



USF St. Petersburg Faculty Senate Committee: General Education: Meetings USF St. Petersburg Faculty Senate Committee: General Education

1-24-2014

General Education Committee Meeting : 2014 : 01 : 24

General Education Committee

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/fac_senate_committees_gen_ed_meetings

Scholar Commons Citation

General Education Committee, "General Education Committee Meeting : 2014 : 01 : 24" (2014). *USF St. Petersburg Faculty Senate Committee: General Education: Meetings*. 62.
https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/fac_senate_committees_gen_ed_meetings/62

This Other is brought to you for free and open access by the USF St. Petersburg Faculty Senate Committee: General Education at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in USF St. Petersburg Faculty Senate Committee: General Education: Meetings by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact scholarcommons@usf.edu.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Agenda & Minutes Friday January 24 Davis 100 10 am

Committee Members:

1. Kathy Arthur, Chair
2. Deni Elliott (Arts and Sciences)
3. Kathy Carvalho-Knighton (Arts and Sciences) excused ill
4. Gary Austin (Library) excused
5. David John (Arts and Sciences)
6. Deanna Michael (Education)
7. Morgan Gresham (Arts and Sciences) excused conference
8. Hugh LaFollette (Arts and Sciences)
9. Adrian O'Connor (Arts and Sciences)
10. Rick Smith (Business)

Attached documents

- Draft of Jan 10 minutes
- Assessment Plans
- Assessment Rubrics

AGENDA

10:15-10:25- Minutes from December 13 approval

10:25-10:35- Chair and Committee updates

- College Meetings Jan 17 CAS, Jan 31 ED, Jan 24 BUS
- Meeting with CAS APC Chair
- Reposting of Application Refillable and Sample Syllabus
 - UG Council
<http://www1.usfsp.edu/ugc/proposals.htm>
 - General Education
<http://www1.usfsp.edu/ir/GenEd/index.htm>
 - Academic Affairs
<http://www1.usfsp.edu/academics/index.htm>
 - College of Arts and Sciences
http://www1.usfsp.edu/coas/faculty_staff.htm
 - College of Business
http://www1.usfsp.edu/cob/faculty_resources.htm
- System General Ed Standing with EVR and POS

10:35-11:00- Course Applications

PHI 2010 and possibly ANT 2000

Distribution of work load- assignment of 2 reviewers per course application

11:30-12:00- Assessment Plans and Rubrics [American Association of Colleges and Universities](http://assessment.aa.ufl.edu/value-rubrics) <http://assessment.aa.ufl.edu/value-rubrics>

MINUTES

Minutes from January 10 approved

Chair and Committee Updates

- Reposting of Application Refillable and Sample Syllabus, Zafer Unal updated all the postings
 - UG Council
<http://www1.usfsp.edu/ugc/proposals.htm>
 - General Education
<http://www1.usfsp.edu/ir/GenEd/index.htm>
 - Academic Affairs
<http://www1.usfsp.edu/academics/index.htm>
 - College of Arts and Sciences
http://www1.usfsp.edu/coas/faculty_staff.htm
 - College of Business
http://www1.usfsp.edu/cob/faculty_resources.htm
- K. Arthur presentations at College Meetings for updates and reviewed application process
 - Spoke with CAS college on Jan 17
 - Spoke with the College of Business on January 24, 2014
 - Scheduled to meet with the College of Education February 4, 2014
 - Scheduled to meet with the Library on March 4
- Liz Southard is the new GE assistant and is entering GE data and will be taking minutes (except in Feb. when she has other obligations)
- Assessment entry indicates F 2010 96.12%, Sp 2011 90.09%, F2011 90.2%, Sp 2012 81.10%, and F. 2012 84.57% completion of assessment by faculty. Still entering 2013 data.
- K. Arthur met with Ella Schmidt, now the chair of the CAS Academic Programs Committee
 - Kathy reviewed the GE application process and the courses that the APC could expect to see in the near future.
 - During this meeting, concerns were expressed about the courses that have been changed from 4 hour courses to 3 hour courses without formerly going through the Faculty committee.
 - Suggestion was made to flag these classes so changes could be made.
- K. Arthur expressed that we still are unsure who the USFSP Undergraduate Committee chair is and that Tom Ainscough has been unresponsive to her emails since last fall. The committee suggested that the Senate find someone who will engage with the committee to chair the UC, as courses will need review and approval quickly this spring. Deanna said she would address the issue with the Senate again.
- The Committee also discussed the lose of courses submitted to the UG in the last few years. We suggested that the university offer an online submission process/place to prevent this in the future—similar to what most journals now offer. There needs to be pressure put on the Administration to allow/set up an electronic system to submit through the faculty Senate.

➤ **Course Applications**

- Course Application deadline is February 3, 2014- Suggestion was made allow for Dean intervention with classes that have inadequate paperwork
- Committee agrees that everyone on the committee needs access to review all applications
- Documents will be placed on Google Drive
- Suggested that 10 minutes should be spent in meetings reviewing the application per course.
- Applications should be looked at by committee members prior to the meetings
- Committee members volunteered to review different courses. K. Arthur will not distribute this list, so to keep reviewers anonymous
- EVR 2001 Course
 - Class does not have State General Education standing under the SCNS, still investigating if this needs to be sent to SCNS again or if the state law will just stand
 - Tampa campus wants USFSP to change to redo EVR2001 to fit class EVR 2002, but USFSP faculty does not want to change as they already teach EVR 2001 as it is. Tampa's EVR 2002 also does not meet State's requirements. K. Arthur told Tampa we do not want to change EVR 2001
- POS – American Government Course
 - Does not have State General Education standing
 - K. Arthur emailed and is waiting for response
 - There would need to be approval from departments.
- PHI- Decided to hold off on reviewing PHI until next meeting
- ANT 2000 Course status after discussion approved pending revision
- Reviewer Recommendation: Three possible responses to a faculty members application
 - Approved
 - Approved Pending Revisions- non substantive changes
 - Revise and Resubmit- substantial changes and comes back to committee for review
 - Rejected
- Suggestion: If an application is pending, the application should be sent back to the professor for revisions and then resubmitted for committee approval
 - Committee agrees
- Meeting set for February 21, 2014
 - This meeting will be dedicated to only course reviews
 - 10 minutes for each course
 - Deanna Michael will not be able to attend the February 21st meeting

➤ **Assessment Tool**

- Mike is working on the modifications
 - Change to fit 2015 program
 - Working on levels of security

Approved Feb 7, 2014

- No option for being able to use the Assessment Tool off campus
- Getting the tool up so faculty can start entering their own data.
- Planning on showcasing the tool at the next faculty meeting.
 - Faculty will need: ids and passwords
 - There is currently no option to change your password.
- Mike needs to create ids and passwords for all committee members can we use NetID
- Tampa Assessment tool is available to all campuses. Trying to contact Vivian, but not sure who this person is.
- Suggestion: A qualitative assessment option needs to be added to the tool.
- Suggestion: There needs to be a way in the tool to link an individual SLO to a certain assignment. The tool currently does not have this option.

➤ **General Education Day**

- General Education Day is March 21, 2014
 - What does the faculty want to see?
 - We need a plan!
 - Suggestion: After looking at Course Applications, look for patterns and problems. This will give direction on what to discuss with faculty on Gen Ed Day.
 - Suggestion: K. Arthur: Tables
 - Qualitative feedback

➤ **Rubrics**

- K. Arthur provided examples of AACU rubrics and indicated that there is a real push by SACS to have common rubrics for each SLO and that faculty members teaching those course create the rubric.
- Most of the committee members believe that they provide guidance on what they expect, but that a formal rubric is too restrictive and subjective.

➤

2010- 2015
General Education Assessment Plan and Procedures for Student Learning
Outcomes through Critical Assignments

This document was written on ----- in absence of a known written document available to faculty outlining a detailed current (2010 to present) USFSP GE assessment plan.

A Critical Assignments text is available in the USFSP SACs Reaffirmation Comprehensive Standard GE3.5.1 pp. 299-300.

Critical Assignments

Faculty members have developed critical assignments that address student learning outcomes in General Education which include papers, portfolios, individual or group projects and/or presentations, as well as embedded items on examinations. Faculty members establish performance criteria and use scoring rubrics to assess student work. An analytical tool is used by the institution to compile and report General Education assessment findings. The Planning, Effectiveness and Budget Committee (formerly, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee) which was established in 2009-10, supports the institutional effectiveness function of the university and the General Education Committee (GEC) supports the university's assessment function. The GEC is a committee of the Faculty Senate, and the Planning, Effectiveness and Budgeting Committee (PEBC) is a faculty body committee that was established by the Regional Chancellor and that is staffed by the Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness (IRPE). IRPE attends GEC meetings on an *ad hoc* basis and supports their assessment efforts as well. In 2008-09, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) developed the assessment data collection and reporting tool for General Education that was previously mentioned, IRPE compiled assessment materials, and the IEC and GEC co-sponsored University Assessment Day. In this section of the response, findings from several reports prepared by IRPE will be presented including a matrix of course offerings by General Education area which includes the number of sections and total enrollment by semester, and output from the General Education Assessment analytical tool [7].

In 2008-09, University Assessment Day took the form of concurrent meetings of Task Force groups that reviewed and discussed assessment material. The concurrent Task Force meetings were co-chaired by GE Committee members and academic program/department chairs and included participation by faculty members that taught General Education courses. The GE Committee issued a Task Force Report and both the GE committee and IEC together convened a joint meeting in order to review all materials relating to General Education assessment. In 2009-10, the Planning, Effectiveness and Budget Committee (PEBC) was established and together with the GEC co-sponsored University Assessment Day. Like in the previous year, the focus of the meeting was to bring together faculty to review and discuss assessment data. In 2009-10, the General Education Assessment Report was compiled by a faculty member and presented to the PEBC. The PEBC review of the GE Assessment Report includes recommendations for actions to be taken by the GE Committee.

Planning, Effectiveness and Budget and General Education Committees, 2009-2010

Planning, Effectiveness and Budget Committee General Education Committee

Prof. Gary Patterson, COB, PEBC Chair Prof. Morgan Gresham*, CAS, GEC Chair

Prof. Frank Biafora, Dean CAS Prof. Tiffany Chenneville, CAS

Prof. Alison Watkins, COB Prof. John Arthur, CAS

Prof. Zafer Unal, COE Prof. Tom Carter, COB

Ms. Tina Neville, Faculty, Library Prof. Olivia Hodges, COE

Ms. Cynthia Collins, Faculty, Advising Center Ms. Tina Neville, Faculty Library

Ms. Julie Jakway, Budget Director

Ms. Holly Kickliter, Enrollment Services

Dr. Ruby Qin, Student Success Center

Mr. John Dickson, Operation and Maintenance

Dr. J. E. Gonzalez, Director, IRPE

Notes:

In 2010-11, Dr. Gresham who chairs the GE Committee, will also serve on the PEBC.

Also in 2010-11, PEBC members will begin to roll off in staggered terms.

The work of assessment of the General Education Core and Liberal Arts Requirements is a faculty-led exercise and the annual review and discussion of findings by their peers increases accountability and viability of this essential university function,

DRAFT

Learning Outcomes for General Education and Exit-Level Courses USF St. Petersburg

A. English Composition

1. Students will demonstrate rhetorical knowledge by focusing on audience, purpose, context, medium, and message;
2. Students will demonstrate critical thinking, reading, and writing by developing writing over time through a series of tasks including finding, evaluating, analyzing, and synthesizing sources into their own ideas, and discussing language, power, and knowledge;
3. Students will demonstrate composing processes through prewriting, drafting, revising, and editing individually and with peers in a range of composing media;
4. Students will demonstrate knowledge of conventions by controlling tone, mechanics, and documentation in a variety of common formats and genres.
5. Students will demonstrate the ability to work rhetorically in electronic environments throughout the composing process: research, drafting, reviewing, revising, editing and sharing ideas.

B. Quantitative Methods

1. Demonstrate the ability to estimate and to apply arithmetic, algebra, geometry, and statistics appropriately to solve problems, and an awareness of the relevance of these skills to a wide range of disciplines.
2. Demonstrate the ability to represent and evaluate mathematical information numerically, graphically and symbolically.
3. Demonstrate the ability to comprehend mathematical arguments, formulas, and graphical representations, and use these to answer questions, understand the significance of the results and judge their reasonableness.

Natural Sciences

1. Demonstrate an appreciation and understanding of the scientific method of inquiry
2. Demonstrate knowledge of the evidence, ideas, and models that scientists use to make judgments about the natural world.
3. Demonstrate how the ideas and models of the natural sciences relate to societal issues including ethics.

D. Social Sciences

1. Demonstrate knowledge of the methods that social scientists use to investigate the human condition and to formulate basic questions about the nature of social organizations and institutions.
2. Demonstrate knowledge about the role played by factors such as race, age, gender, ethnicity, economic status, environment, etc., in influencing human social interaction.
3. Demonstrate awareness of the ethical dimensions of human behavior and the formation of social, cultural and /or religious values.

E.
Historical Perspectives

1. Demonstrate knowledge of the history of human civilizations, societies and cultures, and an awareness of the human experience and its applicability to the contemporary world through study of political, social, cultural, environmental, and intellectual issues in pre-modern and modern eras.
2. Demonstrate the ability to situate primary historical records in their proper contexts and use these sources to construct historical arguments.

F.
Fine Arts

1. Demonstrate the ability to explain the social, historical, cultural, intellectual and/or ethical contexts of works of creative expression.
2. Demonstrate some knowledge of the stylistic analysis, appropriate vocabulary, symbolism and techniques appropriate to the study of the fine arts and an understanding of the tradition and achievement of the creative process.
3. Demonstrate awareness of the relationship of the fine arts to everyday life.

G.
African , Latin American, Middle Eastern or Asian Perspectives (Africa/AMEA)

1. Demonstrate knowledge of one of the above regions through analysis of examples of those regions/countries' historical or contemporary social, political, economic, environmental, and cultural life.
2. Demonstrate understanding of contemporary interconnections between these regions related to one or more global issues, themes and/or conflicts.

The culmination of the General Education learning experience embodied in the Exit Requirements.

H.
Major Works & Major Issues

1. Demonstrate the knowledge of the impact of one or more of the following on the major issues of a particular discipline: culture, environment, race, gender and/or values and ethics.
2. Demonstrate the ability to critically analyze the primary texts and major documents or works (including visual and musical) of a particular discipline within appropriate context.

I.
Literature and Writing

1. Demonstrate the ability to write a well organized and well substantiated analysis of primary literature and crucial sources in a particular discipline.
2. Demonstrate the ability to determine the nature and extent of information needed, evaluate information and sources critically, and write persuasively through the effective use of evidence derived from credible information sources.

Courses that are listed in a GE Area must address at least one learning outcome in that area.
Courses that are listed in multiple GE areas must address at least one learning outcome in each GE Area.

Insert GE course list by Subject Area

Although the above document is in place, this more detailed plan and history was written so that we may evaluate and review our assessment procedures at USFSP.

Currently, courses fall under 1 or more of the USFSP subject areas: English Composition, Quantitative Methods, Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, Historical Perspectives, Fine Arts, and African, Latin American, Middle Eastern or Asian Perspectives (ALAMEA).

General Education Course Assessment Process

Where to Submit?

Each Fall and Spring semester, all the Faculty teaching GE courses are expected to submit their course assessment of Student Learning Outcomes to the IR Officer, the Q drive, the College of Arts and Sciences Assistant Dean (beginning Fall 2011), or the USFSP Chair (began Fall 2013). The faculty members all submit their assessment on a standardized GE Assessment Form. The form is emailed to the faculty by the IR Officer and in 2012 the email was co-authored by the GE Chair (General Education Committee, a faculty committee of the USFSP Faculty Senate). The email with the attached assessment template is sent out at the end of each Fall and Spring semester. The form also is available on the IR and General Education websites. A list of the GE courses and their corresponding Subject Areas and Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) also are available on the websites. The IR officer is responsible for amassing the data in a database and creating summary tables to be available to the faculty.

What to Submit?

All General Education Courses, regardless of teaching format (DL, face to face, etc.) are assessed in the same manner as written below.

The GE Assessment Form was created by the IR Officer and has proceeded through several versions (2008-sp2010; F2010-2011; 2012-present- attached below). The forms required faculty to indicate the SLOs covered in their courses, the critical assignments addressing the SLO, rubric, criteria for success, and the number and percent of students who meet or do not meet each SLO.

Completing the Assessment Form:

Faculty teaching General Education courses are allowed to select one, all, or several of the Student Learning Outcomes listed for each subject area for assessment in their course.

Filling out the Current Form: Please indicate on the form: At the top of the form indicate the Semester, Course, Faculty name, and which Subject Area the course is part of. Faculty should list for each Critical Assignment—the type of assignment, which SLO or SLOs are being filled, threshold performance (what is the cut off number for the critical assignment for the student having met or not met the SLO). Faculty may also submit comments about the assessment and/or compare assessments from previous semesters.

GE Committee and Faculty-wide Assessment Meetings

In the Fall of 2011, the GE committee began to request from the IR officer a list of faculty compliance per each semester and tables summarizing the data, which is documented in their GE minutes. This would allow the committee to request missing data from the faculty and to arrange a GE day for faculty discussion of the assessment. However, this data was not presented to the committee in full until October 2013. At that point it appeared that compliance was 60-70% and the GE chair undertook contacting faculty to collect the missing GE data, which resulted in 80-90% compliance per semester. The GE Committee then arranged a GE Day meeting in the spring 2014 for faculty to review, discuss, and provide a use of the results for the data from Fall 2010 to Fall 2013.

DRAFT

Insert 2008-2010 Assessment Form
Insert 2010-2012 Assessment Form
Insert 2012-2015 Assessment Form

DRAFT

General Education Assessment Report

This form approved by the USFSP Institutional Effectiveness Committee 9/25/2008

COURSE TITLE SEMESTER

COURSE PREFIX AND NUMBER PROGRAM

PROFESSOR NAME

GENERAL EDUCATION AREA

OUTCOME

your case only risk etc

ASSIGNMENT: Describe the assignment(s) or embedded items that measure each outcome. If possible, include scoring rubric. If you attach additional materials, please check box Attachment

NOTE: The attached assignment addresses two outcomes: #1 & #2 - I was unable to select more than 1 Outcome.
Service Learning Review Article (50 Points)
Due April 27th, 2007
Carefully read the article handed out in class: Larson, et. al. (1999) Changes in Adolescents' Daily Interactions With Their Families From Ages 10 to 18: Disengagement and Transformation. Summarize the article on the first page of your five page (typed, double spaced, APA Style) paper. Then respond to the following questions:
1. What might the consequences be for adolescents of spending less time with their families in the way depicted by this article? *← the rest of this document*

CRITERIA: What level of student performance is required for successful completion of the assignment or embedded items? (example: 85% of items correct = PASS)

MUST
Each student was to earn 70% of the 50 points to pass. The cutoff score was 35.
Sixty-nine percent of the students in this semester passed this assignment (18/26).

FINDINGS: Briefly summarize and interpret the raw data provided on the next page. Did these findings indicate improvement from previous semester? Were there exceptional circumstances? etc.

Attached, please find a detailed summary for each student, assignment grade, and overall course grade. The correlation between the assignment grade and the final grade in the course was $r=.70$.

ACTIONS: Briefly describe any changes that were made to the course as a result of these findings

There are a number of specific changes I made in this assignment. This assignment was discussed orally and in the syllabus at the beginning of the class in the following semester. Because this was the first semester this Outcome was used, I did not focus their attention on this as much as I might have. Instead of requiring students to review only 1 article, they were a number of original articles cited from each chapter in the text which cut across topics such as neonatal development, newborns, toddlers through adolescents. These were placed on Blackboard and they were to select one article of particular interest to them and review this.

Please attach the following items to this document

1. COURSE SYLLABUS

- * Syllabus should describe at least 1 general education goal
- * Syllabus should describe at least 1 outcome per goal

2. EXAMPLES OF STUDENT WORK

- * Include at least 1 example of poor student performance per assignment
- * Include at least 1 example of good student performance per assignment

STUDENT PERFORMANCE DATA

Attachment

If possible, paste your course roster data in the box below, indicating individual student performance on each assignment. If you have a large number of students, you may simply provide summary information. (Indicate the number and percentage of students who achieved various scores, i.e., 90-100%, 80-89%, etc.) If you attached this information, please check box

I did not save the papers from this semester and cannot provide work samples from this year. They are available, however, from the following year.

DRAFT

General Education Assessment

– Fall 2010 and Spring 2011

Dear Colleagues,

Thank you for your continued effort in assessment of student learning in general education and exit-level courses. Your hard work in 2008-09 helped us regain our accreditation status. Your efforts in 2009-2010 are included in the Compliance Certification document being submitted to SACS in September; but we must continue our assessment efforts in order to earn re-affirmation in 2010-2011.

In 2010-2011, we will continue to require electronic copies of your syllabi but we also request that you facilitate the review of student learning outcomes by adding specific information to your syllabus.

1. Syllabus Information

Syllabi for General Education and Exit-level courses **must** include information about Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). In addition to the syllabi requirements which may be requested by individual colleges, for university accreditation purposes syllabi should include a clearly labeled section that details Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs).

General Education/Exit-level Course Student Learning Outcomes

This course addresses the following general education student learning outcome(s):
General Education / Exit-level Course Area(s)
Student Learning Outcome(s) for each area

For this year we will continue to collect and compile course-level and student-level data centrally and hand-enter the information into our assessment tool. This year we request two new items that we believe will facilitate and enrich data reporting back to the faculty.

2a. Course-level Data

At the beginning of each semester, faculty will be required to submit course-level data to the Institutional Research Office. As before, course-level data includes:

Instructor Name | Course Prefix/Number and Section | Course Title

General Education / Exit-level Area(s) | Student Learning Outcome(s) [SLOs]

And for each SLO:

1. Title of Critical Assignment
2. Brief Description of Critical Assignment
3. Criteria that correspond to “meeting” or “not meeting” standard

New this year...

4. Characterize the assignment(s) that address each SLO

5. Include the rubric or scoring system used to evaluate student work

2b. Student-level Data

At the end of each semester, at the time that final grades are posted, faculty will be required to submit student-level data to the Institutional Research Office. As

before, rosters will be provided to faculty and faculty will indicate student performance as: “meets / does not meet standard.”

To download these instructions, please go to the IR website:
www.stpete.usf.edu/ir

A new email address is dedicated to assessment submissions:
assessment@stpete.usf.edu

For more information, please contact:
J. E. Gonzalez
727.873-4716
jegon@mail.usf.edu

Due Dates

Within the **first month** of each semester, an electronic copy of your course syllabus and your general education course-level assessment information is due to the Office of Institutional Research.

At the **end of each semester**, when final grades are posted to Blackboard, your student-level assessment information is due to the Office of Institutional Research.

Please submit your syllabus electronically and your course-level data either electronically or in paper form.

Electronic submissions:
E-mail to: assessment@stpete.usf.edu
Subject Line: GE Assessment

Paper submissions:
BAY 212 (in the Regional Chancellor’s Suite: BAY 208)

Learning Outcomes for General Education and Exit-Level Courses

USF St. Petersburg

A. English Composition

1. Students will demonstrate rhetorical knowledge by focusing on audience, purpose, context, medium, and message;
2. Students will demonstrate critical thinking, reading, and writing by developing writing over time through a series of tasks including finding, evaluating, analyzing, and synthesizing sources into their own ideas, and discussing language, power, and knowledge;
3. Students will demonstrate composing processes through prewriting, drafting, revising, and editing individually and with peers in a range of composing media;
4. Students will demonstrate knowledge of conventions by controlling tone, mechanics, and documentation in a variety of common formats and genres.

B. Quantitative Methods

1. Demonstrate the ability to estimate and to apply arithmetic, algebra, geometry, and statistics appropriately to solve problems, and an awareness of the relevance of these skills to a wide range of disciplines.
2. Demonstrate the ability to represent and evaluate mathematical information numerically, graphically and symbolically.
3. Demonstrate the ability to comprehend mathematical arguments, formulas, and graphical representations, and use these to answer questions, understand the significance of the results and judge their reasonableness.

C. Natural Sciences

1. Demonstrate an appreciation and understanding of the scientific method and inquiry.
2. Demonstrate knowledge of the evidence, ideas, and models that scientists use to make judgments about the natural world.
3. Demonstrate how the ideas and models of the natural sciences relate to societal issues, including ethics.

D. Social Sciences

1. Demonstrate knowledge of the methods that social scientists use to investigate the human condition and to formulate basic questions about the nature of social organizations and institutions.
2. Demonstrate knowledge about the role played by factors such as race, age, gender, ethnicity, economic status, environment, etc., in influencing human social interaction.
3. Demonstrate awareness of the ethical dimensions of human behavior and the formation of social, cultural and/or religious values.

E. Historical Perspectives

1. Demonstrate knowledge of the history of human civilizations, societies and cultures, and an awareness of the human experience and its applicability to the contemporary world through study of political, social, cultural, environmental, and intellectual issues in pre-modern and modern eras.
2. Demonstrate the ability to situate primary sources in their proper contexts and use these sources to construct historical arguments.

F. Fine Arts

1. Demonstrate the ability to explain the socio-historical, cultural, intellectual and/or ethical contexts of works of creative expression.
2. Demonstrate some knowledge of the stylistic analysis, appropriate vocabulary, symbolism and techniques appropriate to the study of the fine arts and an understanding of the tradition and achievement of the creative process.
3. Demonstrate awareness of the relationship of the fine arts to everyday life.

G. African, Latin American, Middle Eastern or Asian Perspectives (ALAMEA)

1. Demonstrate knowledge of one of the above regions through analysis of examples of those regions/countries' historical or contemporary social, political, economic, environmental, and/or cultural life.
2. Demonstrate understanding of contemporary interconnections between these regions related to one or more global issues, themes and/or conflicts.

The culmination of the General Education learning experience is embodied in the Exit Requirements.

H. Major Works & Major Issues

1. Demonstrate the knowledge of the impact of one or more of the following on the major issues of a particular discipline: culture, environment, race, gender, and/or values and ethics.
2. Demonstrate the ability to critically analyze the primary texts and major documents or works (including visual and musical) of a particular discipline within appropriate context.

I. Literature and Writing

1. Demonstrate the ability to write a well organized and well substantiated analysis of primary literature and crucial sources in a particular discipline.
2. Demonstrate the ability to determine the nature and extent of information needed, evaluate information and sources critically, and write persuasively through the effective use of evidence derived from credible information sources.

Courses that are listed in a GE Area must address at least one learning outcome in that area.

Courses that are listed in multiple GE areas must address at least one learning outcome in each GE Area.

Rubrics and Scoring Systems

The three examples below are based on the work of Mary Allen (2004). Assessing Academic Programs in Higher Education. Ankor: MA. (pp. 138-141). Allen notes that rubrics: "...are explicit schemes for classifying products or behaviors into categories that are steps along a continuum..." adding that these steps generally range from "unacceptable" to "exemplary." Allen also notes that two major types of rubrics are holistic and analytical. Holistic rubrics: "...describe how one global, holistic judgment is made" while analytical rubrics: "...involve making a series of judgments, each assessing a characteristic of the product being evaluated."

Example of a Holistic Rubric

Level	Description
Inadequate	Insert description of inadequate work
Developing	Insert description of developing work
Acceptable	Insert description of acceptable work
Sophisticated	Insert description of sophisticated work

Example of an Analytical Rubric

	Level of Performance		
Product	Low	Good	Exceptional
A	Insert description for each level of work for product A		
B	Insert description for each level of work for Product B		
C	Insert description for each level of work for Product C		

Example of an Analytical Rubric that includes a Scoring System

	Level of Performance			Score
Product	Low	Good	Exceptional	
A	Description (0-2)	Description (3-5)	Description (6-8)	(0-8)
B	Description (0-2)	Description (3-5)	Description (6-8)	(0-8)
C	Description (0-2)	Description (3-5)	Description (6-8)	(0-8)
Total Score	()	()	()	(0-24)

The example of a rubric below is adapted from Barbara E. Walvoord (2004). Assessment Clear and Simple. Jossey-Bass: CA. (p. 88). On the exam, students were instructed to take a position on a debatable issue concerning the interpretation of the literature studied. Scoring follows:

- 5 points: Student takes a defensible position on the issue posed in the exam question and states the position clearly. Position does not merely state the obvious or parrot one of the readings, but shows a creative mind at work.
- 4 points: Student takes a defensible position on the issue posed in the exam and states the position clearly. Position may be somewhat obvious or closely parallel one of the readings.
- 3 points: Student takes a defensible position on the issue posed in the exam and states the position clearly, but the position may state the obvious or simply paraphrase one of the readings.
- 2 points: Student takes a defensible position on the issue posed in the exam, but the statement is ambiguous, carelessly stated, or must be deferred.
- 1 point: student does not clearly state a defensible position, or position is not defensible, or position is irrelevant to the question posed in the exam.

Other names in the assessment literature include: Trudy Banta, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) and Amy Driscoll, CSU Monterey Bay (CSUMB).

General Education Assessment – Fall 2010 and Spring 2011

_____ Fall 2010, _____ Spring 2011 Course Prefix/Number/Section: _____
 Instructor Name: _____ Ext. #: _____
 Department/Program Chair: _____

Each general education or exit-level course must address at least one Student Learning Outcome (SLO) per GE area and courses that support multiple GE areas must address at least one SLO per area. For assessment purposes, critical assignments that address SLOs must be described and the criteria for assessing student performance must be detailed.

A single (or multiple) critical assignment(s) or may address a single (or multiple) SLO(s). When assignment(s) address a single SLO, please complete one GE/SLO data box. When assignment(s) address multiple SLOs then please complete as many GE/SLO data boxes as may be required to fully describe the assessment process in your course such that critical assignments are clearly linked to SLOs.

General Education Area and Student Learning Outcome					
A. English Composition	<input type="checkbox"/> A1	<input type="checkbox"/> A2	<input type="checkbox"/> A3	<input type="checkbox"/> A4	Combination Areas (specify Area SLOs):
B. Quantitative Methods	<input type="checkbox"/> B1	<input type="checkbox"/> B2	<input type="checkbox"/> B3		<input type="checkbox"/> D & E
C. Natural Sciences	<input type="checkbox"/> C1	<input type="checkbox"/> C2	<input type="checkbox"/> C3		<input type="checkbox"/> D & G
D. Social Sciences	<input type="checkbox"/> D1	<input type="checkbox"/> D2	<input type="checkbox"/> D3		<input type="checkbox"/> E & F
E. Historical Perspectives	<input type="checkbox"/> E1	<input type="checkbox"/> E2			<input type="checkbox"/> E & G
F. Fine Arts	<input type="checkbox"/> F1	<input type="checkbox"/> F2	<input type="checkbox"/> F3		<input type="checkbox"/> D, E & G
G. ALAMEA	<input type="checkbox"/> G1	<input type="checkbox"/> G2			
<u>Exit Level Areas:</u>					
H. Major Works/Issues	<input type="checkbox"/> H1	<input type="checkbox"/> H2			<input type="checkbox"/> H1
I. Lit & Writing	<input type="checkbox"/> I1	<input type="checkbox"/> I2			

Critical Assignment #1 Test, Paper, Presentation/Project, Group Presentation/Project,
 Other (specify): _____

Title: _____

Brief Description: _____

Criteria: "Meets Standard" = _____
 "Does not Meet Standard" = _____

If you use a rubric or scoring system to evaluate student work, please describe or attach.

Critical Assignment #2 Test, Paper, Presentation/Project, Group Presentation/Project,
 Other (specify): _____

Title: _____

Brief Description: _____

Criteria: "Meets Standard" = _____
 "Does not Meet Standard" = _____

If you use a rubric or scoring system to evaluate student work, please describe or attach.

Critical Assignment #3 Test, Paper, Presentation/Project, Group Presentation/Project,
 Other (specify): _____

Title: _____

Brief Description: _____

Criteria: "Meets Standard" = _____
 "Does not Meet Standard" = _____

If you use a rubric or scoring system to evaluate student work, please describe or attach.

Please Save Your File As: Semester_Year_Course_Subject_Number_Section_Instructor Last Name
 Example: Sp 11 MAC 1140 601 Asano

GE Assessment Tool

Semester / Year:
 Course Subject / Number / Section:
 Instructor:

GE or Exi-level Area (see SLOs)	Place 'X' next to SLO	End of Semester Data						End of Semester Data						End of Semester Data									
		Critical Assignment(s)	Place 'X' next to Code	Place 'X' if Scoring Rubric is Used	Threshold for Meeting Performance Standard	No. of Students Graded	No. of Students that Met Standard	No. of Students that Did Not Meet Standard	Critical Assignment 2	Place 'X' next to Code	Place 'X' if Scoring Rubric is Used	Threshold for Meeting Performance Standard	No. of Students Graded	No. of Students that Met Standard	No. of Students that Did Not Meet Standard	Critical Assignment 3	Place 'X' next to Code	Place 'X' if Scoring Rubric is Used	Threshold for Meeting Performance Standard	No. of Students Graded	No. of Students that Met Standard	No. of Students that Did Not Meet Standard	
A1		Critical Assignment #1						Critical Assignment 2							Critical Assignment 3								
A2		Test					Test									Test							
A3		Final Exam					Final Exam									Final Exam							
A4		Paper*					Paper*									Paper*							
B1		Comprehensive Research Paper*					Comprehensive Research Paper*									Comprehensive Research Paper*							
B2		Presentation/Project*					Presentation/Project*									Presentation/Project*							
B3		Group Presentation/Project*					Group Presentation/Project*									Group Presentation/Project*							
C1		Other (Describe)					Other (Describe)									Other (Describe)							
C2																							
C3																							
D1		Critical Assignment #2																					
D2		Test					Test									Test							
D3		Final Exam					Final Exam									Final Exam							
E1		Paper*					Paper*									Paper*							
E2		Comprehensive Research Paper*					Comprehensive Research Paper*									Comprehensive Research Paper*							
F1		Presentation/Project*					Presentation/Project*									Presentation/Project*							
F2		Group Presentation/Project*					Group Presentation/Project*									Group Presentation/Project*							
F3		Other (Describe)					Other (Describe)									Other (Describe)							
G1																							
G2																							
H1		Critical Assignment #3																					
H2		Test					Test							Test									
I1		Final Exam					Final Exam							Final Exam									
I2		Paper*					Paper*							Paper*									
J2		Comprehensive Research Paper*					Comprehensive Research Paper*							Comprehensive Research Paper*									
D & E		Presentation/Project*					Presentation/Project*							Presentation/Project*									
D & G		Presentation/Project*					Presentation/Project*							Presentation/Project*									
E & F		Group Presentation/Project*					Group Presentation/Project*							Group Presentation/Project*									
E & G		Other (Describe)					Other (Describe)							Other (Describe)									
D, E & G																							
H & I																							

DRAFT

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

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.

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 mode might be especially useful in some fields. If insight into the process components of critical thinking (e.g., how information sources were evaluated regardless of whether they were included in the product) is important, assignments focused on student reflection might be especially illuminating.

Glossary

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

- **Ambiguity:** Information that may be interpreted in more than one way.
- **Assumptions:** Ideas, conditions, or beliefs (often implicit or unstated) that are "taken for granted or accepted as true without proof." (quoted from www.dictionary.reference.com/browse/assumptions)
- **Context:** The historical, ethical, political, cultural, environmental, or circumstantial settings or conditions that influence and complicate the consideration of 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" is intended to convey an intensity of emotion, not a skin color.

CRITICAL THINKING VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org



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.

	Capstone 4	Milestones		Benchmark 1
		3	2	
Explanation of issues	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description.
Evidence <i>Selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion</i>	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly.	Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning.	Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning.	Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/evaluation. Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question.
Influence of context and assumptions	Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.	Identifies own and others' assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.	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).	Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions). Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position.
Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis)	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) are acknowledged. Others' points of view are synthesized within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue. Others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue.	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious.
Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences)	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.	Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified.

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 can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

Definition

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

Quantitative Literacy Across the Disciplines

Current trends in general education reform demonstrate that faculty are recognizing the steadily growing importance of Quantitative Literacy (QL) in an increasingly quantitative and data-dense world. AAC&U's recent survey showed that concerns about QL skills are shared by employers, who recognize that many of today's students will need a wide range of high level quantitative skills to complete their work responsibilities. 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 the other 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.

QUANTITATIVE LITERACY VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org



Definition

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

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

	Capstone 4	Milestones		1
		3	2	
Interpretation <i>Ability to explain information presented in mathematical forms (e.g., equations, graphs, diagrams, tables, words)</i>	Provides accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms. Makes appropriate inferences based on that information. <i>For example, accurately explains the trend data shown in a graph and makes reasonable predictions regarding what the data suggest about future events.</i>	Provides accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms. <i>For instance, accurately explains the trend data shown in a graph.</i>	Provides somewhat accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms, but occasionally makes minor errors related to computations or units. <i>For instance, accurately explains trend data shown in a graph, but may miscalculate the slope of the trend line.</i>	Attempts to explain information presented in mathematical forms, but draws incorrect conclusions about what the information means. <i>For example, attempts to explain the trend data shown in a graph, but will frequently misinterpret the nature of that trend, perhaps by confusing positive and negative trends.</i>
Representation <i>Ability to convert relevant information into various mathematical forms (e.g., equations, graphs, diagrams, tables, words)</i>	Skillfully converts relevant information into an insightful mathematical portrayal in a way that contributes to a further or deeper understanding.	Competently converts relevant information into an appropriate and desired mathematical portrayal.	Completes conversion of information but resulting mathematical portrayal is only partially appropriate or accurate.	Completes conversion of information but resulting mathematical portrayal is inappropriate or inaccurate.
Calculation	Calculations attempted are essentially all successful and sufficiently comprehensive to solve the problem. Calculations are also presented elegantly (clearly, concisely, etc.)	Calculations attempted are essentially all successful and sufficiently comprehensive to solve the problem.	Calculations attempted are either unsuccessful or represent only a portion of the calculations required to comprehensively solve the problem.	Calculations are attempted but are both unsuccessful and are not comprehensive.
Application / Analysis <i>Ability to make judgments and draw appropriate conclusions based on the quantitative analysis of data, while recognizing the limits of this analysis</i>	Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for deep and thoughtful judgments, drawing insightful, carefully qualified conclusions from this work.	Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for competent judgments, drawing reasonable and appropriately qualified conclusions from this work.	Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for workmanlike (without inspiration or nuance, ordinary) judgments, drawing plausible conclusions from this work.	Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for tentative, basic judgments, although is hesitant or uncertain about drawing conclusions from this work.
Assumptions <i>Ability to make and evaluate important assumptions in estimation, modeling, and data analysis</i>	Explicitly describes assumptions and provides compelling rationale for why each assumption is appropriate. Shows awareness that confidence in final conclusions is limited by the accuracy of the assumptions.	Explicitly describes assumptions and provides compelling rationale for why assumptions are appropriate.	Explicitly describes assumptions.	Attempts to describe assumptions.
Communication <i>Expressing quantitative evidence in support of the argument or purpose of the work (in terms of what evidence is used and how it is formatted, presented, and contextualized)</i>	Uses quantitative information in connection with the argument or purpose of the work, presents it in an effective format, and explicates it with consistently high quality.	Uses quantitative information in connection with the argument or purpose of the work, though data may be presented in a less than completely effective format or some parts of the explication may be uneven.	Uses quantitative information, but does not effectively connect it to the argument or purpose of the work.	Presents an argument for which quantitative evidence is pertinent, but does not provide adequate explicit numerical support. (May use quasi-quantitative words such as "many," "few," "increasing," "small," and the like in place of actual quantities.)

WRITTEN COMMUNICATION VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org



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

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.

Framing Language

This writing rubric is designed for use in a wide variety of educational institutions. The most clear finding to emerge from decades of research on writing assessment is that the best writing assessments are locally determined and sensitive to local context and mission. Users of this rubric should, in the end, consider making adaptations and additions that clearly link the language of the rubric to individual campus contexts.

This rubric focuses assessment on how specific written work samples or collections of work respond to specific contexts. The central question guiding the rubric is "How well does writing respond to the needs of audience(s) for the work?" In focusing on this question the rubric does not attend to other aspects of writing that are equally important: issues of writing process, writing strategies, writers' fluency with different modes of textual production or publication, or writer's growing engagement with writing and disciplinarity through the process of writing.

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 and surface conventions, and citational systems used in the writing? This will enable evaluators to have a clear sense of how writers understand the assignments and take it into consideration as they evaluate.

The first section of this rubric addresses the context and purpose for writing. A work sample or collections of work can convey the context and purpose for the writing tasks it showcases by including the writing assignments associated with work samples. But writers may also convey the context and purpose for their writing within the texts. It is important for faculty and institutions to include directions for students about how they should represent their writing contexts and purposes.

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)

Glossary

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

- **Content Development:** The ways in which the text explores and represents its topic in relation to its audience and purpose.
- **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 work through complexity or confusion; they might want to argue with other writers, or connect with other writers; they might want to convey urgency or amuse; they might write for themselves or for an assignment or to remember.
- **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 thesis or hypothesis, expectations for kinds of evidence and support that are appropriate to the task at hand, use of primary and secondary sources to provide evidence and support arguments and to document critical perspectives on the topic. 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.
- **Evidence:** Source material that is used to extend, in purposeful ways, writers' ideas in a text.
- **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.
- **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.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATION VALUE RUBRIC

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.

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

	Capstone 4	Milestones		Benchmark 1
		3	2	
Context of and Purpose for Writing <i>Includes considerations of audience, purpose, and the circumstances surrounding the writing task(s).</i>	Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.	Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus on the assigned task(s) (e.g., the task aligns with audience, purpose, and context).	Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).	Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).
Content Development	Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work.	Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work.	Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work.	Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work.
Genre and Disciplinary Conventions <i>Formal and informal rules inherent in the expectations for writing in particular forms and/or academic fields (please see glossary).</i>	Demonstrates detailed attention to and successful execution of a wide range of conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task (s) including organization, content, presentation, formatting, and stylistic choices	Demonstrates consistent use of important conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s), including organization, content, presentation, and stylistic choices	Follows expectations appropriate to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) for basic organization, content, and presentation	Attempts to use a consistent system for basic organization and presentation.
Sources and Evidence	Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing	Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are situated within the discipline and genre of the writing.	Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing.	Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the writing.
Control of Syntax and Mechanics	Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free.	Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the portfolio has few errors.	Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors.	Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.