This includes the capability to learn about and appreciate the cultural diversity of others and to reflect on the ways in which cultural differences influence how we approach and understand the world. Students need to understand how cultural systems operate in observable patterns and often are the result of human design and construction. Global Self-Awareness is the ability to recognize the origins and influences of one's own cultural heritage and to reflect on the ways in which cultural differences influence how we understand and approach the world. Students need to understand how cultural systems operate in observable patterns and often are the result of human design and construction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global learning is a critical analysis of and engagement with complex, interdependent global systems and legacies (such as natural, physical, social, cultural, economic, and political) and their implications for people, places, and the earth's sustainability. Through global learning, students should: 1) become informed, open-minded, and responsible people who are attentive to diversity across the spectrum of differences, 2) seek to understand how their actions affect both local and global communities, and 3) address the world's most pressing and enduring issues collaboratively and equitably.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

**Definition**

Intercultural Knowledge and Competence is “a set of cognitive, affective, and behavioral skills and characteristics that support effective and appropriate interaction in a variety of cultural contexts.”


**Framing Language**

The call to integrate intercultural knowledge and competence into the heart of education is an imperative born of seeing ourselves as members of a world community, knowing that we share the future with others. Beyond mere exposure to culturally different others, the campus community requires the capacity to: meaningfully engage those others, place social justice in historical and political context, and put culture at the core of transformative learning. The intercultural knowledge and competence rubric suggests a systematic way to measure our capacity to identify our own cultural patterns, compare and contrast them with others, and adapt empathically and flexibly to unfamiliar ways of being.

The levels of this rubric are informed in part by M. Bennett's Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (Bennett, M.J. 1993. Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In Education for the intercultural experience, ed. R. M. Paige, 22-71. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press). In addition, the criteria in this rubric are informed in part by D.K. Deardorff's intercultural framework which is the first research-based consensus model of intercultural competence (Deardorff, D.K. 2006. The identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. Journal of Studies in International Education 10(3): 241-266). It is also important to understand that intercultural knowledge and competence is more complex than what is reflected in this rubric. This rubric identifies six of the key components of intercultural knowledge and competence, but there are other components as identified in the Deardorff model and in other research.

**Glossary**

- **Culture**: All knowledge and values shared by a group.
- **Cultural rules and biases**: Boundaries within which an individual operates in order to feel a sense of belonging to a society or group, based on the values shared by that society or group.
- **Empathy**: "Empathy is the imaginary participation in another person's experience, including emotional and intellectual dimensions, by imagining his or her perspective (not by assuming the person's position)." Bennett, J. 1998. Transition shock: Putting culture shock in perspective. In Basic concepts of intercultural communication, ed. M. Bennett, 215-224. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- **Intercultural experience**: The experience of an interaction with an individual or groups of people whose culture is different from your own.
- **Intercultural/cultural differences**: The differences in rules, behaviors, communication, and values, based on cultural values that are different from one's own culture.
- **Suspends judgment in valuing their interactions with culturally different others**: Postpones assessment or evaluation (positive or negative) of interactions with people culturally different from oneself. Disconnecting from the process of automatic judgment and taking time to reflect on possibly multiple meanings.
- **Worldview**: Worldview is the cognitive and affective lens through which people construe their experiences and make sense of the world around them.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Intercultural Knowledge and Competence Value Rubric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curiosity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Openness</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Empathy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nonverbal Communication Skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verbal Communication Skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge of Cultural Worldview Frameworks</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Self-Awareness</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intercultural Knowledge and Competence is "a set of cognitive, affective, and behavioral skills and characteristics that result in an understanding of cultural differences that can be applied to appropriate interaction in a variety of cultural contexts." (Bennett, J. M. 2008. Transformative training: Designing multicultural programs for culture learning. In Contemporary leadership and intercultural competence: Understanding and utilizing cultural diversity to build successful organizations.)

**INTERCULTURAL KNOWLEDGE AND COMPETENCE VALUE RUBRIC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>At this level, the student is unable to identify cultural rules and biases (e.g., demonstrates understanding of the degree to which people use physical contact while communicating in different cultures or use direct/indirect and explicit/implicit meanings) and recognize cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication and begins to suspend judgment in valuing her/his interactions with culturally different others. Has difficulty suspending any judgment in her/his interactions with culturally different others, and is aware of own judgment but is unaware of own judgment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>At this level, the student has a minimal level of understanding of cultural differences but is still unable to negotiate a shared understanding. Identifies some cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication; has a minimal level of understanding of cultural differences but is still unable to negotiate a shared understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>At this level, the student recognizes and participates in cultural differences. Has an emerging understanding of the degree to which people use physical contact while communicating in different cultures or use direct/indirect and explicit/implicit meanings) and recognizes cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication but is unable to negotiate a shared understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>At this level, the student recognizes intellectual and emotional dimensions of more than one worldview and sometimes uses different cultural perspectives. Demonstrates partial understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of other cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>At this level, the student recognizes intellectual and emotional dimensions of more than one worldview and uses different cultural perspectives. Interprets intercultural experience from the perspective of another culture in relation to its history, values, and practices. Demonstrates adequate understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of other cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>At this level, the student recognizes intellectual and emotional dimensions of more than one worldview and demonstrates ability to act in a supportive manner that recognizes the feelings of another culture in relation to its history, values, and practices. Demonstrates surface understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of other cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>At this level, the student recognizes intellectual and emotional dimensions of more than one worldview and demonstrates ability to act in a supportive manner that recognizes the feelings of another culture in relation to its history, values, and practices. Demonstrates partial understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of other cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>At this level, the student recognizes intellectual and emotional dimensions of more than one worldview and demonstrates ability to act in a supportive manner that recognizes the feelings of another culture in relation to its history, values, and practices. Demonstrates adequate understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of other cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>At this level, the student recognizes intellectual and emotional dimensions of more than one worldview and demonstrates ability to act in a supportive manner that recognizes the feelings of another culture in relation to its history, values, and practices. Demonstrates partial understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of other cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>At this level, the student recognizes intellectual and emotional dimensions of more than one worldview and demonstrates ability to act in a supportive manner that recognizes the feelings of another culture in relation to its history, values, and practices. Demonstrates adequate understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of other cultures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark level performance.
The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

**Definition**

Teamwork is behaviors under the control of individual team members (how they put in their effort, their manner of interacting with others on team, and the quantity and quality of contributions they make to team discussions.)

**Framing Language**

Teamwork is behaviors under the control of individual team members (how they put in their effort, their manner of interacting with others on team, and the quantity and quality of contributions they make to team discussions.)
## TEAMWORK VALUE RUBRIC

For more information, please contact value@aacu.org

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Benchmark

1. **Contributes to Team Meetings**
   - Helps the team move forward by articulating the merits of alternative ideas or proposals.
   - Offers alternative solutions or courses of action that build on the ideas of others.
   - Offers new suggestions to advance the work of the group.

2. **Facilitates the Contributions of Team Members**
   - Engages team members in ways that facilitate their contributions to meetings by both constructively building upon or synthesizing the contributions of others as well as noticing when someone is not participating and inviting them to engage.
   - Engages team members in ways that facilitate their contributions to meetings by restating the views of other team members and/or asking questions for clarification.
   - Engages team members by taking turns and listening to others without interrupting.

3. **Individual Contributions Outside of Team Meetings**
   - Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished is thorough, comprehensive, and advances the project.
   - Proactively helps other team members complete their assigned tasks to a similar level of excellence.

4. **Fosters Constructive Team Climate**
   - Supports a constructive team climate by doing all of the following:
     - Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication.
     - Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work.
     - Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it.
     - Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members.
   - Supports a constructive team climate by doing any three of the following:
     - Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication.
     - Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work.
     - Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it.
     - Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members.
   - Supports a constructive team climate by doing any two of the following:
     - Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication.
     - Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work.
     - Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it.
     - Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members.
   - Supports a constructive team climate by doing any one of the following:
     - Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication.
     - Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work.
     - Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it.
     - Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members.

5. **Responds to Conflict**
   - Addresses destructive conflict directly and constructively, helping to manage/resolve it in a way that strengthens overall team cohesiveness and future effectiveness.
   - Identifies and acknowledges conflict and stays engaged with it. Redirecting focus toward common ground, toward task at hand (away from conflict).
   - Passively accepts alternate viewpoints/ideas/opinions.

### Responses to Conflict

- A constructive team climate fosters productive and positive interactions among team members, facilitating effective collaboration and open communication. It is characterized by respect, transparency, and a commitment to the collective success of the team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses to Conflict</th>
<th>Teamwork Assessment</th>
<th>Teamwork Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifies and accepts constructive feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fosters constructive feedback and growth opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redirects focus toward common ground</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Encourages a constructive dialogue and shared focus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passively accepts alternate viewpoints</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Allows for a more passive and less constructive approach.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Teamwork in Action

- **Teamwork is behaviors under the control of individual team members (effort they put into team tasks, their manner of interacting with others on team, and the quantity and quality of contributions they make to team discussions).**
The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

Definition

The ability to know when there is a need for information, to be able to identify, locate, evaluate, and effectively and responsibly use and share that information for the problem at hand.

Adopted from the National Forum on Information Literacy

Framing Language

This rubric is recommended for use evaluating a collection of work, rather than a single work sample in order to fully gauge students' information skills. Ideally, a collection of work would contain a variety of different types of work and might include research papers, editorials, speeches, grant proposals, marketing or business plans, PowerPoint presentations, posters, and even documents for class assignments and instruction. Evidence of learning can be measured and discussed across the traditional domains of learning, including through interviews, observations, and self-assessments. The rubric is designed to help faculty design and assess assignments that encourage students to develop information skills as they go through a process of critical thinking and reasoning. Rubrics can be customized to the needs of individual courses or programs, and can be used to evaluate student work in a variety of formats, including written assignments, presentations, and projects.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension 3: Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically</th>
<th>Benchmark 1</th>
<th>Benchmark 2</th>
<th>Benchmark 3</th>
<th>Benchmark 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determine the Extent of Information Needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Defines the scope of the research question or thesis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Can determine key concepts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Types of information (sources) selected relate to concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Answers the research question.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Has difficulty defining the scope of the research question.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Has difficulty determining key concepts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Types of information (sources) selected do not relate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Answers the research question.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access the Needed Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Accesses information using effective, well-designed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>search strategies and most appropriate information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Accesses information using variety of search strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and some relevant information sources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Demonstrates ability to refine search.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Accesses information using simple search strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and retrieves information from limited and similar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Accesses information randomly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and retrieves information that lacks relevance and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Chooses a variety of information sources appropriate to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the scope and discipline of the research question.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Selects sources after considering the importance (to the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>researched topic) of the multiple criteria used (such as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relevance to the research question, currency, authority,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audience, and bias or point of view).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Chooses a variety of information sources appropriate to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the scope and discipline of the research question.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Selects sources using multiple criteria (such as relevance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the research question, currency, and authority).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Chooses a variety of information sources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selects sources using basic criteria (such as relevance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the research question and currency).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Chooses a few information sources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selects sources using limited criteria (such as relevance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the research question).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Information Effectively to Accomplish a Specific Purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Communicates, organizes and synthesizes information from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sources to fully achieve a specific purpose, with clarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and depth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Communicates, organizes and synthesizes information from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sources. The intended purpose is achieved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Communicates and organizes information from sources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information is not yet synthesized, so the intended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purpose is not fully achieved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Communicates information from sources. The information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is fragmented and or used inappropriately (misquoted,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taken out of context, or incorrectly paraphrased, etc.),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so the intended purpose is not achieved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access and Use Information Ethically and Legally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Students use correctly all of the following information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use strategies (use of citations and references; choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; using information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between common knowledge and ideas from information).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Students use correctly three of the following information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use strategies (use of citations and references; choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; using information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between common knowledge and ideas from information).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Students use correctly two of the following information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use strategies (use of citations and references; choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; using information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between common knowledge and ideas from information).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Students use correctly one of the following information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use strategies (use of citations and references; choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; using information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between common knowledge and ideas from information).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The link to the Assessment Action Plan online form can be found in the Employee Portal > Files & Forms > Assessment of Student Learning. Faculty should use the online form to submit their action plan.

Assessment Action Plan

2016-17 Academic Year

PLAN ► ASSESS ► IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING

M State is dedicated to creating a culture of continuous improvement regarding the assessment of student learning.

Your Information:

First Name:
Last Name:
Email:

Step 1. General Action Plan Information

A. This action plan is for a (choose one): □ Course □ Program/Department

B. Name of the course or program/department:
   *Include the course number and name if applicable (e.g. ENGL 1101 College Writing I)

C. If this is a collaborative action plan, enter all the name(s) of the faculty involved in this project:
Step 2. What area of student learning would you like to improve?
(This may include a course competency, program outcome, or departmental goal for enhancing learning.)

Step 3. What baseline data/information will you use to measure improvement?
(Optional - upload files with supporting data/information)

Step 4. What is your strategy to improve student learning?

INSTRUCTIONS (Please Read!): If you do not have your results yet, skip steps 5-7 and click on the "submit/save" button at the bottom of this page. You will receive a confirmation email with a link to update your action plan at a later date when you have your results.

Assessment Action Plan Results

Complete this section after you have implemented your strategy and reviewed your results.
*If your action plan results will not be available prior to the deadline, indicate this in step 6 and submit your plan.

Step 5. Analyze the Effectiveness of Your Strategy
How did your strategy impact student learning? Provide supporting data/information.
(Optional - Upload files with supporting data/information)

Step 6. Next Steps
Identify any next steps you plan to take with this action plan.

Step 7. Peer Consultation
Did you discuss your plan and/or results with peers? If so, what did you take away from these discussions?
The link to the Core Ability Score Sheet Request Form can be found in the Employee Portal > Files & Forms > Assessment of Student Learning. Use the online form to submit your requests.

Core Ability Score Sheet Request Form
Information submitted on this form will be used to generate a Core Ability Score Sheet, which you will receive from M State's institutional research department.

Your Information

First Name:
Last Name:
Email:

Enter information below for the course you would like to assess

1. Term:

2. Course prefix and number (e.g. ENGL 1101):

3. Full name of the course (e.g. College Writing I):

4. Enter the six digit course ID for the section(s) you want to assess:
(The course ID can be found on the web schedule)

5. Select a rubric:

What's Next?
Click on the "submit" button below and Institutional Research will email you a populated Core Ability Score Sheet for the requested course. You will receive your score sheet in approximately 5-10 business days, unless a preferred date is indicated below.

Date preference to receive Score Sheet (optional):

Submit Request
### Core Ability Score Sheet Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Define Problem</th>
<th>Identify Strategies</th>
<th>Propose Solutions / Hypotheses</th>
<th>Evaluate Potential Solutions</th>
<th>Implement Solution</th>
<th>Evaluate Outcomes</th>
<th>Row Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>111111</td>
<td>Doe, Jane</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222222</td>
<td>Doe, John</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333333</td>
<td>Student, Sample</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**
- You must score 3 or more categories of the AAC&U rubric.
- If you are not using a category, please leave it blank.
- Only integers 1, 2, 3, and 4 can be used for scoring (see score in rubric column headings).

**RESOURCES:**
Click on the "Assessment Resources" tab below.

---

*The Core Ability Score Sheet Assessment Request Form link can be found in the Employee Portal > Files and Forms > Assessment of Student Learning under Core Ability Assessment. Complete the online request form (see example online request form on page 36) to receive a score sheet for the requested course from the institutional research department.*