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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 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; 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
Assessment Glossary

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.

Classroom assessment → Institutional assessment

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

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.

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)

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.

Evidence: Source material that is used to extend, in purposeful ways, writers' ideas in a text.

Writers will incorporate sources according to disciplinary and genre conventions, according to the writer's purpose for the text. Through increasingly sophisticated use of sources, writers develop an ability to differentiate between their own ideas and the ideas of others, credit and build upon work already accomplished in the field or issue they are addressing, and provide meaningful examples to readers.

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

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 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

Written communication abilities develop through iterative experiences across the curriculum.

Faculty interested in the research on writing assessment that has guided our work here can consult the National Council of Teachers of English/ Council of Writing Program Administrators' White Paper on Writing Assessment (2008; www.wpacouncil.org/whitepaper) and the Conference on College Composition and Communication's Writing Assessment: A Position Statement (2008; www.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/123784.htm).

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 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 context.

Evaluators using this rubric must have information about the assignments or purposes for writing guiding writers' work. Also recommended is including reflective work samples of collections of work that address such questions as:

• What decisions did the writer make about audience, purpose, and genre as s/he compiled the work in the portfolio? How are those choices evident in the writing -- in the content, organization and structure, reasoning, evidence, mechanical

The definitions that follow were developed to clarify terms and concepts used in this rubric only. For more information, please contact value@aacu.org.
**Definition**

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 texts, data, and images. Written communication abilities develop through iterative experiences across the curriculum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Benchmark 1</th>
<th>Benchmark 2</th>
<th>Benchmark 3</th>
<th>Benchmark 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context of and Purpose for Writing</td>
<td>Demonstrates novice understanding of audience, purpose, and context</td>
<td>Demonstrates proficient understanding of audience, purpose, and context</td>
<td>Demonstrates advanced understanding of audience, purpose, and context</td>
<td>Demonstrates expert understanding of audience, purpose, and context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Development</td>
<td>Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to develop ideas, convey the writer's understanding, and shape the whole work</td>
<td>Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas, develop the writer's understanding, and shape the whole work</td>
<td>Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work</td>
<td>Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas in some parts of the work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genre and Disciplinary Conventions</td>
<td>Demonstrates detailed attention to and consistent use of conventions particular to a discipline and/or writing task(s) including organization, content, presentation, formatting, and stylistic choices</td>
<td>Demonstrates consistent use of conventions particular to a discipline and/or writing task(s), including organization, content, presentation, and stylistic choices</td>
<td>Follows expectations appropriate to a discipline and/or writing task(s) for basic organization, content, and presentation</td>
<td>Attempts to use a consistent system for basic organization and presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources and Evidence</td>
<td>Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing</td>
<td>Demonstrates consistent use of credible and relevant sources to support ideas that are situated within the discipline and genre of the writing</td>
<td>Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of Syntax and Mechanics</td>
<td>Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free</td>
<td>Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the portfolio has few errors.</td>
<td>Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers, although writing may include some errors.</td>
<td>Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.</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. 

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 material 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 supports 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 knowledgeable and informed interpreter of Shakespeare’s works.
ORAL COMMUNICATION VALUE RUBRIC

For more information, please contact value@aacu.org

**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><strong>Characteristics</strong></th>
<th>Benchmark 1</th>
<th>Benchmark 2</th>
<th>Benchmark 3</th>
<th>Benchmark 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td>Effective, engaging, and persuasive.</td>
<td>Consistent and logical.</td>
<td>Occasional, but not consistent.</td>
<td>Absent or inconsistent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language</strong></td>
<td>Audience-appropriate and engaging.</td>
<td>Audience-appropriate and clear.</td>
<td>Occasional, but not audience-appropriate.</td>
<td>Absent or inconsistent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery</strong></td>
<td>Comfortable and confident.</td>
<td>Comfortable and clear.</td>
<td>Occasional, but not comfortable.</td>
<td>Uncomfortable and unclear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting Material</strong></td>
<td>Comprehensive and relevant.</td>
<td>Relevant and supportive.</td>
<td>Partially relevant and supportive.</td>
<td>Irrelevant or negligible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Message</strong></td>
<td>Strong and compelling.</td>
<td>Clear and consistent with the supporting material.</td>
<td>Possibly clear, but not consistently presented.</td>
<td>Central message can be deduced, but not clearly stated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supporting Evidence**

1. Evidence of oral communication
2. Evidence of language
3. Evidence of delivery
4. Evidence of central message
5. Evidence of supporting material

**Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence of Oral Communication</th>
<th>Evidence of Language</th>
<th>Evidence of Delivery</th>
<th>Evidence of Central Message</th>
<th>Evidence of Supporting Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral communication is evident.</td>
<td>Language is appropriate.</td>
<td>Delivery is comfortable.</td>
<td>Message is clear.</td>
<td>Supporting materials are comprehensive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral communication is present.</td>
<td>Language is audience-appropriate.</td>
<td>Delivery is clear.</td>
<td>Message is possibly clear.</td>
<td>Supporting materials are relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral communication is absent.</td>
<td>Language is irrelevant.</td>
<td>Delivery is uncomfortable.</td>
<td>Message is not deduced.</td>
<td>Supporting materials are absent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This rubric provides the framework for evaluating both students' developing relationship to texts and the range of texts their coursework introduces them to. It is likely that users of this rubric will detect that the cell repertoire of reading performances naturally during the undergraduate years and beyond as a consequence of meeting ... as a "basic skill" in which students may require "remediation." They have assumed that students come with ... 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. The core expectations articulated ... are intended for the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses.

### Glossary

**Comprehension:** The extent to which a reader "gets" the text, both literally and figuratively. Accomplished and sophisticated readers will have moved from being able to "get" the meaning that the language of the text provides to being able to "get" the implications of the text, the questions it raises, and the counterarguments one might suggest in response to it. A helpful and accessible discussion of 'comprehension' is found in Chapter 2 of the RAND report, Reading for Understanding: www.rand.org/pubs/monograph_reports/MR1465/MR1465.ch2.pdf.

**Analysis:** The process of recognizing and using features of a text to build a more advanced understanding of the ... (Might include evaluation of genre, language, tone, stated purpose, explicit or implicit logic (including flaws of reasoning), and historical context as they contribute to the meaning of a text.)

**Parts:** Titles, headings, meaning of vocabulary from context, structure of the text, important ideas and relationships among those ideas.

**Multiple Perspectives:** Consideration of how text-based meanings might differ depending on point of view.

**Interpretive Strategies:** Purposeful approaches from different perspectives, which include, for example, asking clarifying questions, building knowledge of the context in which a text was written, visualizing and considering counterfactuals (asking what might our country be like if the Civil War had not happened? How would Hamlet be different if Hamlet had simply killed the King?).

**Eistemological lens:** The knowledge framework a reader develops in a specific discipline as s/he moves through an academic major (e.g., essays, textbook chapters, literary works, journal articles, lab reports, grant proposals, lectures, blogs, webpages, or literature reviews, for example). The depth and breadth of this knowledge provides the foundation for independent and self-regulated responses to the range of texts in any discipline or field that students will encounter.

**Genre:** A particular kind of "text" defined by a set of disciplinary conventions or agreements learned through participation in academic discourse. Genre governs what texts can be about, how they are structured, what to expect from them,...
### 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
Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark level performance.

### Capstone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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 the 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.
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

Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events prior to accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.

Framing Language

This rubric 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 modes 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 standard education might be especially valuable.

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.

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 any 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.
• Metaphor: Information that is (intended to be) interpreted in a non-literal way. For example, "she was green with envy" would be interpreted to mean that her skin was green, not that she was sick or ill.

Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events prior to accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.

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 any 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.
• Metaphor: Information that is (intended to be) interpreted in a non-literal way. For example, "she was green with envy" would be interpreted to mean that her skin was green, not that she was sick or ill.

Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events prior to accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.

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 any 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.
• Metaphor: Information that is (intended to be) interpreted in a non-literal way. For example, "she was green with envy" would be interpreted to mean that her skin was green, not that she was sick or ill.
### Definition

Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events 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>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation of issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Influence of context and assumptions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others’ assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies own and others’ assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others’ assumptions than one’s own (or vice versa).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student’s position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limits of position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) are acknowledged.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others’ points of view are synthesized within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others’ points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical and reflect student’s informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

CRITICAL THINKING 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

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.

Inquiry and Analysis Glossary

- Conclusions: A synthesis of key findings drawn from research or evidence.
- Limitations: Critique of the process or evidence.
- Implications: How inquiry results apply to a larger context or the real world.

Glossary

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

- Conclusions: A synthesis of key findings drawn from research or evidence.
- Limitations: Critique of the process or evidence.
- Implications: How inquiry results apply to a larger context or the real world.

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, evidence, design, analysis, etc.). The more familiar and accessible the terminology and process are to the student, the more appropriate and useful the rubric will be.

In addition, this rubric addresses the products of inquiry and analysis, 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. Finally, faculty are encouraged to adapt the essence and language of each criterion to the disciplinary or interdisciplinary context to which it is applied.

Conclusion

The definitions of inquiry and analysis are closely related to which is applied first. When the definitions of inquiry and analysis are combined, they become a powerful tool for understanding and analyzing complex problems. The definitions of inquiry and analysis are closely related to which is applied first. When the definitions of inquiry and analysis are combined, they become a powerful tool for understanding and analyzing complex problems.
### Inquiry and Analysis Value Rubric

**Definition**

Inquiry is a systematic process of exploring issues/objects/works through the collection and analysis of evidence that result in informed conclusions/judgments. Analysis is the process of breaking complex topics or issues into parts to gain a better understanding of them.

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

### Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Implications/Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inquiry/Analysis</td>
<td>Inapplicable to the inquiry findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inquiry/Analysis</td>
<td>Inapplicable to the inquiry findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Inquiry/Analysis</td>
<td>Inapplicable to the inquiry findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Inquiry/Analysis</td>
<td>Inapplicable to the inquiry findings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Conclusion

- Simplicity related to focus
- Inadequate synthesis of evidence or inferences
- Organized evidence, but the organization is not effective in revealing important patterns, differences, or similarities
- Lists evidence, but it is not organized and/or is unrelated to focus

### Limitations and Implications

- Insightfully discusses in detail relevant and supported limitations and implications
- Discusses relevant and supported limitations and implications
- Presents relevant and supported limitations and implications
- Presents limitations and implications, but they are possibly irrelevant and unsupported

### Milestones

- Inquiry Process
- Design Process
- Evidence, Knowledge, Research
- Topic Selection

**Complex topics of Inquiry and Analysis are the core processes of Inquiry and Analysis. The goal is to provide evidence-based conclusions and recommendations.**
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 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.

**Framing Language**

Problem solving covers a wide range of approaches and strategies that may vary significantly across disciplines. Learning the common elements of most problem-solving contexts is designed to function across all disciplines. 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 respective abilities to practice thinking through problems in order to reach solutions. Because the focus is on the problem-solving process, rather than the quality of the end-product, 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.

**Glossary**

- **Contextual Factors**: Constraints (such as limits on cost), resources, attitudes (such as biases) and desired additional knowledge which affect how the problem can be best solved in the real world.
- **Critique**: Involves analysis and synthesis of a full range of perspectives.
- **Feasible**: Workable, in consideration of time-frame, functionality, available resources, necessary buy-in, and limits of the assignment or task.
- **"Off the shelf" solution**: A simplistic option that is familiar from everyday experience but not tailored to the problem at hand (e.g., holding a bake sale to "save" an underfunded public library).
- **Solution**: An appropriate response to a challenge or a problem.
- **Strategy**: A plan of action or an approach designed to arrive at a solution (If the problem is to "cross a river" and the solution could be a construction-oriented, cooperative, (build a bridge with your community) approach and a personally oriented, physical (swim across alone) approach. An approach that partially applies would be a personal, physical approach for someone who doesn't know how to swim).
- **Support**: Provide specific, tangible evidence for solution or selection of solution.

**Problem Solving VALUE RUBRIC**
### Problem Solving Value Rubric

**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>Capstone</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Capstone</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Capstone</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Problem Solving
- **Define Problem**
  - Demonstrates the ability to construct a clear and insightful problem statement with evidence of all relevant contextual factors.
  - Demonstrates the ability to construct a problem statement with evidence of most relevant contextual factors, and problem statement is adequately detailed.
  - Begins to demonstrate the ability to construct a problem statement with evidence of most relevant contextual factors, but problem statement is superficial.
  - Demonstrates a limited ability in identifying a problem statement or related contextual factors.

- **Identify Strategies**
  - Identifies multiple approaches for solving the problem that apply within a specific context.
  - Identifies multiple approaches for solving the problem, only some of which apply within a specific context.
  - Identifies only a single approach for solving the problem that does apply within a specific context.
  - Identifies one or more approaches for solving the problem that do not apply within a specific context.

- **Propose Solutions/Hypotheses**
  - 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.
  - 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.
  - Proposes one solution/hypothesis that is "off the shelf" rather than individually designed to address the specific contextual factors of the problem.
  - Proposes a solution/hypothesis that is difficult to evaluate because it is vague or only indirectly addresses the problem statement.

- **Evaluate Potential Solutions**
  - 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.
  - 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.
  - 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.
  - 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.

- **Implement Solution**
  - Implements the solution in a manner that addresses thoroughly and deeply multiple contextual factors of the problem.
  - Implements the solution in a manner that addresses multiple contextual factors of the problem in a superficial manner.
  - Implements the solution in a manner that addresses the problem statement but ignores relevant contextual factors.
  - Implements the solution in a manner that does not directly address the problem statement.

- **Evaluate Outcomes**
  - Reviews results relative to the problem defined with thorough, specific considerations of need for further work.
  - Reviews results relative to the problem defined with some consideration of need for further work.
  - Reviews results in terms of the problem defined with little, if any, consideration of need for further work.
  - Reviews results superficially in terms of the problem defined with no consideration of need for further work.

---

For more information, please contact value@aacu.org.
QUANTITATIVE LITERACY 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 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 think and reason with numbers in a variety of contexts, including the ability to draw conclusions from quantitative information, represent quantitative information in appropriate forms, complete calculations to answer meaningful questions, make judgments based on quantitative data and communicate the results of that work for various purposes and audiences.

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. Virtually all of today's students, regardless of career choice, will need basic QL skills such as the ability to draw information from charts, graphs, and geometric figures, and the ability to accurately complete straightforward estimations and calculations.

Preliminary efforts to find student work products which demonstrate QL skills proved a challenge in this rubric creation process. It's possible to find pages of mathematical problems, but what those problem sets don't demonstrate is whether the student was able to think about and understand the meaning of her work. It's possible to find research papers that include quantitative information, but those papers often don't provide evidence that allows the evaluator to see how much of the thinking was done by the original source (often carefully cited in the paper) and how much was done by the student herself, or whether conclusions drawn from analysis of the source material are even accurate.

Given widespread agreement about the importance of QL, it becomes incumbent on faculty to develop new kinds of assignments which give students substantive, contextualized experience in using such skills as analyzing quantitative information, representing quantitative information in appropriate forms, completing calculations to answer meaningful questions, making judgments based on quantitative data and communicating the results of that work for various purposes and audiences. As students gain experience with those skills, faculty must develop assignments that require students to create work products which reveal their thought processes and demonstrate the range of their QL skills.

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, a successful demonstration of QL will place the mathematical work in the context of a full and robust discussion of the underlying issues addressed by the assignment.

Finally, QL skills can be applied to a wide array of problems of varying difficulty, confounding the use of this rubric. For example, the same student might demonstrate high levels of QL achievement when working on a simplistic problem and low levels of QL achievement when working on a very complex problem. Thus, to accurately assess a student's QL achievement it may be necessary to measure QL achievement within the context of problem complexity, much as is done in diving competitions where two scores are given, one for the difficulty of the dive, and another for the skill in accomplishing the dive. In this context, that would mean giving one score for the complexity of the problem and another score for the QL achievement in solving the problem.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Interpreting Information</th>
<th>Representing Information</th>
<th>Application/Analysis</th>
<th>Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provides accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical terms.</td>
<td>Uses quantitative information in connection with the argument or purpose of the work.</td>
<td>Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for comprehensive, logical arguments.</td>
<td>Successfully conveys quantitative information in support of the work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provides somewhat accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical terms.</td>
<td>Uses quantitative information in connection with the argument or purpose of the work, consistently high quality.</td>
<td>Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for comprehensive, logical arguments.</td>
<td>Uses quantitative information in support of the work, but does not necessarily lead to conclusions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Provides accurate, somewhat incomplete explanations of information presented in mathematical terms.</td>
<td>Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for comprehensive, logical arguments.</td>
<td>Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for comprehensive, logical arguments.</td>
<td>Uses quantitative information in support of the work, but does not necessarily lead to conclusions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Provides somewhat accurate, somewhat incomplete explanations of information presented in mathematical terms.</td>
<td>Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for comprehensive, logical arguments.</td>
<td>Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for comprehensive, logical arguments.</td>
<td>Uses quantitative information in support of the work, but does not necessarily lead to conclusions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 can clearly communicate those arguments in a variety of forms (tables, graphs, mathematical equations, etc., as appropriate).

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

For instance, attempts to explain the trend data shown in a graph, but will frequently misinterpret the nature of mathematical forms, but draws incorrect conclusions about what the information means.

Provides accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms.

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 the information presented. Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for comprehensive, logical arguments. Uses quantitative information in connection with the argument or purpose of the work, but does not necessarily lead to conclusions. Uses quantitative information in support of the work, but does not necessarily lead to conclusions. Uses quantitative information in support of the work, but does not necessarily lead to conclusions.

Provides somewhat accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms, but occasionally makes minor errors related to computations or units.

Provides somewhat accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms, but occasionally makes minor errors related to computations or units. Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for comprehensive, logical arguments. Uses quantitative information in connection with the argument or purpose of the work, but does not necessarily lead to conclusions. Uses quantitative information in support of the work, but does not necessarily lead to conclusions. Uses quantitative information in support of the work, but does not necessarily lead to conclusions.

Provides accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms. Makes appropriate inferences based on the information presented. Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for comprehensive, logical arguments. Uses quantitative information in connection with the argument or purpose of the work, but does not necessarily lead to conclusions. Uses quantitative information in support of the work, but does not necessarily lead to conclusions. Uses quantitative information in support of the work, but does not necessarily lead to conclusions.

Provides somewhat accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms, but occasionally makes minor errors related to computations or units. Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for comprehensive, logical arguments. Uses quantitative information in connection with the argument or purpose of the work, but does not necessarily lead to conclusions. Uses quantitative information in support of the work, but does not necessarily lead to conclusions. Uses quantitative information in support of the work, but does not necessarily lead to conclusions. Uses quantitative information in support of the work, but does not necessarily lead to conclusions.
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

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

- 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

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

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 Responsibility and Higher Education, edited by Thomas Ehrlich, published by Oryx Press, 2000, Preface, page vi.) In addition, civic engagement encompasses

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIVIC ENGAGEMENT VALUE RUBRIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title:</strong> Civic Engagement Value Rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Author:</strong> Civic Responsibility and Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year:</strong> 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publisher:</strong> Oryx Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Page vi.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The VALU E 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

- 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

- 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

- 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.
CIVIC ENGAGEMENT VALUE RUBRIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Reflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civic Contexts/Structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Identity and Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of Communities and Cultures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Ehrlich, published by Oryx Press, 2000, Preface, page vi.) In addition, civic engagement encompasses actions wherein individuals participate in activities of personal and public concern that are both individually life enriching and socially beneficial to the community.

| Civic Engagement Rubric | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------| | | | | | | | |
| Civic Communication    | | | | | | | | |
| Civic Identity and Commitment | | | | | | | | |
| Analysis of Knowledge | | | | | | | | |
| Diversity of Communities and Cultures | | | | | | | | |

Demonstrates experience identifying and interpreting civic contexts, and does one's own reflection on what one is learning and how that learning might be used to achieve a civic aim within a civic context.

Demonstrates ability and commitment to knowledge, skills, values, and motivation that are relevant to civic-contextual analysis.

Connects and extends knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.

Demonstrates independent experience and initiative in team leadership of complex or multiple civic engagement activities, showing ability to do all of the following:

- Effectively communicates in civic context, showing understanding of how to achieve a civic aim and to tone's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.
- Begins to connect knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.
- Begins to identify knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline that is relevant to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.
- Provides evidence of experience in civic-engagement activities and describes what can be learned from diversity of communities and cultures.
- Exhibits curiosity about what can be learned from diversity of communities and cultures.
- Exhibits little curiosity about what can be learned from diversity of communities and cultures.
- Has awareness that own attitudes and beliefs are different from those of other cultures and indifferent or resistant to what can be learned from diversity of communities and cultures.
- Expresses attitudes and beliefs as an expression of one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.
- Reflects on how own attitudes and beliefs are different from those of other cultures and indifferent or resistant to what can be learned from diversity of communities and cultures.
- Has clearly experimented with civic contexts and structures, tried out a few to see what fits.
- Experiments with civic contexts and structures, based on others' perspectives.
- Express, listen, and adapt ideas and messages based on others' perspectives.
- Express, listen, and adapt ideas and messages, showing ability to do more than one of the following:
- Provides little evidence of her/his experience in civic-engagement activities and does not relate to a reinforced and clarified sense of civic identity and continued commitment to civic action.
- Provides evidence of experience in civic-engagement activities and describes what can be learned from diversity of communities and cultures.
- Demonstrates evidence of adjustment in own expectations or course requirements rather than working to meet them.
- Demonstrates experience identifying and interpreting civic contexts, and does one's own reflection on what one is learning and how that learning might be used to achieve a civic aim within a civic context.
- Responsible and committed commitment to being a citizen and acting in the public interest.
- Effective communicator in civic context, showing understanding of how to achieve a civic aim and to tone's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.
- Express, listen, and adapt ideas and messages, showing ability to do more than one of the following:
- Provides little evidence of her/his experience in civic-engagement activities and does not relate to a reinforced and clarified sense of civic identity and continued commitment to civic action.
- Provides evidence of experience in civic-engagement activities and describes what can be learned from diversity of communities and cultures.
- Demonstrates evidence of adjustment in own expectations or course requirements rather than working to meet them.
- Responsible and committed commitment to being a citizen and acting in the public interest.
- Effective communicator in civic context, showing understanding of how to achieve a civic aim and to tone's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.
- Express, listen, and adapt ideas and messages, showing ability to do more than one of the following:
- Provides little evidence of her/his experience in civic-engagement activities and does not relate to a reinforced and clarified sense of civic identity and continued commitment to civic action.
- Provides evidence of experience in civic-engagement activities and describes what can be learned from diversity of communities and cultures.
- Demonstrates evidence of adjustment in own expectations or course requirements rather than working to meet them.
- Responsible and committed commitment to being a citizen and acting in the public interest.
- Effective communicator in civic context, showing understanding of how to achieve a civic aim and to tone's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.
- Express, listen, and adapt ideas and messages, showing ability to do more than one of the following:
- Provides little evidence of her/his experience in civic-engagement activities and does not relate to a reinforced and clarified sense of civic identity and continued commitment to civic action.
- Provides evidence of experience in civic-engagement activities and describes what can be learned from diversity of communities and cultures.
- Demonstrates evidence of adjustment in own expectations or course requirements rather than working to meet them.
- Responsible and committed commitment to being a citizen and acting in the public interest.
- Effective communicator in civic context, showing understanding of how to achieve a civic aim and to tone's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.
- Express, listen, and adapt ideas and messages, showing ability to do more than one of the following:
ETHICAL REASONING 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

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. In an era of globalization, today’s students need to be able to describe and analyze the ramifications of ethical issues and consider the ramifications of ethical issues in a variety of settings. Ethical Reasoning is reasoning about right and wrong human conduct. It requires students to be able to describe and analyze positions on ethical issues.

Framing Language

The rubric focuses on five elements: Ethical Self Awareness, Ethical Issue Recognition, Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts, Application of Ethical Principles, and Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts. Students’ Ethical Self Awareness or ability to identify their own ethical compass and core beliefs can evolve as they practice ethical decision-making skills and learn how to describe and analyze positions on ethical issues. Ethical Issue Recognition involves identifying ethical issues in a variety of settings and recognizing the ramifications of ethical issues. Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts is the ability to identify and describe different ethical perspectives and how they might be applied to ethical dilemmas. Application of Ethical Principles involves applying ethical perspectives and concepts to specific ethical issues. Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts is the ability to identify and describe the ramifications of different ethical perspectives and how they might be applied to ethical dilemmas.

Glossary

• Core Beliefs: Those fundamental principles that consciously or unconsciously influence one’s ethical conduct and ethical thinking. Even when unacknowledged, core beliefs shape one’s responses. Core beliefs can reflect one’s environment, religion, culture or training. A person may or may not choose to act on their core beliefs.

• Ethical Perspectives/concepts: The different theoretical means through which ethical issues are analyzed, such as ethical theories or ethical concepts. Ethical Perspectives/Concepts are applied to ethical issues to help students identify and describe different ethical perspectives and how they might be applied to ethical dilemmas.

• Complex, multi-layered (gray) context: The sub-parts or situational conditions of a scenario that bring two or more ethical dilemmas into the mix/problem/context/for student’s identification.

• Cross-relationships among the issues: Obvious or subtle connections between/among the sub-parts or situational conditions of the issues present in a scenario (e.g., relationship of production of corn as part of climate change issue).

• Cross-references among issues: Differences or similarities that can be identified between/among ethical issues that are presented in a scenario (e.g., relationship of production of corn as part of climate change issue).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Reasoning is reasoning about right and wrong human conduct.</td>
<td>definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It requires students to be able to assess their own ethical values and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the social context of problems, recognize ethical issues in a variety of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>settings, think about how different ethical perspectives might be applied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ethical dilemmas, and consider the ramifications of alternative actions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ ethical self-identity evolves as they practice ethical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decision-making skills and learn how to describe and analyze positions on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethical issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation of Ethical Reasoning**

**Ethical Self-Awareness**
- **Benchmark**: Student discusses in detail/analyses both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs and discussion has greater depth and clarity.
- **3**: Student discusses in detail/analyses both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs.
- **2**: Student states both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs.
- **1**: Student states either their core beliefs or articulates the origins of the core beliefs but not both.

**Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts**
- **Benchmark**: 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.
- **3**: 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.
- **2**: Student can name the major theory she/he uses, and is only able to present the gist of the named theory.
- **1**: Student only names the major theory she/he uses.

**Ethical Issue Recognition**
- **Benchmark**: Student can recognize ethical issues when presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context AND can recognize cross-relationships among the issues.
- **3**: Student can recognize ethical issues when issues are presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context OR can grasp cross-relationships among the issues.
- **2**: Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues and grasp (incompletely) the complexities or interrelationships among the issues.
- **1**: Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues but fails to grasp complexity or interrelationships.

**Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts**
- **Benchmark**: Student can independently apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, accurately, and is able to consider full implications of the application.
- **3**: 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.
- **2**: Student can apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, independently (to a new example), and the application is inaccurate.
- **1**: 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).
GLOBAL LEARNING VALUE RUBRIC

Definition

Global learning is a critical analysis, and an engagement with complex, interdependent global systems and legacies (such as natural, physical, societal, 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 how their actions affect both local and global communities, and the natural and physical world, (3) develop the capacity to engage and learn from perspectives and experiences different from one's own and understand how one's place in the world both informs and limits one's knowledge. The goal is to develop the capacity to understand the interrelationships between multiple perspectives, such as personal, social, cultural, disciplinary, environmental, local, and global. This requires understanding how these systems are influenced, how they are constructed, and how they operate with differential consequences, and analyzing the power structures that determine hierarchies, inequalities, and opportunities and which can vary over time and place. Global learning is based on the principle that the world is a complex and overlapping system with power asymmetries that shape learning and development in ways that can affect individuals' ability to advance knowledge and justice. As a result, global learning is a critical and cumulative experience that is required for individuals to advance knowledge and justice at both the local and global levels. Global learning cannot be achieved in a single course or a single experience but is acquired cumulatively across students' entire college careers. Depending on the context, there may be development within one level rather than growth from level to level.

Framing Language

Effective and transformative global learning offers students meaningful opportunities to engage with complex global issues and systems, fostering a deep understanding of diversity, engaged scholarship, and ethical reasoning. Global learning is designed to encourage students to think critically and creatively about global challenges, fostering a sense of global citizenship and responsibility. This rubric is intended to assess global learning on a programmatic level, taking into account the diverse contexts and experiences that students bring to their studies.

Glossary

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 involves recognizing one's responsibilities to society—locally, nationally, and globally—and developing a perspective on cultural and power relations both across the globe and within one's own community.

Cultural Diversity: The ability to recognize the origins and influences of one's own cultural heritage along with its limitations in providing all that one needs to know in the world. This includes the curiosity to learn respectfully about the cultural diversity of others and the ability to traverse cultural boundaries to bridge differences and collaboratively reach common goals. On a systems level, the important skill of comparatively analyzing how cultures can be marked and assigned a place within power structures that determine hierarchies, inequalities, and opportunities and which can vary over time and place. This can include, but is not limited to, understanding race, ethnicity, gender, nationhood, religion, and class.

Knowledge Application: In the context of global learning, the application of an integrated and systemic understanding of the interrelationships among the self, local and global communities, and the natural and physical world, and the ability to apply knowledge and skills gained through higher learning to real-life problem-solving both alone and with others.

Civic Engagement: The ability to engage in democratic participation and contribute to the public good through active participation in civic life and an understanding of the role of citizens in a democratic society.

Intercultural Knowledge and Competence: The ability to understand and engage with diverse cultural perspectives, including one's own, and to apply this understanding in collaborative and cooperative settings.

Ethical Reasoning: The ability to recognize and engage with ethical and moral issues, and to develop the capacity to reason and act in ways that are consistent with ethical principles and values.

Global Systems: The complex and overlapping systems, including natural and human systems, that operate in observable patterns and often are affected by or are the result of human design or disruption. These systems include human and natural systems, the influence of human design or disruption, and the power structures that determine hierarchies, inequalities, and opportunities and which can vary over time and place.
## Definition
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 both local and global communities.

## Global Learning Value Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Benchmark</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><strong>Understanding Global Systems</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Diversity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global Self-Awareness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perspective Taking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal and Social Responsibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applying Knowledge to Contemporary Global Challenges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Understanding Global Systems</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Diversity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global Self-Awareness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perspective Taking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal and Social Responsibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applying Knowledge to Contemporary Global Challenges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 dialogue 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 biases, 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 one self. 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.
**Intercultural Knowledge and Competence Value Rubric**

**Definition**

Intercultural Knowledge and Competence is "a set of cognitive, affective, and behavioral skills and characteristics that are necessary for effective interaction in a variety of cultural contexts." (Bennett, J. M. 2008. Transformative training: Designing for change, p. 31.)

**Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example 1</th>
<th>Example 2</th>
<th>Example 3</th>
<th>Example 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge of Cultural Worldview Frameworks</strong></td>
<td>This includes understanding the various cultural paradigms and how they influence behavior and communication.</td>
<td>Articulates a complex understanding of cultural worldviews.</td>
<td>Identifies components of other cultural worldview.</td>
<td>Demonstrates surface understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of multiple cultural groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Self-Awareness</strong></td>
<td>This involves recognizing one's own cultural biases and how they impact interactions.</td>
<td>Expresses openness to most, if not all, interactions with culturally different others.</td>
<td>Displays comfort with the complexities that new cultural experiences present.</td>
<td>Recognizes new perspectives about one's own cultural group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Openness</strong></td>
<td>This refers to an openness to new cultural experiences and perspectives.</td>
<td>Expresses openness to most, if not all, interactions with culturally different others.</td>
<td>Expresses openness to most, if not all, interactions with culturally different others.</td>
<td>Expresses openness to most, if not all, interactions with culturally different others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes</strong></td>
<td>This involves having an attitude of curiosity, empathy, and flexibility.</td>
<td>Articulates insights into own cultural rules and biases.</td>
<td>Identifies some cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication;</td>
<td>Identifies some cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skills</strong></td>
<td>This includes interpersonal and communication skills.</td>
<td>Identifies some cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication;</td>
<td>Identifies some cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication;</td>
<td>Identifies some cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intercultural Knowledge and Competence</strong></td>
<td>This is the ability to recognize and respond to cultural biases.</td>
<td>Identifies own cultural rules and biases (e.g. with a strong preference for those rules shared with own cultural group).</td>
<td>Understands that cultural biases can influence communication and interaction;</td>
<td>Displays appropriate interaction based on those differences but is still unable to negotiate a shared understanding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Has difficulty suspending any judgment in her/his interactions with culturally different others, and is aware of own judgment.</td>
<td>Suspends judgment in valuing her/his interactions with culturally different others.</td>
<td>Has difficulty suspending any judgment in her/his interactions with culturally different others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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.

**Teamwork**

**Definition**

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.)

**Framing Language**

Students participate on many different teams, in many different settings. For example, a given student may work on separate teams to complete a lab assignment, give an oral presentation, or complete a community service project. Furthermore, the people the student works with are likely to be different in each of these different teams. As a result, it is assumed that a work sample or collection of work that demonstrates a student's teamwork skills could include a diverse range of inputs. This rubric is designed to assess the quality of a process, not the quality of an end product. A work sample or collection of work will need to include some evidence of the contributions of the work produced by the student, but it is not the case that the student must have been a lead or main contributor to the team. The focus is on the quality of the teamwork that the student exhibited, not the quality of the final product. It is recommended that work samples or collections of work for this outcome come from one (or more) of the following three sources: (1) student self-reflections on their contributions to team work; (2) evaluation or feedback from fellow team members about a student's contributions to team work; or (3) the evaluation of an outside observer regarding students' contributions to team work.

It is recommended that work samples or collections of work for this outcome come from one (or more) of the following three sources: (1) student self-reflections on their contributions to team work; (2) evaluation or feedback from fellow team members about a student's contributions to team work; or (3) the evaluation of an outside observer regarding students' contributions to team work. These three sources differ considerably in the resource demands they place on an institution. It is expected that in most cases the majority of the resource demands will be in the form of evaluating the work products of students, followed by the evaluation of self-reflections, and with the least resource demands being the evaluation of work produced by outside observers. Institutions using this rubric are encouraged to carefully consider their resources and the extent to which they are able to allocate to the assessment of teamwork and discuss a means of completing work samples or collections of work that best suits their priorities, needs, and purposes.

**Success**

Students participating on many different teams in many different settings. For example, a given student may have worked on separate teams to complete a lab assignment, give an oral presentation, or complete a community service project. Furthermore, the people the student works with are likely to be different in each of these different teams. As a result, a work sample or collection of work that demonstrates teamwork skills could include a diverse range of inputs. This rubric is designed to assess the quality of a process, not the quality of an end product. A work sample or collection of work will need to include some evidence of the contributions of the work produced by the student, but it is not the case that the student must have been a lead or main contributor to the team. The focus is on the quality of the teamwork that the student exhibited, not the quality of the final product. It is recommended that work samples or collections of work for this outcome come from one (or more) of the following three sources: (1) student self-reflections on their contributions to team work; (2) evaluation or feedback from fellow team members about a student's contributions to team work; or (3) the evaluation of an outside observer regarding students' contributions to team work. These three sources differ considerably in the resource demands they place on an institution. It is expected that in most cases the majority of the resource demands will be in the form of evaluating the work products of students, followed by the evaluation of self-reflections, and with the least resource demands being the evaluation of work produced by outside observers. Institutions using this rubric are encouraged to carefully consider their resources and the extent to which they are able to allocate to the assessment of teamwork and discuss a means of completing work samples or collections of work that best suits their priorities, needs, and purposes.

**TEAMWORK VALUE RUBRIC**

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

For more information, please contact value@aacu.org

#### Definition

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.).

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributes to Team Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps the team move forward by articulating the merits of alternative ideas or proposals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offers alternative solutions or courses of action that build on the ideas of others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offers new suggestions to advance the work of the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark</strong></td>
<td>Shar es ideas but does not advance the work of the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitates the Contributions of Team Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engages team members in ways that facilitate their contributions to meetings by constructively building upon or synthesizing the contributions of others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engages team members by taking turns and listening to others without interrupting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark</strong></td>
<td>Shar es ideas but does not advance the work of the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Contributions Outside of Team Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished is thorough, comprehensive, and advances the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished advances the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completes all assigned tasks by deadline.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark</strong></td>
<td>Shar es ideas but does not advance the work of the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fosters Constructive Team Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark</strong></td>
<td>Shar es ideas but does not advance the work of the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responds to Conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses destructive conflict directly and constructively, helping to manage/resolve it in a way that strengthens overall team cohesiveness and future effectiveness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies and acknowledges conflict and stays engaged with it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redirecting focus toward common ground, toward task at hand (away from conflict).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passively accepts alternate viewpoints/ideas/opinions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></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.

In July 2013, there was a correction to Dimension 3: Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically.

---

**Definition**

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

Adopted from the National Forum on Information Literacy:

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

**Framing Language**

This rubric is recommended for use evaluating a collection of work rather than a single work sample in order to fully gauge student’s 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, scientific papers, literature reviews, position papers, and more. In addition, a description of the assignments that initiated the student work would be helpful in providing the context in which the work was created.

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

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. - The National Forum on Information Literacy

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

Milestones

- Benchmark
- Capstone
- Professional
- Expert

Dimension 1: Determine the Extent of Information Needed

**Benchmark**

- Defines the scope of the research question or thesis completely.
- Can determine key concepts.
- Types of information (sources) selected relate to concepts or answer research question.

**Capstone**

- Defines the scope of the research question or thesis incompletely (parts are missing, remains too broad or too narrow, etc.).
- Can determine key concepts.
- Types of information (sources) selected partially relate to concepts or answer research question.

**Professional**

- Has difficulty defining the scope of the research question or thesis.
- Has difficulty determining key concepts.
- Types of information (sources) selected do not relate to concepts or answer research question.

**Expert**

- Does not meet the benchmark.

Dimension 2: Access the Needed Information

**Benchmark**

- Accesses information using effective, well-designed search strategies and most appropriate information sources.

**Capstone**

- Accesses information using variety of search strategies and some relevant information sources.
- Demonstrates ability to refine search.

**Professional**

- Accesses information using simple search strategies, retrieves information from limited and similar sources.

**Expert**

- Accesses information randomly, retrieves information that lacks relevance and quality.

Dimension 3: Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically*

**Benchmark**

- Chooses a variety of information sources appropriate to the scope and discipline of the research question. Selects sources after considering the importance (to the researched topic) of the multiple criteria used (such as relevance to the research question, currency, authority, audience, and bias or point of view).

**Capstone**

- Chooses a variety of information sources appropriate to the scope and discipline of the research question. Selects sources using multiple criteria (such as relevance to the research question, currency, authority).

**Professional**

- Chooses a variety of information sources. Selects sources using basic criteria (such as relevance to the research question and currency).

**Expert**

- Chooses a few information sources. Selects sources using limited criteria (such as relevance to the research question).

Dimension 4: Use Information Effectively to Accomplish a Specific Purpose

**Benchmark**

- Communicates, organizes and synthesizes information from sources to fully achieve a specific purpose, with clarity and depth.

**Capstone**

- Communicates and organizes information from sources. The information is not yet synthesized, so the intended purpose is not fully achieved.

**Professional**

- Communicates information from sources. The information is fragmented and/or used inappropriately (misquoted, taken out of context, or incorrectly paraphrased, etc.), so the intended purpose is not achieved.

**Expert**

- Does not meet the benchmark.

Dimension 5: Access and Use Information Ethically and Legally

**Benchmark**

- Students use correctly all of the following information use strategies (use of citations and references; choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; using information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas ... of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.

**Capstone**

- Students use correctly three of the following information use strategies (use of citations and references; choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; using information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas ... of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.

**Professional**

- Students use correctly two of the following information use strategies (use of citations and references; choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; using information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas ... of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.

**Expert**

- Students use correctly one of the following information use strategies (use of citations and references; choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; using information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas ... of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.

*Corrected Dimension 3: Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically in July 2013*
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

2017-18 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?

Step 5. Select the category your action plan best relates to in regards to student learning:

- Course Competency
- Student Engagement
- Skill Demonstration
- Performance on Industry Recognized Credential

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?

Submit/Save
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 Assessment Score Sheet Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Name:</th>
<th>Sandy Shore</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAC&amp;U Rubric:</td>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Ability:</td>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course:</th>
<th>CHEM 1101 Principles of Chemistry, ID 000968</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Term:</td>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>2</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>4</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>1</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.