UCA CORE

RUBRIC TASK FORCE

Report and Recommendations

Submitted to the

UCA Core Council

October 7, 2014

CONTENTS

UCA CORE RUBRIC TASK FORCE

Charge:

- Review feedback about the UCA Core rubrics from instructors who used them during the 2013-2014 academic year;
- Recommend to the UCA Core Council any needed substantive changes to the UCA Core student learning goals and outcomes;
- Recommend to the UCA Core Council any changes to the UCA Core rubrics, independent of recommended changes to the student learning goals and outcomes.

Members:

- Kurt Boniecki (Chair)
- Noel Campbell (CoB)
- Patty Phelps (CoE)
- Katherine Bray (CFAC)
- Susan Gatto (CHBS)
- Wendy Lucas (CLA)
- Rick Tarkka (CNSM)

Meetings:

- June 3, 2014, 1:30 – 4:00
- June 10, 2014, 1:30 – 4:00
- June 17, 2014, 1:30 – 4:00
- June 20, 2014, 1:00 – 4:00
- June 26, 2014, 1:30 – 4:00
- July 1, 2014, 1:30 – 4:00
- July 3, 2014, 2:30 – 5:00

Reports to: The Director of the UCA Core and the UCA Core Council

BACKGROUND

In the Spring of 2012, the General Education Council renamed the UCA general education program "The UCA Core" and approved the following mission and core values:

> **UCA CORE MISSION:** The UCA Core is designed to help students develop the knowledge and skills necessary for critical inquiry, effective communication, and responsible living in a diverse and changing world.

> **CORE VALUES:** The overarching goal of the program is to develop curious, knowledgeable, articulate, and ethical people who are prepared for greater success in future learning and who are willing and able to make effective contributions to their communities.

In the Fall of 2012, following a Summer task force recommendation and considerable campus input, the General Education Council revised the general education curriculum to achieve the mission and support the core values of the new UCA Core. The UCA Core was approved by the General Education Council, The Council of Deans, the Provost, the President, the Board of Trustees, and endorsed by the Faculty Senate and Student Government Association in early 2013.

In contrast to the former general education program that organized a curriculum of lower-division courses around disciplinary areas, the new UCA Core includes lower-division and upper-division courses organized around four general knowledge and skill areas. From the UCA Core Program website (http://uca.edu/gened, October 6, 2014):

> The UCA Core is a cohesive course of study carried through all four years that builds core competencies around the four general education knowledge and skill areas:
> - **critical inquiry** - the ability to analyze new problems and situations to formulate informed opinions and conclusions;
> - **effective communication** – the ability to develop and present ideas logically and effectively to enhance communication and collaboration with diverse individuals and groups;
> - **responsible living** – the ability to address real-world problems and find ethical solutions for individuals and society;
> - **diversity**—the ability to analyze familiar cultural assumptions in the context of the world's diverse values, traditions, and belief systems as well as to analyze the major ideas, techniques, and processes that inform creative works within different cultural and historical contexts

The UCA Core Council (formerly the General Education Council) also approved the following learning goals and outcomes associated with each general education knowledge and skill area:

Critical Inquiry

Goal #1: Demonstrate a knowledge base that helps them ask more informed questions and learn more complex concepts
a. Demonstrate an understanding of the basic concepts and principles in the discipline
b. Find and evaluate appropriate information based on knowledge of subject and technology
c. Apply appropriate modes of academic inquiry and analysis to develop and evaluate a position on significant questions in the discipline

Goal #2: Use scientific, quantitative, and computational processes in order to solve real-world problems
a. Apply scientific processes to solve problems
b. Apply quantitative and computational processes to solve problems

Diversity

Goal #1: Analyze their own cultural assumptions in the context of the world's diverse values, traditions, and belief systems
a. Articulate one's own cultural values and assumptions
b. Compare cultural values across a range of cultures
c. Respond to complex questions with answers that reflect multiple cultural perspectives

Goal #2: Analyze the major ideas, techniques, and processes that inform creative works within different cultural and historical contexts
a. Identify creative techniques and processes and their relationship to ideas and themes in creative works
b. Evaluate the relationship between creative works and the cultural and historical context in which they are created

Effective Communication

Goal #1: Develop and present ideas logically and effectively in order to enhance communication and collaboration with diverse individuals and groups
a. Use appropriate conventions and strategies in oral communication for various audiences and purposes
b. Use appropriate conventions and strategies in written communication for various audiences and purposes

c. Individually apply appropriate verbal and nonverbal strategies to promote collaboration

Responsible Living

Goal #1: Describe ways in which ethical principles affect human choices.
a. Explain ethical dimensions of human choices.

Goal #2: Analyze the effect that decisions have on self, others, and the environment.
a. Recognize the consequences of decision making.

Goal #3: Evaluate and practice strategies leading to individual and social well-being.
a. Evaluate practices that lead to personal and social well-being.

In the Spring of 2013, the UCA Core Council drafted rubrics to assess the learning goals and outcomes of the UCA Core, and decided to pilot the rubrics during the following academic year. A voluntary group of faculty members teaching lower-division and upper-division UCA Core courses in the Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 semesters used the rubrics and provided feedback to the Director of the UCA Core. The pilot rubrics are available in Appendix A.

FEEDBACK FROM THE RUBRIC PILOT

Faculty members who used the rubrics were asked to rate their agreement with the following 10 statements using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree):

1. This rubric made grading the assignment faster or easier.
2. This rubric allowed my grading to be more consistent.
3. The traits (rows) in this rubric were applicable to my class.
4. The traits (rows) in this rubric were applicable to my assignment.
5. The descriptions of the traits (cells) were applicable to my class.
6. The descriptions of the traits (cells) were applicable to my assignment.
7. The traits were well defined.
8. The descriptions of the traits were well defined.
9. Overall, this was a "useful" rubric.
10. Overall, this was a "useable" rubric.

We conducted a factor analysis of the ratings. A factor analysis is a statistical procedure that helps researchers reduce the overall number of measures by identifying underlying "factors" correlated to the survey items. The analysis identified two factors; one factor correlated to the grading items (1 and 2) and the other factor correlated to the applicable/well defined/useful/usable items (3 – 10). Therefore, each respondent's ratings of items 1 and 2 were averaged for an index of the degree that the rubric helped grading, and each respondent's ratings of items 3 – 10 were averaged for an index of the general utility (applicable/well defined/useful/usable) of the rubric. Tables 1 and 2 show means for each index across respondents broken down by rubric and division (upper or lower).

Table 1: Mean Index of Helped Grading (Items 1 & 2) by Rubric & Division

Rubric	Lower Division N	Lower Division Mean	Upper Division N	Upper Division Mean	Total N	Total Mean	Min	Max
Communication Goal #1, Outcome A	3	2.33	7	3.86	10	2.80	1.00	4.00
Communication Goal #1, Outcome B	6	2.25	11	2.86	17	2.65	1.00	4.00
Communication Goal #1, Outcome C	5	2.70	4	1.75	9	2.28	1.00	4.00
Critical Inquiry Goal #1	5	2.50	13	2.85	18	2.75	1.00	4.00
Critical Inquiry Goal #2, Outcome A	1	3.00	2	3.50	3	3.33	3.00	4.00
Critical Inquiry Goal #2, Outcome B	0	-	3	3.67	3	3.67	3.00	4.00
Diversity Goal #1	4	3.38	9	2.28	13	2.62	1.00	5.00
Diversity Goal #2	1	3.00	2	2.25	3	2.50	2.00	3.00
Responsible Living Goal #1, #2, & #3	2	2.25	7	2.25	9	2.44	1.00	3.50
Total	32	2.72	58	2.78	90	2.71	1.00	5.00

As can be seen in Table 1, ratings of the rubrics' utility for grading assignments were mixed, but on average, instructors slightly disagreed that they helped grading. Two exceptions were the rubrics for Critical Inquiry Goal #2, Outcomes A and B; three out of the six instructors

who used those rubrics agreed that they helped grading, whereas the other three neither agreed nor disagreed. Although overall there was little difference between lower-division and upper-division instructors, those that used the Communication Goal #1, Outcome A (oral communication) rubric in upper-division courses thought it helped grading, whereas those who used the same rubric in lower-division courses did not agree. On the other hand, those who used the Diversity Goal #1 rubric in lower-division courses thought it helped grading, but not those who used the same rubric in upper-division courses.

Table 2: Mean Index of General Utility (Items 3 - 10) by Rubric & Division

	Lower Division		Upper Division		Total			
Rubric	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	Min	Max
Communication Goal #1, Outcome A	3	1.83	7	3.18	10	2.78	1.25	3.75
Communication Goal #1, Outcome B	6	3.15	11	3.16	17	3.15	1.00	4.63
Communication Goal #1, Outcome C	6	3.48	4	2.31	10	3.01	1.00	4.25
Critical Inquiry Goal #1	5	3.25	13	3.18	18	3.20	2.00	4.00
Critical Inquiry Goal #2, Outcome A	1	1.75	2	3.13	3	2.67	1.75	3.13
Critical Inquiry Goal #2, Outcome B	0	-	3	3.54	3	3.54	3.00	4.00
Diversity Goal #1	5	3.58	9	2.65	14	2.98	1.00	4.38
Diversity Goal #2	1	3.75	2	3.50	3	3.58	3.25	3.75
Responsible Living Goal #1, #2, & #3	2	3.25	7	3.25	9	2.81	1.00	4.50
Total	36	3.15	58	3.07	94	3.06	1.00	4.63

As can be seen in Table 2, instructors' perceptions of the general utility of the rubrics were also very mixed. Some instructors using a particular rubric agreed that it applied to their courses and assignments, was well defined, and was useful and usable, whereas other instructors using the same rubric disagreed. As a result, average ratings were very close to the Likert scale midpoint (3), reflecting a somewhat equal difference of opinion. Two exceptions were the rubrics for Critical Inquiry Goal #2, Outcome B, and Diversity Goal #2. The three instructors who used the Critical Inquiry Goal #2, Outcome B rubric, on average, agreed that the rubric was generally applicable, well defined, useful, and usable. Also, the three instructors who used the Diversity Goal #2 rubric, on average, had similarly positive views.

Overall, the mean index of general utility did not differ between lower-division and upper-division instructors; however, there were three notable exceptions. Similar to the grading index, upper-division instructors using the Communication Goal #1, Outcome A (oral communication) rubric had much more positive views of the rubric's applicability, usefulness, and usability than did lower-division instructors. In contrast, the Communication Goal #1, Outcome C (collaboration) rubric was viewed as more applicable, useful, and usable by lower-division instructors than by upper-division instructors. Likewise, lower-division instructors rated the Diversity Goal #1 rubric more positively than the upper-division instructors who used the same rubric.

Faculty members who used the rubrics were also asked to respond to the following open-ended questions:

1. Was this rubric useful to you, and was this rubric useable in your class? If so, how, or why? If not, why not? Please respond regarding both the usefulness and the useable-ness of the rubric.
2. How could this rubric be improved?

Responses to the open-ended questions are listed in Appendix B. Table 3 summarizes the open-ended questions by presenting the percentage of respondents who identified problems with the usefulness or usability of the rubric (in response to question 1) and the percentage of respondents who suggested improvements (in response to question 2).

Table 3: Response Percentages to Open-Ended Questions by Rubric

Rubric	N*	Identified Problems	Suggested Improvements
Communication Goal #1, Outcome A	10	50%	20%
Communication Goal #1, Outcome B	19	58%	26%
Communication Goal #1, Outcome C	12	50%	25%
Critical Inquiry Goal #1	19	58%	16%
Critical Inquiry Goal #2, Outcome A	3	33%	33%
Critical Inquiry Goal #2, Outcome B	3	0%	0%
Diversity Goal #1	14	43%	50%
Diversity Goal #2	3	66%	66%
Responsible Living Goal #1, #2, & #3	10	50%	30%

*Includes respondents that submitted ratings but did not respond to one or both open-ended questions

Although several instructors identified problems specific to certain rubrics, there were some consistent problems identified across the rubrics. Many instructors mentioned that the rubric they used was too general or vague, and did not apply to the specific assignments they had developed for the course. Other instructors felt that their rubric was unclear, too complex, difficult to use, or the cells lacked sufficient distinctiveness. Most suggested improvements that focused on increasing specificity, clarity, and distinctiveness.

TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

We reviewed the feedback from the pilot program, and after considerable discussion and debate, we recommend the following revisions to the UCA Core and the rubrics. The revised rubrics are available in Appendix C.

Reorganization of the UCA Core Learning Goals and Outcomes

We believe the current structure of the UCA Core learning goals and outcomes is overly complex and inconsistent across the rubrics. In some cases, the rubric assesses only one learning outcome of a learning goal. For example, the Effective Communication area has only one goal broken down into three outcomes, and each outcome has its own rubric with additional specific criteria. Thus, the rows of each rubric assess the specific criteria of a learning outcome. The same is true for Critical Inquiry Goal #2 which has two outcomes and additional specific criteria associated with each. In other cases, the rubric assesses the entire learning goal. For example, Critical Inquiry Goal #1 has three outcomes, all of which are measured by a single rubric without any additional specific criteria. Thus, each row of the rubric assesses a learning outcome instead of the specific criteria of a learning outcome. The same is true for the two Diversity goals. Furthermore, the Responsible Living area has three goals, each with one outcome and no specific criteria, all of which are measured using a single rubric. Thus, in this case, the rubric appears to assess the entire general skill or knowledge area, not just a single goal or outcome.

Without a consistent structure, instructors (especially those using multiple rubrics) are likely to be confused and find the rubrics difficult to use. We recommend simplifying the organization of the UCA Core into the following four levels of specificity:

Level 1.   **General Skill and Knowledge Areas:** These are the four areas of the UCA Core (Critical Inquiry, Effective Communication, Diversity, and Responsible Living) as defined on page 3.

Level 2.   **Goals:** Each area of the UCA Core would have 2 – 3 goals. Each goal is assessed by a single rubric.

Level 3.   **Specific Skill and Knowledge Areas:** Each goal would have a set of clearly defined skill and knowledge areas that a student should master before graduation. Each row of the rubric assesses a specific skill or knowledge area.

Level 4.   **Student Learning Outcomes:** These are the observable or measurable behaviors of students that demonstrate progress in each specific skill or knowledge area. Each cell of the rubric will describe the expected student learning outcome at that level of progress.

This new organization would align a single rubric to each goal by either restating the outcomes as goals or as specific skill and knowledge areas.

Under the new organization, we recommend that the two goals and five outcomes of the Critical Inquiry area be replaced with the following three goals to align with the existing three rubrics.

> **Critical Inquiry** – the ability to analyze new problems and situations to formulate informed opinions and conclusions
> > **Goal A:** Demonstrate a knowledge base to ask more informed questions and learn more complex concepts
> > **Goal B:** Apply scientific processes to solve problems/answer questions
> > **Goal C:** Apply quantitative and computational processes to solve problems

In this case, the outcomes of the first goal are redefined as the specific skill and knowledge areas of that goal, whereas the two outcomes of the second goal are restated as goals (replacing the second goal) and the outcome "criteria" are revised as the specific skill and knowledge areas of that goal (see page 13 for a further discussion of these changes).

We further recommend that the two goals and five outcomes of the Diversity area be replaced with the following three goals.

> **Diversity** – the ability to analyze familiar cultural assumptions in the context of the world's diverse values, traditions, and belief system as well as to analyze the major ideas, techniques, and processes that inform creative works within different cultural and historical contexts.
> > **Goal A:** Analyze one's own cultural values and assumptions.
> > **Goal B:** Analyze or compare diverse values, traditions, belief systems, and/or perspectives.
> > **Goal C:** Analyze creative works within diverse contexts.

In this case, the first and second outcomes of the first Diversity goal are restated as Goals A and B, whereas the third outcome is revised as a specific skill or knowledge area of Goal B. A shortened version of Diversity Goal #2 remains as Goal C and its outcomes are revised as specific skill and knowledge areas (see page 15 for a further discussion of these changes).

Because there are three communication rubrics, we recommend that the Effective Communication area have the following three goals, instead of one goal with three outcomes.

> **Effective Communication** – the ability to develop and present ideas logically and effectively to enhance communication and collaboration with diverse individuals and groups

> **Goal A:** Use appropriate conventions and strategies in oral communication for various audiences and purposes
>
> **Goal B:** Use appropriate conventions and strategies in written communication for various audiences and purposes
>
> **Goal C:** Individually apply appropriate verbal and nonverbal strategies to promote collaboration

In this case, the former outcomes are restated as goals and the "criteria" for each rubric are revised as a specific skill or knowledge areas (see page 17 for a further discussion of these changes).

Lastly, we recommend reorganizing the three goals and three outcomes of the Responsible Living area into the following two goals.

> **Responsible Living** – the ability to address real-world problems and find ethical solutions for individuals and society.
>
> **Goal A:** Apply ethical principles to solve problems.
>
> **Goal B:** Evaluate the effect that decisions have on the well-being of self, others, society and/or environment(s).

In this case, Goal A is a revised version of the original Goal #1 that emphasizes the application of ethical principles, not just their description. We recommend deleting the single learning outcome and developing a set of specific skill or knowledge areas related to Goal A. Goal B is a combination of the original Goal #2 and Goal #3. We similarly recommend deleting the two learning outcomes associated with these goals and developing a set of specific skill or knowledge areas related to Goal B (see page 19 for a further discussion of these changes).

Information Cover Pages

We returned to the original Association of American College and Universities (AAC&U) Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (VALUE) rubrics[1] from which many of the UCA Core rubrics were adapted. Each AAC&U VALUE rubric includes a cover page that clearly defines the specific skill area being assessed and any potentially confusing terminology used in the rubric. We believe some of the general confusion instructors expressed about the UCA Core rubrics could be eliminated by adding a cover page that clearly defines what is being assessed and guides instructors on how to use the rubric. Each rubric in Appendix C includes a cover page that defines the general skill and knowledge area, the goal, and the specific skill and knowledge areas assessed by the rubric.

Each cover page also includes a "how to use this rubric" guide. In response to the feedback on grading, we included in the guide a discussion of how the rubric relates to grading.

---

[1] The AAC&U VALUE rubrics are available at https://www.aacu.org/value-rubrics.

Most instructors did not feel that the rubric they used helped them grade their assignments. In truth, the UCA Core rubrics were not intended or designed (with one exception) to assist grading, particularly in lower-division courses. Unfortunately, the first two items of the pilot feedback survey implied that they should. To help dispel the misperception, all but one revised rubric[2] states the following:

> Although the rubric may inform the grading scheme used for the assignment, it should not replace it. Scores of 4, 3, 2, and 1 do not necessarily correspond to A, B, C, and D. The rubric is used to track students' progress throughout the UCA Core, not just their performance in a single course. Thus, a score of 4 represents the expected mastery of that skill or knowledge area by time a student graduates. That mastery may come earlier or later in a student's progression through the UCA Core, but generally speaking, scores of 1 and 2 are expected in lower-division courses, whereas scores of 3 and 4 are expected in upper-division and capstone courses.

Standard Language for the Score of Zero

Every AAC&U VALUE rubric encourages evaluators "to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance." We recommend doing the same, rather than attempting to describe what is less than the minimum expected student learning outcome (i.e., a score of 1) for every specific skill and knowledge area. We recommend that each UCA Core rubric simply instructs users to "assign a zero for performance that does not meet a score of one (1)."

Revisions to the Critical Inquiry Rubrics

We recommend making the following substantive revisions to the rubric for Critical Inquiry Goal #1 (see Appendix A) to create the new Critical Inquiry Rubric A (see Appendix C).
- Replace the learning outcomes with the following specific skill and knowledge areas:
  - **Knowledge:** An understanding of the concepts and/or principles in the discipline and how they relate to important questions.
  - **Information:** Selecting appropriate and credible information based on knowledge of topic and discipline.
  - **Analysis:** Evaluating a position and/or drawing conclusions on significant questions in the discipline.

---

[2] The one exception is the rubric for Critical Inquiry Goal C. This rubric assesses students' mastery of quantitative and computational processes. However, the student learning outcomes do not depend on the difficulty of the quantitative problems. As a result, the rubric can only assess the mastery of quantitative skills and knowledge at one level of difficulty, and cannot track students' quantitative progress through increasing levels of difficulty across an entire program of study (e.g., from lower-division to upper-division courses).

- Revise the cell descriptions to create student learning outcomes that improve clarity and distinctiveness, and are more aligned to the specific knowledge and skill areas.

We recommend making the following substantive revisions to the rubric for Critical Inquiry Goal #2 (see Appendix A) to create the new Critical Inquiry Rubric B (see Appendix C).

- Replace "Strategies" with "Methodology" because it is more consistent with scientific terminology.
- Move "Propose Hypotheses" above "Identify Methodology" so that the order of the rows follows the scientific process.
- Change "Specific Criteria for Learning Outcome A" to "Specific Skill or Knowledge Areas" and define them as follows:
  - **Define Problem/Question:** A statement or summary that identifies a problem or raises a question that is relevant to the topic or assignment, appropriate to the discipline, and open to empirical inquiry (i.e., objective observation).
  - **Propose Hypotheses:** Formulating testable propositions that follow from one particular solution/answer to the problem/question.
  - **Identify Methodology:** Selecting the appropriate set of procedures to test the hypotheses.
  - **Evaluate Results:** An objective assessment of the hypotheses based on the empirical evidence gathered from the methodology.

We recommend making the following substantive revisions to the rubric for Critical Inquiry Goal #3 (see Appendix A) to create the new Critical Inquiry Rubric C (see Appendix C).

- Replace the Specific Criteria for Learning Outcome B with the following specific skill and knowledge areas:
  - **Information:** Identifying and extracting relevant information needed to solve the problem.
  - **Methods:** Selecting the appropriate methods to solve the problem.
  - **Communication:** Effectively communicating quantitative concepts or evidence consistent with the purpose of the assignment.
- Replace the lowest student learning outcome (1) of the first row (Information) with one that describes what the student can do, not what the student is "unable" to do. Without a statement of what the student is expected to do for a score of one (1), there is no threshold for assigning a score of zero (0).
- Remove reference to "irrelevant information" from the first row of student learning outcomes (Information) because it is unnecessary language. Once relevant information is identified, the remaining information is irrelevant.
- Remove the phrase "real world" from two highest student learning outcomes of the second row (Methods). We suspect that many advanced quantitative problems may not exist in the "real world."

Revisions to the Diversity Rubrics

The original rubric for Diversity Goal #1 assessed all three learning outcomes for the goal (see Appendix A). Based on formal and informal feedback, as well as our own discussion, we concluded that the rubric most appropriately applies to a limited number of courses that teach students about their own culture *and* other cultures. Courses designed to immerse students in the history and perspectives of another culture, but not their own culture, may find this rubric difficult to use and may be unable to keep a Diversity designation. Therefore, we recommend dividing Goal #1 into two goals—one focused on student's own culture (Goal A) and one focused on other cultures (Goal B)—and developing two new rubrics to assess the goals. We turned to the AAC&U Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric to aid in the development of the new rubrics.

Based on the AAC&U VALUE rubric, we recommend the following three specific skill or knowledge areas related to Goal A: Analyze one's own cultural values and assumptions.

- **Cultural Self-awareness:** Knowledge of how experiences have shaped one's own cultural rules, and how to recognize and respond to cultural biases, resulting in a shift in self-description.
- **Empathy:** The ability to imagine one's self as another, with another's interests and emotions, and within another's cultural rules, biases, and perspectives.
- **Openness:** Desire to interact with culturally different others. Interactions with culturally different others should be interpreted broadly, and can include experiences with texts, creative works, or individuals.

The student learning outcomes to assess the above areas were also adapted from the same AAC&U VALUE rubric; though, we edited language to improve clarity and distinctiveness (see Appendix C).

Likewise, we recommend the following three specific skill or knowledge areas related to Goal B: Analyze or compare diverse values, traditions, belief systems, and/or perspectives.

- **Cultural Worldview Frameworks:** The history, values, politics, communication styles, economics, or beliefs and practices by which people construe their experiences and make sense of the world around them.
- **Curiosity:** Willingness to understand and engage with other worldview frameworks.
- **Application:** Responding to complex questions with answers that reflect diverse perspectives.

The first two specific skill or knowledge areas (Cultural Worldview Frameworks and Curiosity) and their associated student learning outcomes were adapted from the AAC&U VALUE rubric. The third specific skill or knowledge area (Application) is essentially the third learning outcome of Diversity Goal #1. However, we revised the cell descriptions of the original rubric to create student learning outcomes that more clearly described students' progress from identifying multiple perspectives to using those perspectives to solve complex problems.

We received very little formal feedback on the rubric for Diversity Goal #2 (analyze the major ideas, techniques, and processes that inform creative works within different cultural and historical contexts). Because none of the task force members felt qualified to evaluate the efficacy of the rubric for assessing a goal related to creative works, we solicited additional feedback from the following departments: Art (Jeff Young), English (Michael Schaefer), Mass Communication and Theatre (John Gale), Music (Paige Rose), and Writing (Carey Smitherman). Additionally, Paige Rose attended the meeting in which we discussed the rubric.

The informal feedback we received, and our own discussions, revealed that the wording of the goal was confusing. The original goal states that students will "analyze the major ideas, techniques, and processes that inform creative works within different cultural and historical contexts." As worded, the analysis focuses on the "ideas, techniques, and processes," not on the "creative works." Some wondered if this goal was intended to say "apply the major ideas, techniques, and processes to analyze creative works…." because the highest level (4) of the first row essentially says just that. Furthermore, some indicated that "cultural" differences have long been interpreted in UCA's general education program as a comparison between Eastern and Western cultures and questioned what it meant now. Given the confusion, we concluded that "cultural and historical" might lead people to a narrow interpretation of diversity. According to UCA's Core Values (http://uca.edu/about/mission/), we embrace "the diversity of individuals and ideas, including race, ethnicity, religion, spiritual beliefs, national origin, age, gender, marital status, socioeconomic background, sexual orientation, physical ability, political affiliation, and intellectual perspective."

To resolve the above problems, we recommend simplifying the goal. We propose the following Diversity Goal C: "Analyze creative works within diverse contexts." We believe the simpler version is easier to understand and allows for a broader set of student learning outcomes consistent with the goal. We then developed the following four specific skill and knowledge areas related to the goal:

- **Theory/Criticism/Technique:** The set of concepts/principles used to create or evaluate creative works.
- **Themes and Ideas:** The concepts expressed in the creative work that are representative of diverse cultures/perspectives.
- **Context:** The personal, social, cultural, and historical influences on the creative work.
- **Reflection:** The articulation of a personal response to the experience of a creative work.

The first three areas were adapted from the criteria listed on the pilot rubric (see Appendix A). However, we rewrote them and the associated student learning outcomes (i.e., cell descriptions) to improve clarity and distinctiveness. Specifically, we had difficulty perceiving a difference between the original cell descriptions of the first two rows; both described techniques and processes in relation to cultural perspectives. Therefore, we rewrote the areas and the student learning outcomes so that one focused exclusively on theory, criticism, or techniques, and the other focused exclusively on themes and ideas. Further, we noticed that the lowest level (1) of the original rubric's third row only stated what the student is "unable" to do. As noted elsewhere, without a statement of what the student is expected to do for a score

of one (1), there is no threshold for assigning a score of zero (0). Therefore, we rewrote that student learning outcome to state what a student would be expected to do at the lowest level, and then rewrote the other Context student learning outcomes to reflect clear incremental progress towards the goal.

We recommend adding the fourth area, Reflection, to assess students' progress in formulating a defensible personal response to a creative work. In other words, can students utilize basic and advanced concepts from the course to articulate a position regarding a creative work? Do they like the work? Why or why not? Students' learning outcomes progress from using basic concepts in support of their position to using more advanced concepts with increasing depth and clarity.

Revisions to the Effective Communication Rubrics

We believe effective communication requires a core set of knowledge and skills, regardless of whether it is oral or written. Thus, we recommend that the oral *and* written communication rubrics assess the following specific skill or knowledge areas common to all communication:

- **Central Message:** The topic, thesis, or main point of the communication that is consistent with the purpose of the assignment.

- **Organization:** The grouping of material in the communication, including a specific introduction, conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions.

- **Supporting Material/Evidence:** Explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities, or other kinds of information or analysis that support the central message.

- **Context and Audience:** The people and situations surrounding the communication, including the cognitive, social, and cultural factors that influence the audience and communicator.

The revised rubrics have the exact same student learning outcomes aligned to these four specific skill or knowledge areas. These student learning outcomes were based on wording from the pilot rubrics that most clearly fit the revised ones. We also edited the original wording where needed to improve clarity and distinctiveness between the student learning outcomes.

In addition to the common skill and knowledge areas, we added a single skill or knowledge area unique to each rubric. The oral communication rubric (Communication Rubric A) includes the following:

- **Verbal and Nonverbal Delivery:** Posture, gesture, eye contact, vocal expressiveness (loudness, tone, emphasis), and vocal fillers ("um," "uh," "like," "you know," etc.).

Student learning outcomes reflecting students' verbal and nonverbal delivery were adapted from the AAC&U Oral Communication VALUE rubric.

The written communication rubric (Communication Rubric B) includes the following:

- **Control of Syntax and Mechanics:** The use of language to communicate meaning, including word choice, sentence and paragraph structure, grammar, punctuation, and spelling.

Student learning outcomes reflecting students' control of syntax and mechanics are the same as the cell descriptions in the pilot version of the written communication rubric.

Several instructors who used the collaboration rubric during the pilot commented that the rubric was difficult to use for peer evaluation. Many instructors use peer evaluation to assess teamwork because it is difficult for instructors to evaluate the contributions of individual team members. Therefore, we focused primarily on improving the rubric for use by students to evaluate other students on their team. We drew on material from the pilot rubric as well as the AAC&U Teamwork VALUE Rubric in our revision. From both rubrics, we identified a list of behaviors demonstrating "appropriate verbal and nonverbal strategies to promote collaboration" (Goal C) and organized them into the following two specific skill or knowledge areas:

- **Individual Contributions:** The contributions of a single student that advances a group project, including the timely completion of assigned tasks, thorough and comprehensive work, articulating the merits of alternative ideas or proposals, building constructively upon the contributions of others, and being punctual, focused, and prepared.

- **Fosters Constructive Team Climate:** Student behaviors that promote collaboration among group members, including being respectful and positive, motivating and assisting teammates, and engaging with teammates in ways that facilitate their contributions.

However, unlike other rubrics, we found it difficult to arrange the behaviors hierarchically into progressive student learning outcomes. Instead, we opted to define the student learning outcomes quantitatively, such that the number of behaviors, rather than the type of behaviors, reflected progress towards the goal (see Appendix C).

We believe this format will be better for peer evaluation because it is easily adapted to a checklist format. For example, a teammate

- ✓ who completes all assigned tasks in a timely manner
- ✓ whose work is thorough, comprehensive and advances the project
- ✓ who is punctual, focused and prepared
- ✓ who articulates the merits of alternative ideas or proposals,

but does not constructively build upon or synthesize the contributions of others, would be scored a three (3) by other teammates on the individual contributions area. Another teammate missing any one of those five behaviors would also be scored a three (3). We realize that the behaviors are somewhat vague. (For example, what is "timely?" What is "thorough?" If a teammate arrives two minutes late once, is he still punctual?) However, we believe it must be left to individual instructors to define the standards for each behavior to their students.

Revisions to the Responsible Living Rubrics

For the pilot, a single rubric was created to assess all three goals of the Responsible Living area. Under the new organization, though, each goal should be assessed by a separate rubric. Rather than develop three distinct rubrics, we recommend that the three original goals be reorganized into two goals. Specifically, we propose that Goal #2 (analyze the effect that decisions have on self, others, and the environment) and Goal #3 (evaluate and practice strategies leading to individual and social well-being) are sufficiently similar and should be combined. Thus, we recommend two Responsible Living goals; the first focused on ethics (Goal A) and the second focused on well-being (Goal B). We believe that each goal involves certain distinct skills or knowledge that should be assessed by separate rubrics.

Based on the AAC&U Ethical Reasoning VALUE rubric, we recommend the following specific skill or knowledge areas for Goal A:

- **Ethical Awareness:** Awareness of the core beliefs that consciously or unconsciously influence one's own and others' ethical conduct and reasoning. 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 Issue Recognition:** Recognition of various ethical issues and their interconnections in complex contexts (i.e., the obvious and subtle connections between/among the sub-parts or situational conditions of a scenario that bring two or more ethical dilemmas/issues into the problem; e.g., relationship of production of corn as part of the climate change issue).
- **Ethical Application:** The application of different ethical theories (e.g., utilitarian, natural law, virtue) or ethical concepts (rights, justice, duty) to analyze the ethical issues of a problem.

The student learning outcomes designed to assess progress in each specific skill or knowledge area were adapted from the same VALUE rubric.

For Goal B, we recommend the following two specific skill or knowledge areas:

- **Issue Recognition:** Recognition of various issues that affect well-being and their interconnections in complex contexts. The interconnections of issues in complex context refer to the obvious and subtle connections between/among the sub-parts or situational conditions of a scenario that bring two or more dilemmas/issues into the problem (e.g., relationship of health screenings to increased health care costs).
- **Impact of Decisions:** The consequences—good or bad—of decisions on the well-being of self, others, society and/or environment(s).

Issue Recognition is clearly similar to the skill or knowledge area related to Goal A, but in this case it is focused on issues that affect well-being rather than ethical issues. As such, the student learning outcomes that assess progress in Issue Recognition are the same as the rubric for Goal A, sans the word "ethical." The Impact of Decisions area is conceptually similar to the Goal #2 learning outcome (evaluate the consequences of decision making). Thus, the new student learning outcomes that assess progress in understanding the Impact of Decisions are merely revised versions of the cell descriptions in the pilot rubric for the original Goal #2 learning outcome.

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

We, the UCA Core Rubric Task Force, met for 18 hours over the course of seven days to discuss the faculty feedback collected on the pilot rubrics and to develop revisions that would improve the overall assessment of the UCA Core. The results of our work are respectfully presented to the UCA Core Council within this document. Although the faculty feedback was highly variable, criticisms of the rubrics often identified problems with understanding the cell descriptions or how one cell description differed from another. *Thus, the general intent of our revisions was to increase the clarity and distinctiveness of the rubrics.* We tried to eliminate jargon and unnecessary wording. We carefully compared and revised the cell descriptions to make sure that each score was a clear "step down" from the next higher score. We combined rows that seemed redundant, and separated rows that were too general. In some cases, we added new rows or whole rubrics. Overall, we tried to eliminate confusion.

The linchpin of our recommendations is the reorganization of the UCA Core learning goals and outcomes. Under the new organization, the four general skill and knowledge areas—Critical Inquiry, Diversity, Effective Communication, and Responsible Living—remain the same as before. But now, each general skill and knowledge area has 2 – 3 goals and we revised or created a single rubric to assess progress towards each and only *one* goal. Progress towards each goal is defined by the student's performance in 2 – 5 specific skill or knowledge areas, and each row of a rubric assesses students' performance on one specific skill or knowledge area. We essentially simplified the UCA Core organization by eliminating the learning outcome level and restating the old learning outcomes as either goals or as specific skill or knowledge areas. Under the new organization, the term "student learning outcome" now refers to the rubric cells that describe the student's performance on each specific skill or knowledge area.

The new organization has implications for existing UCA Core courses. The old organization had 9 rubrics, whereas the new organization has 11. Thus, some departments will need to choose a new rubric to assess existing UCA Core courses. We do not expect many courses to change. Courses using the pilot Communication rubrics will likely use the revised ones. Most courses using the pilot Critical Inquiry rubrics will continue to use the revised versions as well; however, some lower-division courses currently under Critical Inquiry (e.g., Art Appreciation, African & African-American Studies, Theatre Appreciation, and World Languages) may now find one of the revised Diversity rubrics to be a more appropriate assessment. As a result, some courses may move from Critical Inquiry to Diversity. Departments currently using the pilot rubric to assess Diversity Goal #1 (World Cultures) will need to choose whether the Diversity Rubric A (Own) or Diversity Rubric B (Other) is the more appropriate assessment for their courses. Likewise, departments using the pilot rubric for Responsible Living will need to choose whether the Responsible Living Rubric A (Ethics) or Responsible Living Rubric B (Well Being) is the more appropriate assessment. **We recommend that departments choose at least *one* rubric for each of their UCA Core courses.** Doing so should *not* change the current structure of the lower-division UCA Core. That is, choosing Diversity Rubric A or B would still classify a course under the Diversity in World Cultures category, and choosing Responsible Living Rubric A or B would still classify a course under the

Responsible Living category. **Departments should not be required to use more than one rubric to assess a UCA Core course (excluding FYS and capstone courses[3]), though they may opt to do so.**

The UCA Core Council charged the task force with proposing revisions to the rubrics *independent* of changes to the learning goals and outcomes. The recommended changes to the Critical Inquiry and Communication rubrics can be implemented independent of the recommended reorganization of the UCA Core. However, the proposed Diversity and Responsible Living rubrics are dependent on the recommended reorganization of the UCA Core and the creation of the additional Diversity and Responsible Living goals. Based on our recommendations, the original Diversity Goal #1 would be split into two goals and its three learning outcomes replaced with the six new specific skill and knowledge areas of the two new goals. Further, the original Responsible Living Goals #2 and #3 would be merged and the three learning outcomes of the three original Responsible Living goals would be replaced with the five new specific skill and knowledge areas of the two new goals. Although there is some overlap, the new specific skill and knowledge areas (i.e., the rows of the rubrics) do not easily align to the original learning outcomes. Thus, the recommended new rubrics for Diversity and Responsible Living cannot be implemented if the original learning outcomes remain intact. We did not have time to reach a consensus on alternative recommendations. Therefore, should the UCA Core Council not accept the replacement of the Diversity and Responsible Living learning outcomes with the recommended specific skill and knowledge areas, the Council would need to determine whether to revise the pilot rubrics for Diversity Goal #1 and Responsible Living, and if so, how.

Another common criticism of the rubrics was that they were not sufficiently specific to the course assignments or useful for grading. Although we attempted to address some of these perceived problems on each rubric's cover page, we cannot fully resolve them by revising the rubrics. Because the rubrics are intended to assess students' progress over the entire lower- and upper-division UCA Core, the student learning outcomes must apply to a wide range of disciplines, courses, and assignments. Making a rubric specific for one discipline reduces its utility for another. Rather than make the rubrics more specific, we tried to increase their flexibility by eliminating jargon, wordiness, and misconstrued terminology. Also, by adding new rubrics for Diversity and Responsible Living, we hope that some departments will find a better fit to their specific UCA Core courses. Nonetheless, the revised rubrics remain generally worded. **We recommend that each department discuss how the general student learning outcomes apply to their courses and develop a shared understanding of the rubric for their discipline. We also recommend that the UCA Core Council, in partnership with the Instructional Development Center, create and regularly offer training for instructors on the purpose and use of the UCA Core rubrics.** Training will be essential to reducing instructors' confusion and frustration with the rubrics, and for ensuring the collection of reliable assessment data.

Since 2012, the new UCA Core has gone through multiple changes based on feedback from a variety of stakeholders. Again, based on feedback from instructors and our own discussions, we propose

---

[3] Courses designated as a First-Year Seminar (FYS) or as a capstone will continue to require assessment of written communication (Communication Rubric B) and collaboration (Communication Rubric C) in addition to the assessment of at least one goal under the Critical Inquiry, Diversity, or Responsible Living areas.

further changes that we believe will make a substantial improvement to the long-term assessment of the UCA Core. Given our time constraints, we realize that the revised rubrics are far from perfect and may still require some revision. We encourage the UCA Core Council to read them carefully and critically, and to make further revision as they deem necessary. **Ultimately, once approved, we recommend that the final rubrics not be substantively revised for at least four years to allow for a full cycle of assessment data to be collected.** Four years of data would allow the UCA Core Council to observe progress from freshmen-level courses through senior-level and capstone courses within the same cohort. Nonetheless, the UCA Core Council should continue to seek feedback from instructors and use the feedback every four years to make further improvements to the rubrics and the UCA Core.

APPENDIX A: PILOT RUBRICS

Communication (Oral)

Communication Goal #1: Develop and present ideas logically and effectively in order to enhance communication and collaboration with diverse individuals and groups.

> **Learning Outcome A:** Use appropriate conventions and strategies in oral communication for various audiences and
> purposes.

Specific Criteria for Learning Outcome A	4	3	2	1	0
Organization	Arrange presentation so transitions create coherent progress toward the conclusion and the main points are identified in the introduction and repeated in the conclusion.	Employ a recognizable organizational pattern with well stated main points, some sudden transitions, and/or clear conclusion.	Show some organization with main points that are unclear or not sufficiently stressed.	Demonstrates poor organization with underdeveloped, irrelevant, or unclear introduction, main points, and conclusions.	Lack organization.
Language / Audience Awareness	Compose effective presentation using language that is concise, original, and suited to the audience.	Understand audience but uses language with less sophistication, expressiveness, and/or originality.	Identify target audience but is not effective in using language that conveys the appropriate tone	Use language that is too informal, too imprecise or too distracting for target audience.	Unable to identify target audience and/or use of language is inappropriate.
Supporting Material/ Evidence	Employ timely and relevant material to provide effective support in a way that reflects a thorough understanding of the topic/thesis.	Select sufficient and relevant supporting materials, but lack in analysis, comparisons, or credible authorities.	Use some supporting materials with limited or incomplete explanations, examples, and/or descriptions.	Identify insufficient or inappropriate supporting materials.	Lack sources or documentation.
Topic/Thesis	Formulate a topic/thesis that is clear, developed, and well supported.	Delineate topic/thesis and main points with partially developed explanations.	State topic/thesis but the difference between the main points and supporting details is blurred.	Identify topic/thesis vaguely which cause audience to make assumptions.	Lack focus which causes audience confusion.

Overall, has this student demonstrated appropriate knowledge and skills for this level in this discipline? __ Yes __No

__ This student did not turn in an acceptable response to the assignment (e.g., failed to turn in a paper, plagiarized, etc.)

Communication—Written

Written Communication Goal #1: Develop and present ideas logically and effectively in order to enhance communication and collaboration with diverse individuals and groups.

       Learning Outcome B: Use appropriate conventions and strategies in written communication for various audiences and purposes.

Criteria	4	3	2	1	0
Context of and Purpose (or thesis) for Writing	Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses on all elements of the work.	Exhibits 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).	Expresses deliberate awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).	Shows minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).	Insufficient performance
Content Development	Applies relevant, substantive, and thoughtful content to achieve purpose and illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding of and contribution to the academic conversation throughout the whole work.	Uses relevant and substantive content to achieve purpose and explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work.	Incorporates appropriate and relevant content to achieve main purpose and develop and explore ideas through most of the work.	Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work.	Insufficient performance
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.	Attempts to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing.	Shows minimal attention to source material to support idea in the writing.	Insufficient performance
Control of Syntax and Mechanics	Demonstrates clear and fluid control of syntax and mechanics that skillfully communicates meaning to readers and is virtually error-free.	Uses syntax and mechanics that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity. The language has few errors.	Exhibits substantive errors in syntax and mechanics which, at times, impedes the clarity of the work.	Shows a serious pattern of error in syntax and mechanics that interferes with meaning.	Insufficient performance

NOTE: Writing should be scored in each category according to genre and disciplinary conventions.

Overall, has this student demonstrated appropriate knowledge and skills for this level in this discipline?   __ Yes   __No
__ This student did not turn in an acceptable response to the assignment (e.g., failed to turn in a paper, plagiarized, etc.)

Communication

Effective Communication Goal #1: Develop and present ideas logically and effectively in order to enhance communication and collaboration with diverse individuals and groups.

Learning Outcome C: Individually apply appropriate verbal and nonverbal strategies to promote collaboration

Learning Outcome	4	3	2	1	0
Focus on Task and Participation	Stay on task consistently and reliably without reminders from group members or instructor.	Focus on the task most of the time but needs occasional reminders.	Focus on the task some of the time. Other group members must remind this person to keep on task.	Focus little on the task and lets others do the work.	Does not participate.
Teamwork	Encourage others to share ideas, helps to make them clear and connects them to the team's work. Always performs all duties of the assigned team role.	Help team solve problems, manage conflicts, and stay focused and organized.	Show some effort to share ideas with the team	Contribute little to the group effort	Does not contribute to group effort.
Respect for Others	Recognize everyone's strengths and encourages the team to use them.	Listen carefully to teammates and is polite and thoughtful.	Listen to teammates, but not consistently.	Show little respect for teammates (may interrupt, ignore ideas, hurt feelings).	Ignore teammates.

Overall, has this student demonstrated appropriate knowledge and skills for this level in this discipline?   __ Yes   __No

__ This student did not turn in an acceptable response to the assignment (e.g., failed to turn in a paper, plagiarized, etc.)

Critical Inquiry

Critical Inquiry Goal #1: Demonstrate a knowledge base that helps them ask more informed questions and learn more complex concepts.

Learning Outcome	4	3	2	1	0
Demonstrate an understanding of the basic concepts and principles in the discipline	Evaluate arguments/theories in terms of knowledge of concepts and principles.	Apply concepts and principles to answer questions or solve problems.	Explain basic concepts within the context of broader questions/theories.	Identify basic concepts without connecting them to broader questions/theories.	Insufficient performance
Find and evaluate appropriate information based on knowledge of subject and technology.	Synthesize appropriate information from multiple sources in order to support effective arguments.	Compare/contrast information from more than one source in appropriate ways.	Locate relevant information in a single source.	Identify minimal information that is relevant to the assignment in a source or text.	Insufficient performance
Apply appropriate modes of academic inquiry and analysis to develop and evaluate a position on significant questions in the discipline.	Justify a position on a significant question or problem using appropriate modes of inquiry and analysis.	Investigate a significant question/problem using appropriate modes of inquiry and analysis.	Identify different perspectives used in the discipline.	Understand there are multiple approaches to academic questions/problems.	Insufficient performance

Overall, has this student demonstrated appropriate knowledge and skills for this level in this discipline?   __ Yes   __No

__ This student did not turn in an acceptable response to the assignment (e.g., failed to turn in a paper, plagiarized, etc.)

Critical Inquiry

Critical Inquiry Goal #2: Use scientific, quantitative, and computational processes in order to solve real-world problems.

Learning Outcome A: Apply scientific process to solve problems/answer questions

Specific Criteria for Learning Outcome A	4	3	2	1	0
Define Problem/Question	Communicate comprehensive, contextual understanding of the problem/question	Compare problem/question statements to determine which best summarizes the problem	Compose a basic, accurate problem/question statement	Recognize an applicable problem/question statement.	Unable to identify a problem/question statement.
Identify Strategies	Propose complex, multi-level strategic approaches for solving the problem or addressing the question.	Devise a complete appropriate strategic plan including controls to address the problem/question.	Distinguish between valid options to select best strategic plan to address the problem/question.	Recognize appropriate strategic steps that address the problem/question.	Unable to recognize steps that address the problem/question.
Propose Hypotheses	Communicate a hypothesis reflecting a comprehensive understanding of problem/question.	Develop a hypothesis that links variables	Compose a testable hypothesis from a scenario	Recognize a testable hypothesis.	Unable to recognize a testable hypothesis.
Evaluate Results	Articulate a comprehensive evaluation of results including next steps.	Produce an accurate interpretation of data including a consideration of sources of error.	Selects the best interpretation of results.	Recognize an accurate interpretation of results.	Unable to recognize results

Overall, has this student demonstrated appropriate knowledge and skills for this level in this discipline?   __ Yes   __No

__ This student did not turn in an acceptable response to the assignment (e.g., failed to turn in a paper, plagiarized, etc.)

Critical Inquiry

Critical Inquiry Goal #2: Use scientific, quantitative, and computational process in order to solve real-world problems

Learning Outcome B: Apply quantitative and computational processes to solve problems.

Specific Criteria for Learning Outcome B	4	3	2	1	0
Analyze relevant information that is needed to solve problems.	Justify solution in terms of relevant information needed to solve a problems from irrelevant information.	Use relevant information needed to solve a problem and explain if/why other information is irrelevant.	Identify relevant information needed to solve the problem but cannot explain if/why other information is irrelevant.	Unable to extract relevant information needed to solve a problem.	Unable to identify appropriate information or misinterpret information.
Select appropriate methods and apply them to solve problems.	Solve a variety of real-world problems using appropriate methods with consistent accuracy without verbal or supporting cues.	Use appropriate methods to calculate real-world problems accurately with occasional verbal or supportive cues. Independent calculations. Includes minor errors.	Solve calculations correctly but requires frequent verbal or supportive cues. Independent calculation accuracy is erratic.	Perform calculations with minimal accuracy independently. Can perform calculation accurately but only with continuous verbal and supportive cues.	Perform calculations with less than 50% accuracy.
Effectively communicate quantitative concepts.	Articulate a variety of complex concepts in a logical and comprehensible manner.	Generate explanations of concepts that are detailed and clear.	Define all major steps with some details missed or some language not completely precise.	List basic concepts.	Unable to explain basic concepts.

Overall, has this student demonstrated appropriate knowledge and skills for this level in this discipline?   __ Yes   __No

__ This student did not turn in an acceptable response to the assignment (e.g., failed to turn in a paper, plagiarized, etc.)

Diversity (World Cultures)

Diversity Goal #1: Analyze their own cultural assumptions in the context of the world's diverse values, traditions, and belief systems.

Learning Outcomes	4	3	2	1	0
Articulate one's own cultural values and assumptions.	Examine perceptions and assumptions about other cultures. Acknowledges assumptions and biases.	Tolerate ambiguity and understands one's own identification with multiple identities (gender, age, religion, ethnicity, SES, etc.).	Recognize the influence of cultural background on self. Examines and understands how one's own worldview evolved from socialization.	Show minimal awareness of one's own cultural and historical background.	Unaware of one's own cultural and historical background.
Compare cultural values across a range of cultures.	Articulate the complex nuances of a range of cultures.	Cognizant of differing values across cultures. Does not distinguish differences as superior or inferior.	Recognize some cultural differences. Identifies differences in terms of positive or negative.	Show minimal awareness of cultural differences.	Unaware of cultural differences.
Respond to complex questions with answers that reflect multiple cultural perspectives.	Evaluate a position, text, or behavior.	Articulate the significance of acknowledging culture in decision-making/problem-solving.	Reflect on multiple cultural perspectives, but does so in an overly generalized or simplified manner.	Response is ethnocentric in nature and/or asserts that cultural differences are inconsequential.	Insufficient performance

Overall, has this student demonstrated appropriate knowledge and skills for this level in this discipline?   __ Yes   __No

__ This student did not turn in an acceptable response to the assignment (e.g., failed to turn in a paper, plagiarized, etc.)

Diversity in Creative Works

Diversity Goal #2: Analyze the major ideas, techniques, and processes that inform creative works within different cultural and historical contexts

Criteria	4	3	2	1	0
Identify creative techniques and processes used in creative works from different cultural perspectives.	Apply an understanding of creative techniques and processes from different cultural perspectives and their significance to the analysis of creative works	Explain how techniques and processes from different cultural perspectives are significant in the creation of creative works.	Describe techniques and processes from a single cultural perspective and define their significance in relation to the work	Has difficulty linking technique and process of a creative work to a cultural perspective.	Insufficient Performance
Relate techniques and processes to the expression of themes and ideas representative of different cultural perspectives.	Relate techniques and processes to the expression of themes and ideas representative of different cultural perspectives	Analyze with the use of examples the ways relevant techniques and processes contribute to themes and ideas representative of different cultural perspectives	Explain the relationship of relevant techniques and processes to themes and ideas representative of different cultural perspectives	Identify techniques and processes associated with a cultural perspective.	Insufficient Performance
Relate creative works from different cultural perspectives to their historical context.	Apply a clear understanding of historical context and cultural perspective to the analysis of a creative work	Comprehend historical context and cultural perspective and explains its relationship to a particular creative work	Identify the historical context and cultural perspective of a creative work, but expression of the influence of those elements is limited.	Unable to link both historical context and cultural perspective to creative works.	Insufficient Performance

Overall, has this student demonstrated appropriate knowledge and skills for this level in this discipline?   __ Yes   __No

__ This student did not turn in an acceptable response to the assignment (e.g., failed to turn in a paper, plagiarized, etc.)

Responsible Living

Responsible Living Goal #1: Describe ways in which ethical principles affect human choices.

Learning Outcome	4	3	2	1	0
Explain ethical dimensions of human choices	Evaluate relevant ethical, factual, and/or conceptual issues.	Apply relevant ethical, factual, and/or conceptual issues.	Explain relevant ethical, factual, and/or conceptual issues.	Recognize relevant ethical, factual, and/or conceptual issues.	Unaware of relevant ethical, factual, and/or conceptual issues.
Explain ethical dimensions of human choices.	Evaluate alternative courses of action and thoughtful reflection associated with outcomes of each.	Apply a course of action and reflect on the associated outcomes.	Explains a course of action and minimally reflects on outcomes	Recognize a course of action but does not indicate reflection on outcomes.	Unaware of an ethical course of action without reflection on outcomes.

Responsible Living Goal #2: Analyze the effect that decisions have on self, others, and the environment.

Learning Outcome	4	3	2	1	0
Evaluate the consequences of decision making.	Evaluate the consequences of decision making on self, others and the environment.	Predict the consequences of decision making on self, others, and the environment.	Describe the consequences of decision making on self, others and the environment.	Recognize the consequences of decision making on self, others, and the environment.	Unaware of the consequences of decision making on self and others, and the environment.

Responsible Living Goal #3: Evaluate and practice strategies leading to individual and social well-being.

Learning Outcome	4	3	2	1	0
Evaluate practices that lead to personal and social well-being.	Evaluate strategies that influence individual and social well-being	Predict how different practices influence individual and social well-being.	Explain the connection between practices and individual and social well-being.	Recognize the connection between practices and individual and social well-being.	Unaware of the connection between practices and individual and social well-being.

Overall, has this student demonstrated appropriate knowledge and skills for this level in this discipline?   __ Yes   __No

__ This student did not turn in an acceptable response to the assignment (e.g., failed to turn in a paper, plagiarized, etc.)

APPENDIX B: OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES

1. **Was this rubric useful to you, and was this rubric useable in your class? If so, how, or why? If not, why not? Please respond regarding both the usefulness and the useable-ness of the rubric.**

Communication Goal #1, Outcome A

This rubric didn't really serve much purpose for my course as it was mainly a lecture course, and I had to come up with group activities to fit this rubric. It took out vital lecture time.

The main reason that I think this rubric does not apply to my class is because the students' proficiency level has yet to reach advanced level in this advanced-level course.

I disagree with the rubric's rating of 4 for organization that seeks to value "repeating the main ideas" in the conclusion. This is not appropriate for humanities disciplines where often it is more important to conclude by making the case for the relevance of the argument or its wider significance. Simply restating the main ideas smacks of freshmen and high school work to me.

There is no need for five (5) different ratings and four (4) criteria to assess oral communications.

It's unclear in that I don't know whether I am also to be judging the delivery of the content. A student could score perfectly on this rubric, yet still read directly from a piece of paper while staring at her shoes: ineffective oral communication.

Communication Goal #1, Outcome B

It works as a general guide, if you don't get caught up in the excess language. See "Content Development" or "Sources and Evidence" for the distinction between a 2 and a 3. It looks like 3 means more of what is described for 2.

I did not use this rubric for grading, because I have a rubric of my own that is specifically tailored for the assignment that I give. Not only that, but the standards required for a 4 are beyond the reach of any freshman. That is fine for the purposes of an assessment rubric applied at all levels, but it means that you cannot use this rubric for a class grade.

Originally, this was supposed to be applied to a different assignment/project. That plan did not work as intended (not the rubric part but the actual assignment). I could therefore not accurately assess two components of the rubric (the sources and syntax elements). That wasn't a problem with the rubric but rather with how well the assignment was planned and executed.

For some time now I have used an end-of-the-semester group project assignment to assess students' ability to synthesize knowledge and skills learned in the music discipline and to assess skills in written communication and collaboration. This assignment was an easy choice to use for these two rubrics. The assignment requires a written report that allows the opportunity for students to demonstrate mastery of subject matter and to develop content that is appropriate for the music discipline. In addition students are required to use appropriate sources and write using good grammar. The project has the unique dimension of in-class and outside-of-class group work. I am able as instructor to observe in class to what extent students function within a group situation where participation and input is required. I think both of these rubrics are effective tools for measurement; however, most students achieve about level 1 or 2 for written communication (for each sub-category of Outcome B) and about level 2 for collaboration (for each sub-category of Outcome C).

I find "content development" and "sources and evidence" somewhat difficult to distinguish. I wonder which trait the analysis of evidence falls under. All of the descriptions could be clearer. I also don't like having to provide a simple yes-or-no answer to the question of whether the student has demonstrated appropriate knowledge and skills. That question seems counter-productive to me.

I had developed my own rubric but I think in the future I'll integrate the Core rubric with my own.

I have no problem with Communication, Goal I, outcome B.

We completed this assessment as grading of teams. This approach explains the groupings of a sample of students from the various teams (Team 1, Team 2, and Team 3). Similar to our comments to the Communication, Part C rubric for WRTG 3310, the difficulty with this rubric reveals itself in that collaboration is often graded as teamwork where all members of a team share the same grade. This rubric uses the term "collaboration" then quickly focuses in on the level of the individual student rather than the level of the team, which, barring extreme occurrences brought on by the occasional individual student, would be more precisely assessed at the scale of the team--the level at which collaboration occurs. Beyond this issue is the other problem that results whenever assessors are not familiar with the assignment.

It is generally useful but not as a grading rubric.

In professional writing, sources and evidence aren't always used in the traditional way which can skew the results of students' performance.

I am not sure I understand the difference between usefulness and useable-ness. To me those terms mean almost the same thing.   The problem for me is the rubric has too many categories with some of the category descriptions sounding almost alike. I would prefer three well defined categories, which would allow for distinct differences between each.

The "3" answers because I provided the students with an "annotated" rubric translating the traits to the class and to the assignment.

Some of the grading criteria needs definition such as "control of syntax and mechanics" really puzzles. How do you rate a student from 1-4 for that? On the whole I think the matrix needs to be more specific. I evaluated the students' submission based upon their ability to understand the concepts and theories of the management topic that I am teaching and whether they know how to apply them to solve management problems. So I would consider this matrix more relevant to maybe Business communication or business writing classes.

There is no need for five (5) different ratings of four (4) criteria for every student to assess written communication skills. This can be much simpler.

Communication Goal #1, Outcome C

Clearly written, with minimal educational jargon.

This rubric was useful. The group assignments went fairly well in my class, so most of the students did pretty well on this rubric. I don't know if that is because it is too easy, but I think any student who takes on the assignment in good faith is going to be able to score a 3. Scoring a 4 is harder, because it does seem to require active leadership.

I consistently have difficulty assessing group work so having this rubric actually gave me some insights and ideas for how to restructure my own existing scoring system. My existing system has 8 levels which can be compressed into the 4-level rubric being used but it did require a little reevaluation of my prior classifications.

For some time now I have used an end-of-the-semester group project assignment to assess students' ability to synthesize knowledge and skills learned in the music discipline and to assess skills in written communication and collaboration. This assignment was an easy choice to use for these two rubrics. The assignment requires a written report that allows the opportunity for students to demonstrate mastery of subject matter and to develop content that is appropriate for the music discipline. In addition students are required to use appropriate sources and write using good grammar. The project has the unique dimension of in-class and outside-of-class group work. I am able as instructor to observe in class to what extent students function within a group situation where participation and input is

required. I think both of these rubrics are effective tools for measurement; however, most students achieve about level 1 or 2 for written communication (for each sub-category of Outcome B) and about level 2 for collaboration (for each sub-category of Outcome C).

In my mind, there is considerable overlap among the three traits.

I am not sure I understand the difference between usefulness and useable-ness. To me those terms mean almost the same thing.   The problem for me is the rubric has too many categories with some of the category descriptions sounding almost alike. I would prefer three well defined categories, which would allow for distinct differences between each.

Students in my class were divided into groups, however for the purposes of my class a much more detail rubric is used to determine the students contribution to each team. Students are evaluated based on evaluation of individual's overall contribution to the group, punctuality at meeting, ability to solve project problems, willingness to cooperate, willingness to listen, attendance at group meetings, attitude towards project, leadership, individual effort in getting things done and contribution of time to overall project. These are evaluated by peers so it has to be detailed. So instead of the rubric being useful to me, I have to fit my questionnaires to the rubric. It is the cart before the horse.

Critical Inquiry Goal #1

The idea behind this rubric is good, though the execution needs some work. For the first criterion, the difference between the levels is somewhat unclear. I have a general sense of the difference, but it is not concrete. The descriptions of the levels for the third criterion need a lot of work. I suppose it is trying to avoid being too discipline specific, but I found those descriptions to be very unhelpful. When assigning numbers to that learning outcome, I just assessed how well the paper developed and assessed a position in my own terms, not using the descriptions of the levels.

I already employed a structured grading scale for many assignments. These were not rubrics, per se, but I thought I could integrate my existing scale with the new rubric. This proved more difficult than I had anticipated. Part of the difficulty was in the detail; my existing grading structure has 8 levels and I found the course grained rubric more vague than I would have liked. This is probably more useful as a university-wide device so it is understandable, however.

The Rubric seems to be put together with a lot of thought and consideration. I have nothing of value to add to it. It is a useful rubric to use for consistent grading.

Overall, it is probably reasonable. However, since the assignment covers discipline-specific content in addition to Core learning goals, it does not make grading the assignments easier, nor more consistent. Furthermore, the descriptions of the traits are rather limiting. For example, one student did 'apply appropriate modes of academic analysis and inquiry...,' but only did a portion of the assigned work. The completed portion was excellent, and demonstrated that that student in all likelihood is in possession of appropriate knowledge and skills for their level, but there is no way to assign a score on a given trait without being bound by the description for that numerical value. In other words, student performance can meet or fail to meet what I believe to be the intent of each articulated learning outcome (trait) without necessarily doing so in the very specific way described in the cells.

Again, even though the rubric applies to the assignment of this course, but with students' current proficiency level in Chinese, it does not necessarily apply to my class.

The rubric is not particularly useful to me in my class because I do not use the rubric for grade/assessment purposes (beyond the CORE).

The assessment questions we devised for FINA 3330 merely require grading five questions so the rubric is not needed. The number correct out of 5 is the recorded score. However, the rubric scoring system is consistent.

I think I will modify the assignment I use in the future for this rubric. In particular, in my understanding of the rubric, I'm not sure that my students could have scored a "4" on the last learning outcome--I will have to think more about it. In general, the assignment asked them to work through the "problem" of translation. The way I structured the assignment, all students had to "justify a position"--that is, their own translation--and they had to evaluate an official translation of the text, but they did not have to speculate on the official translator's motivations. Also, I think I will need to relate it back to the larger questions of the discipline.

Yes this was useful and easy to use.

The rubric is "useable" per se but it is by nature very broad and therefore not a likely candidate to be used to construct the final paper grading rubric in this class. That said, it assesses critical inquiry well enough to work.

As colleagues commented when they saw the rubric, the rubric is so generic that it loses its purpose. Yes, I can apply it to class, and easily. No, it's not as good as what we had already. For a one-size-fits-all tool, though, it will do.

For a professional writing class, it was difficult to apply parts of the rubric to a non-traditional research assignment (where sources are not explicitly stated/documented). Also, in the first row, "Apply" is a more advanced term than "Evaluate".

I found the rubric somewhat useful and fairly usable. Specifically, I found the learning outcomes appropriate to the goal of critical inquiry and applicable to my assignment and class. Where I had more trouble was in interpreting the descriptions associated with each learning outcome, especially those under 3 and 4 for each learning outcome.

Critical Inquiry Goal #2, Outcome A

Testing this rubric with my lab sections in fall 2013 revealed that I had designed an inappropriate assessment instrument. Based on the work that I assigned students, I was unable to discriminate among levels (0-4) in the rubric for individual students (as a result, I do not have data to report from fall 2013). For fall 2014, I have developed a revised assessment instrument. But there are problems inherent in the rubric that will make it difficult to use, regardless of instrument, in BIOL 1400 (explained below).

Critical Inquiry Goal #2, Outcome B

No responses.

Diversity Goal #1

Concerns were raised in my department about the goal to "Articulate one's own cultural values and assumptions." "One's own cultural values" could be such different things given that we have students from different countries, cultures, religions. Thus we might not teach this to students as much as ask them to do it.

I think we need to work a bit more on the description of some traits (cells) so that they are clearer and have more continuity from the level 2 description to level 3, specifically. The transition from level 2 to 3 for the second trait (Compare cultural values across a range of cultures) works well, but for the third row trait (Respond to complex questions with answers that reflect multiple cultural perspectives) level 3 does not seem to be a continuation of levels 2 and 1. In addition, the level 4 description for that isn't specific enough to be helpful.

The rubric is generally very useful and useable to my assignment and course.

The rubric assumes certain details about intercultural diversity that are not applicable to a technical writing course where intercultural understanding is exhibited. In basic terms, the rubric focuses mainly on academic examination of intercultural perspectives. Though

integral to technical writing practice, it is unlikely that a technical writing artifact will engage in overt discussion of various cultural perspectives. Instead, technical writing exhibits understanding of cultural difference through the effectiveness of the written product created. This is why the course is best served by a rubric similar to the one developed for creative expressions. Unfortunately, there is no rubric that allows a technical writing course to assert that student work in such a course is a kind of creative endeavor. We need a third rubric for workplace writing as creative expression or that at least acknowledges that the work of assessing intercultural awareness in technical writing involves examining written products as created artifacts of the workplace. This current rubric does not allow this outcome. Similarly, the existing alternative rubric, Diversity: Goal 2, appears to favor a notion of artifacts as solely that of creative expression in artistic expressions. This leaves gap leaves technical writing effectively with no place to call home among the existing rubrics for diversity. For example, how does one assess a student's awareness of intercultural adeptness through correct document formatting when the Diversity: Goal 1 rubric fixates on academic conversations about intercultural perspectives?

The rubric is useable and perhaps useful to gauge student's overall awareness of their culture in relation to others, but in general, it is difficult to translate the Likert scale approach accurately to a definitive "score" on particular assignments. I scored the assignments and then used the rubric separately for assessment purposes only, leading to additional work without actual benefits for my course.

The rubrics were partly applied to my course but the course exercise is much more specific to the rubric i.e. the application of culture to management and organization is emphasized and not measured in the rubric.

This rubric was useful for this assignment. It helped me bring out points regarding cultural diversity that student's need to be aware of.

The rubric was useful for the discussion question portion of the assignment but not necessarily for the assignment as a whole. The rubric was not useable in class because half of the discussion questions listed on the assignment were in-class discussion, while the other half required written responses that were a small percentage of the graded PR writing assignment. Although all students completed the PR writing portion of the assignment, some did not turn in the discussion question portion; therefore, I primarily relied on a previously created rubric that assessed their PR writing rather than the diversity goal. In retrospect, I could have applied the rubric to the in-class discussion questions as well as the written ones to make it more useable. I also could have emphasized the importance of turning in written responses to the remaining discussion questions for assessment

purposes. Another option could have been making the discussion questions more in-depth and a larger percentage of the PR writing assignment.

Diversity Goal #2

I was able to use the rubric, but I find that this type of assessment does not enhance my grading or the student's learning experience associated with the class. I do not see the assessment processes' benefits at this time.

The rubric was useable. I will need to modify my assignment to take the "historical context" portion more into consideration. As the assignment is currently, it focuses primarily on cultural perspectives rather than historical ones.

Responsible Living Goals #1, #2, and #3

It seems that the rubric is designed to evaluate an assignment in which the actual content is an answer to the question of responsible living. In order to tie the designation to out course material, our assignment asks students to describe the relationships between ethics and an element/principle of rhetoric, using an analysis of a particular text to illustrate that relationship. The conceptual sophistication of what the students are being asked to do is not adequately reflected by this rubric. There is also some lack of clarity in the terminology -- for example, shouldn't prediction be a higher-level skill than evaluation?

In terms of assessing whether the responsible living objectives were addressed, yes, the rubric was useful and useable. In terms of making grading easier, it just added another layer to the assessment process.

The whole thing is a colossal exercise in futility.

It is not very clear what is the difference between column 1 and column 2.

This rubric was useful in my course. The goals of responsible living were relevant to the course and class assignment which is based on health promotion and disease prevention. I was able to incorporate the rubric for responsible living into the course assignment rubric which was easy to use.

The rubric was somewhat useful for this to use this rubric in grading an assignment that was appropriate both for my course subject matter particular assignment but not for my class. I found it difficult and for the intended use of the Responsible Living assignment.

2. **How could this rubric be improved?**

Communication Goal #1, Outcome A

Style it towards specific courses.

I would change the descriptor for Organization #4 to include "connects issues studied to broader issues and considerations" or something like that.

Communication Goal #1, Outcome B

I would love to share grading rubrics with students, but this wouldn't do, particularly at the freshman level. See, for example, the description for a 4 on "Control of Syntax and Mechanics." Maybe someone in the writing department could make better use of this, after wading through all of the adjectives (appropriate, relevant, deliberate, substantive, thoughtful, skillful, high-quality, clear, fluid). Of course, I still don't understand why the chemistry department doesn't incorporate psychology into their courses. We could have, "psychology across the curriculum."

I am not sure what "Context and Purpose" is looking for. As I was assessing, I associated this with whether the essay had a clear thesis and argument, but I am not sure if that is what it means. I also could not tell the difference between levels 2 and 3 for this item. How is "Exhibits adequate consideration" different that "Expresses deliberate awareness"? I am also unsure of the difference between "Content Development" and "Sources and Evidence." In other words, it was unclear to me whether the top three categories were assessing clearly different things or not. Perhaps some more explanation of the focus of each criterion would help.

This rubric seems exceedingly clear. The only place where it doesn't quite fit the assignment is that my students drew only from primary textual sources and evidence, so I wasn't sure if they must also draw on secondary sources to receive a 4 or 3 in "Sources and Evidence".

Change the focus from emphasizing the individual to emphasizing teams.

The first criterion on audience and purpose seems to evolve in the four scoring categories into an assessment of completeness or thoroughness (i.e."...and focuses on all elements of the work.") that does not follow from the first three criteria.

I think the committee spent a lot of time and effort developing this matrix and as it is, if it measures the relevant class, I think it will be fine.

Communication Goal #1, Outcome C

Just a note on this feedback form: What does it mean to say that, "The descriptions of the traits were well defined.

I think this rubric is pretty good for its purposes.

I DON'T KNOW WHAT YOU MEAN BY ASKING IF THIS RUBRIC MADE MY GRADING FASTER OR EASIER--FASTER OR EASIER THAN WHAT? WITHOUT IT? I WOULDN'T HAVE BEEN GRADING ANYONE ON THIS IF NOT REQUIRED BY THE FYS.

The three traits need to be much more clearly defined.

I think it was more of a problem with the assignment I chose, rather than a problem with the rubric per se.

Change the focus from the individual to the team (or at least make a team focused assessment an alternative for scoring on this rubric.

For this rubric to be useful, it might be better to use the 10 questions that I used for the students to perform a peer evaluation of each other. Using the three questions in the rubric for peer evaluation is not specific enough to measure all the team dynamics dimensions. I used the peer evaluation to determine each individual's contribution to the overall score of the team and award grades according to the team members' evaluation of their peer, so a three criteria peer evaluation might not be enough for my purpose.

Critical Inquiry Goal #1

Perhaps a "user's guide" describing the levels for each criteria in more detail. The third criteria needs a lot of work. I don't know what "Identify different perspectives use in the discipline" means, nor why "understanding there are multiple approaches to academic questions" is a valuable thing to assess.

See above regarding the detail. I don't know that adding levels would necessarily help, though. I was able to split my 8-level grading system nicely into the 4-level rubric (8 or 7 = 4, 6 or 5 = 3, and so on) so it wasn't as difficult as I probably made it.

Some of the trait descriptors for the varying levels could be improved for more fluid transitions between the numbers. Also, the phrase "in the discipline" is very vague and does not take into consideration the multiple elements associated with various disciplines.

Link to rubric does not work.

I think the rubric is pretty good, it's just a matter of me modifying the assignment slightly.

For the "develop and evaluate a position" the descriptors for ratings 1 and 2 seem substantially the same and didn't seem to be setting a high enough bar. Part A of the rubric had the best logical progression for the four areas scored.

Given the cross-disciplinary requirement of the assessment, I don't see what else you could do.

The wording used to distinguish 3 ("apply") from 4 ("evaluate") on the first outcome is a tough distinction to make at times. This is also true about distinguishing a 3 from a 4 on the third outcome. Also, it is subjective/ambiguous to make the call of overall demonstration of knowledge in the discipline. Is a series of 2s acceptable or is the bar set higher? I'd like guidance on how to make the Yes/No call in a way that can be consistent across disciplines.

Critical Inquiry Goal #2, Outcome A

For BIOL 1400 (and, presumably, for chemistry and physics courses, as well), the criteria (traits) in the rubric should be re-ordered so that after "define question/problem," the next trait is "propose hypotheses," followed by "design hypothesis tests," and finally, "evaluate results." I do not know what it would mean, in science, to "identify strategies" before one has proposed a hypothesis. Furthermore, "identify strategies" is not the sort of language we would use in a biology course; we would ask students to develop/design hypothesis tests.

Critical Inquiry Goal #2, Outcome B

No responses.

Diversity Goal #1

The phrase "Articulate the complex nuances of a range of cultures." seems a tad vague. Perhaps it could be re-worked a little in some manner.

The descriptions of the traits need to be revised so that there is a very clear progression between the levels. For the second row trait, I think they work well, but levels 1 and 3 could be clearer. We also need to consider putting clear instructions on the rubric about what the expectations are between upper- and lower- division courses. of course, the challenge is to do this revision without making the rubric too discipline-specific. The biggest challenge is creating a "one-size fits all" rubric. This rubric is workable, but I think it can be better.

The only problem I have with the rubric is the descriptions for the final learning outcome. The description for a 4 in this learning outcome seems to have nothing to do with the

others, and the description for a 3 introduces "decision making/problem solving" which didn't seem to relate to the learning outcome (and wasn't a part of my assignment. The other descriptions, however (particularly "tolerates ambiguity", "defines in terms of positive or negative" and "does not distinguish as superior or inferior") were exceedingly clear and very helpful.

We had 5 readers for this UCA Core assessment activity. In reading the same student texts, we have concluded that the lack of knowledge of the instructor assignment leads to some difficulty when the instructor of record is not the sole reader for the UCA core assessment. One additional item that was identified as problematic was that the first box in the category 1 column (the Diversity: Goal 1 learning outcomes) is not all that different that the third box in the Category 2 column (the Diversity: Goal 1 learning outcomes). In essence, though worded slightly different, the same assessment criteria appear in two places on the rubric.

For the current assessment outlook at UCA, the rubric functions fine; however, as a tool for evaluation towards a course grade, the assessment process and associated rubrics have little value.

Perhaps development of cultural rubrics that are more specific to the practice of management i.e. not only must students be evaluated by their knowledge of culture and cultural diversity in organizations but also the ability to apply it to solve certain situational problems.

More flexibility in adding specific content area for a particular class. While most of the traits and descriptions fit well into my assignment, some were not overly general and were difficult to fit with content for class.

Overall the rubric seems fine. Perhaps the assignment used for assessment purposes could be enhanced or changed to better fit the learning outcomes of the rubric.

Diversity Goal #2

For the current assessment outlook at UCA, the rubric functions fine; however, as a tool for evaluation towards a course grade, the assessment process and associated rubrics have little value.

The link does not work!

I'm not quite sure I understand the distinction between a 4 and a 3 in either the first or the second Learning outcome. Specifically, I'm not sure what "apply an understanding of creative techniques and processes" means.

Responsible Living Goals #1, #2, and #3

If the purpose of this assessment is programmatic, I am not sure why we are being asked for student information. Also, there should be some way to accommodate multiple readers, in order for the assessment to provide reliable data. Readers were unsure about what was meant by "practices" in 3.

I think it is fine for use as a reporting tool for the assessment of the general education requirements being met.

Again I would stress the association of theories and concepts of ethics or ability of students to identify the normative ethical models and their ability to differentiate the different models. Then we should assess their ability to apply these models to solve management problems.

Currently, I would not make any changes to the rubric.

Allow for individualization by the instructor, possibly keeping the traits and descriptions but allowing the instructor to add cells regarding content of their particular course.

APPENDIX C: REVISED RUBRICS

UCA CORE – Critical Inquiry Rubric A (Inquiry and Analysis)

This rubric is used to assess students' progress towards *Goal A* of the *Critical Inquiry* area of the UCA Core.

Critical Inquiry: the ability to analyze new problems and situations to formulate informed opinions and conclusions.

Goal A: Demonstrate a knowledge base to ask more informed questions and learn more complex concepts.

This rubric assesses the following three specific skill or knowledge areas related to Goal A:
- **Knowledge:** An understanding of the concepts and/or principles in the discipline and how they relate to important questions.
- **Information:** Selecting appropriate and credible information based on knowledge of topic and discipline.
- **Analysis:** Evaluating a position and/or drawing conclusions on significant questions in the discipline.

How to use this rubric:
- Apply the rubric to at least one assignment. If different skill or knowledge areas are assessed by different assignments, then apply the respective rows of the rubric to those assignments that assess each specific skill or knowledge area. All skill or knowledge areas listed in this rubric must be assessed by the end of the course.
- For each specific skill or knowledge area, assign a score from 0 to 4 based on the student learning outcome that best matches the performance of the student on the assignment.
- Although the rubric may inform the grading scheme used for the assignment, it should not replace it. Scores of 4, 3, 2, and 1 do not necessarily correspond to A, B, C, and D. The rubric is used to track students' progress throughout the UCA Core, not just their performance in a single course. Thus, a score of 4 represents the expected mastery of that skill or knowledge area by time a student graduates. That mastery may come earlier or later in a student's progression through the UCA Core, but **generally speaking, scores of 1 and 2 are expected in lower-division courses, whereas scores of 3 and 4 are expected in upper-division and capstone courses**.
- Enter scores into the Excel spreadsheet found on the UCA General Education website (http://uca.edu/gened/core-assessment-process/) and email the completed spreadsheet to the UCA Core Director, Jacob Held (jmheld@uca.edu), before grades are due.

UCA CORE – Critical Inquiry Rubric A (Inquiry and Analysis)

Specific Skill or Knowledge Area Related to the Goal	Student Learning Outcomes				0
	4	3	2	1	
Knowledge	Shows both a broad and deep understanding of the concepts/principles and their relevance to important questions in the discipline.	Shows a general grasp of the concepts/principles and how they relate to important questions in the discipline.	Shows some knowledge of the concepts/principles and can begin to relate them to important questions in the discipline.	Shows some knowledge of the concepts/principles and limited ability to relate them to important questions in the discipline.	Assign a zero for performance that does not meet a score of one (1).
Information	Selects information from the most relevant and credible sources, without critical omissions of key sources.	Selects relevant information from a variety of sources, but may lack some appropriate and credible sources.	Selects information from limited and similar sources.	Selects information randomly that lacks relevance and quality; or was given the information by instructor.	
Analysis	Justifies a position and/or draws a logical conclusion using appropriate disciplinary analysis on a significant question or problem.	Presents a position and/or conclusion on a significant question/problem using appropriate disciplinary analysis, but lacks depth and/or draws a weak/illogical conclusion	Summarizes different perspectives used in the discipline but does not evaluate a position and/or draw a conclusion.	Recognizes there are multiple approaches to academic questions/problems.	

Overall, has this student demonstrated appropriate knowledge and skills for this level in this discipline?   __ Yes   __No

__ This student did not turn in an acceptable response to the assignment (e.g., failed to turn in a paper, plagiarized, etc.)

50

UCA CORE – Critical Inquiry Rubric B (Scientific)

This rubric is used to assess students' progress towards *Goal B* of the *Critical Inquiry* area of the UCA Core.

Critical Inquiry: the ability to analyze new problems and situations to formulate informed opinions and conclusions.

Goal B: Apply scientific process to solve problems/answer questions

This rubric assesses the following four specific skill or knowledge areas related to Goal B:

- **Define Problem/Question:** A statement or summary that identifies a problem or raises a question that is relevant to the topic or assignment, appropriate to the discipline, and open to empirical inquiry (i.e., objective observation).
- **Propose Hypotheses:** Formulating testable propositions that follow from one particular solution/answer to the problem/question.
- **Identify Methodology:** Selecting the appropriate set of procedures to test the hypotheses.
- **Evaluate Results:** An objective assessment of the hypotheses based on the empirical evidence gathered from the methodology.

How to use this rubric:

- Apply the rubric to at least one assignment. If different skill or knowledge areas are assessed by different assignments, then apply the respective rows of the rubric to those assignments that assess each specific skill or knowledge area. All skill or knowledge areas listed in this rubric must be assessed by the end of the course.
- For each specific skill or knowledge area, assign a score from 0 to 4 based on the student learning outcome that best matches the performance of the student on the assignment.
- Although the rubric may inform the grading scheme used for the assignment, it should not replace it. Scores of 4, 3, 2, and 1 do not necessarily correspond to A, B, C, and D. The rubric is used to track students' progress throughout the UCA Core, not just their performance in a single course. Thus, a score of 4 represents the expected mastery of that skill or knowledge area by time a student graduates. That mastery may come earlier or later in a student's progression through the UCA Core, but generally speaking, scores of 1 and 2 are expected in lower-division courses, whereas scores of 3 and 4 are expected in upper-division and capstone courses.
- Enter scores into the Excel spreadsheet found on the UCA General Education website (http://uca.edu/gened/core-assessment-process/) and email the completed spreadsheet to the UCA Core Director, Jacob Held (jmheld@uca.edu), before grades are due.

UCA CORE – Critical Inquiry Rubric B (Scientific)

Specific Skill or Knowledge Area Related to the Goal	Student Learning Outcomes				0
	4	3	2	1	
Define Problem/Question	Communicates comprehensive, contextual understanding of the problem/question.	Compares problem/question statements to determine which best summarizes the problem.	Composes a basic, accurate problem/question statement.	Recognizes an applicable problem/question statement.	Assign a zero for performance that does not meet a score of one (1).
Propose Hypotheses	Communicates a hypothesis reflecting a comprehensive understanding of the problem/question.	Develops a hypothesis that links variables.	Composes a testable hypothesis from a scenario.	Recognizes a testable hypothesis.	
Identify Methodology	Proposes complex, multi-level strategic approaches for solving the problem or addressing the question.	Devises a complete appropriate strategic plan including controls to address the problem/question.	Distinguishes between valid options to select the best strategic plan to address the problem/question.	Recognizes appropriate strategic steps that address the problem/question.	
Evaluate Results	Articulates a comprehensive evaluation of results including next steps.	Produces an accurate interpretation of data including a consideration of sources of error.	Selects the best interpretation of results.	Recognizes an accurate interpretation of results.	

Overall, has this student demonstrated appropriate knowledge and skills for this level in this discipline?   __ Yes   __No

__ This student did not turn in an acceptable response to the assignment (e.g., failed to turn in a paper, plagiarized, etc.)

UCA CORE – Critical Inquiry Rubric C (Quantitative)

This rubric is used to assess students' progress towards *Goal C* of the *Critical Inquiry* area of the UCA Core.

Critical Inquiry: the ability to analyze new problems and situations to formulate informed opinions and conclusions.

Goal C: Apply quantitative and computational processes to solve problems.

This rubric assesses the following three specific skill or knowledge areas related to Goal C:
- **Information:** Identifying and extracting relevant information needed to solve the problem.
- **Methods:** Selecting the appropriate methods to solve the problem.
- **Communication:** Effectively communicating quantitative concepts or evidence consistent with the purpose of the assignment.

How to use this rubric:
- Apply the rubric to at least one assignment. If different skill or knowledge areas are assessed by different assignments, then apply the respective rows of the rubric to those assignments that assess each specific skill or knowledge area. All skill or knowledge areas listed in this rubric must be assessed by the end of the course.
- For each specific skill or knowledge area, assign a score from 0 to 4 based on the student learning outcome that best matches the performance of the student on the assignment.
- Unlike other UCA Core rubrics that track students' progress through the UCA Core, the use of this rubric is complicated by the difficulty of the quantitative problems that students may encounter early compared to later in the UCA Core. For example, a student majoring in Mathematics may show mastery of the material (a score of 4) in Calculus I as a freshman but may struggle in Advanced Calculus as a senior. Thus, it is *not* expected that scores of 1 and 2 are more likely in lower-division courses and scores of 3 and 4 are more likely in upper-division and capstone courses.
- Enter scores into the Excel spreadsheet found on the UCA General Education website (http://uca.edu/gened/core-assessment-process/) and email the completed spreadsheet to the Director of the UCA Core, Jacob Held (jmheld@uca.edu), before grades are due.

UCA CORE – Critical Inquiry Rubric C (Quantitative)

Specific Skill or Knowledge Area Related to the Goal	Student Learning Outcomes				
	4	3	2	1	0
Information	Justifies solution in terms of relevant information needed to solve a problem.	Extracts all relevant information needed to solve a problem, but cannot justify the solution.	Extracts some, but not all, relevant information needed to solve a problem.	Recognizes relevant information needed to solve the problem, but cannot extract the information.	Assign a zero for performance that does not meet a score of one (1).
Methods	Solves a variety of problems using appropriate methods with consistent accuracy without verbal or supporting cues.	Uses appropriate methods to calculate problems accurately with occasional verbal or supportive cues. Independent calculations. Includes minor errors.	Solves calculations correctly but requires frequent verbal or supportive cues. Independent calculation accuracy is erratic.	Performs calculations with minimal accuracy independently. Can perform calculation accurately but only with continuous verbal and supportive cues.	
Communication	Articulates a variety of complex concepts in a logical and comprehensible manner.	Generates explanations of concepts that are detailed and clear.	Defines all major steps with some details missed or some language not completely precise.	Lists basic concepts.	

Overall, has this student demonstrated appropriate knowledge and skills for this level in this discipline?　__ Yes　__No

__ This student did not turn in an acceptable response to the assignment (e.g., failed to turn in a paper, plagiarized, etc.)

UCA CORE – Diversity Rubric A (Own)

This rubric is used to assess students' progress towards *Goal A* of the *Diversity* area of the UCA Core.

Diversity: the ability to analyze familiar cultural assumptions in the context of the world's diverse values, traditions, and belief system as well as to analyze the major ideas, techniques, and processes that inform creative works within different cultural and historical contexts.

Goal A: Analyze one's own cultural values and assumptions.

This rubric assesses the following three specific skill or knowledge areas related to Goal A:

- **Cultural Self-awareness:** Knowledge of how experiences have shaped one's own cultural rules, and how to recognize and respond to cultural biases, resulting in a shift in self-description.
- **Empathy:** The ability to imagine one's self as another, with another's interests and emotions, and within another's cultural rules, biases, and perspectives.
- **Openness:** Desire to interact with culturally different others. Interactions with culturally different others should be interpreted broadly, and can include experiences with texts, creative works, or individuals.

How to use this rubric:

- Apply the rubric to at least one assignment. If different skill or knowledge areas are assessed by different assignments, then apply the respective rows of the rubric to those assignments that assess each specific skill or knowledge area. All skill or knowledge areas listed in this rubric must be assessed by the end of the course.
- For each specific skill or knowledge area, assign a score from 0 to 4 based on the student learning outcome that best matches the performance of the student on the assignment.
- Although the rubric may inform the grading scheme used for the assignment, it should not replace it. Scores of 4, 3, 2, and 1 do not necessarily correspond to A, B, C, and D. The rubric is used to track students' progress throughout the UCA Core, not just their performance in a single course. Thus, a score of 4 represents the expected mastery of that skill or knowledge area by time a student graduates. That mastery may come earlier or later in a student's progression through the UCA Core, but generally speaking, scores of 1 and 2 are expected in lower-division courses, whereas scores of 3 and 4 are expected in upper-division and capstone courses.
- Enter scores into the Excel spreadsheet found on the UCA General Education website (http://uca.edu/gened/core-assessment-process/) and email to the UCA Core Director, Jacob Held (jmheld@uca.edu), before grades are due.

UCA CORE – Diversity Rubric A (Own)

Specific Skill or Knowledge Area Related to the Goal	Student Learning Outcomes				
	4	3	2	1	0
Cultural Self-awareness	Articulates critical and substantive insights into own cultural rules, biases, and perspectives.	Recognizes own cultural rules, biases, and perspectives; demonstrates a willingness to think critically/analytically about them, but not always able to articulate them well.	Identifies own cultural rules, biases, and perspectives, but demonstrates an uncritical preference for own culture.	Shows minimal awareness of own cultural rules, biases, and perspectives.	Assign a zero for performance that does not meet a score of one (1).
Empathy	Interprets intercultural experiences from perspectives of own and more than one worldview. Demonstrates ability to think in an empathetic manner regarding those outside of own group.	Recognizes intellectual and emotional dimensions of more than one worldview and sometimes uses more than one worldview in analysis.	Identifies components of other cultural perspectives but responds in all situations with own worldview.	Views the experience of others but does so through own cultural worldview.	
Openness	Fully develops interactions with culturally different others. Makes informed judgments about differences that show respect for cultural diversity.	Initiates but does not fully develop interactions with culturally different others. Begins to make informed judgments about differences that show respect for cultural diversity.	Expresses openness to most, if not all, interactions with culturally different others. May have difficulty making informed judgments about differences that show respect for cultural diversity.	Receptive to interacting with culturally different others. Has difficulty making informed judgments about differences that show respect for cultural diversity.	

Overall, has this student demonstrated appropriate knowledge and skills for this level in this discipline?   __ Yes   __No

__ This student did not turn in an acceptable response to the assignment (e.g., failed to turn in a paper, plagiarized, etc.)

Portions of this rubric were adapted from the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) VALUE Rubrics.

UCA CORE – Diversity Rubric B (Other)

This rubric is used to assess students' progress towards *Goal B* of the *Diversity* area of the UCA Core.

Diversity is the ability to analyze familiar cultural assumptions in the context of the world's diverse values, traditions, and belief system as well as to analyze the major ideas, techniques, and processes that inform creative works within different cultural and historical contexts.

Goal B: Analyze or compare diverse values, traditions, belief systems, and/or perspectives.

This rubric assesses the following three specific skill or knowledge areas related to Goal B:

- **Cultural Worldview Frameworks:** The history, values, politics, communication styles, economics, or beliefs and practices by which people construe their experiences and make sense of the world around them.
- **Curiosity:** Willingness to understand and engage with other worldview frameworks.
- **Application:** Ability to engage and learn from different perspectives and experiences; to understand how one's place in the world both informs and limits one's knowledge.

How to use this rubric:

- Apply the rubric to at least one assignment. If different skill or knowledge areas are assessed by different assignments, then apply the respective rows of the rubric to those assignments that assess each specific skill or knowledge area.
- For each specific skill or knowledge area, assign a score from 0 to 4 based on the student learning outcome that best matches the performance of the student on the assignment.
- Although the rubric may inform the grading scheme used for the assignment, it should not replace it. Scores of 4, 3, 2, and 1 do not necessarily correspond to A, B, C, and D. The rubric is used to track students' progress throughout the UCA Core, not just their performance in a single course. Thus, a score of 4 represents the expected mastery of that skill or knowledge area by time a student graduates. That mastery may come earlier or later in a student's progression through the UCA Core, but generally speaking, scores of 1 and 2 are expected in lower-division courses, whereas scores of 3 and 4 are expected in upper-division and capstone courses.
- Enter scores into the Excel spreadsheet found on the UCA General Education website (http://uca.edu/gened/core-assessment-process/) and email to the UCA Core Director, Jacob Held (jmheld@uca.edu), before grades are due.

UCA CORE – Diversity Rubric B (Other)

Specific Skill or Knowledge Area Related to the Goal	Student Learning Outcomes				
	4	3	2	1	0
Cultural Worldview Frameworks	Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of the complex elements important to a worldview framework.	Demonstrates full understanding of the obvious elements important to a worldview framework.	Demonstrates adequate understanding of a few of the elements important to a worldview framework.	Demonstrates inadequate understanding of a few of the elements important to a worldview framework.	Assign a zero for performance that does not meet a score of one (1).
Curiosity	Asks complex questions about other cultures/ institutions/ structures, seeks out and articulates answers to these questions that reflect multiple perspectives.	Asks questions about other cultures/institutions/structures and seeks out answers to these questions.	Asks simple or surface questions about other cultures/institutions/structures but does not seek out answers to these questions.	Demonstrates minimal interest in learning more about other cultures/institutions/structures.	
Application	Evaluates and applies diverse perspectives to complex subjects within natural and human systems in the face of multiple and even conflicting positions (such as cultural, disciplinary, and ethical.)	Summarizes other perspectives (such as cultural, disciplinary, and ethical) but unable to apply knowledge of those perspectives to advanced problems.	Identifies multiple perspectives (such as cultural, disciplinary, and ethical) without bias for own positioning.	Identifies multiple perspectives while maintaining a preference for own positioning (such as cultural, disciplinary, and ethical).	

Overall, has this student demonstrated appropriate knowledge and skills for this level in this discipline?   __ Yes   __No

__ This student did not turn in an acceptable response to the assignment (e.g., failed to turn in a paper, plagiarized, etc.)

Portions of this rubric were adapted from the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) VALUE Rubrics.

UCA CORE – Diversity Rubric C (Creative Works)

This rubric is used to assess students' progress towards *Goal C* of the *Diversity* area of the UCA Core.

Diversity is the ability to analyze familiar cultural assumptions in the context of the world's diverse values, traditions, and belief system as well as to analyze the major ideas, techniques, and processes that inform creative works within different cultural and historical contexts.

Goal C: Analyze creative works within diverse contexts.

This rubric assesses the following three specific skill or knowledge areas related to Goal C:
- **Theory/Criticism/Technique:** The set of concepts/principles used to create or evaluate creative works.
- **Themes and Ideas:** The concepts expressed in the creative work that are representative of diverse cultures/perspectives.
- **Context:** The personal, social, cultural, and historical influences on the creative work.
- **Reflection:** The articulation of a personal response to the experience of a creative work.

How to use this rubric:
- Apply the rubric to at least one assignment. If different skill or knowledge areas are assessed by different assignments, then apply the respective rows of the rubric to those assignments that assess each specific skill or knowledge area. All skill or knowledge areas listed in this rubric must be assessed by the end of the course.
- For each specific skill or knowledge area, assign a score from 0 to 4 based on the student learning outcome that best matches the performance of the student on the assignment.
- Although the rubric may inform the grading scheme used for the assignment, it should not replace it. Scores of 4, 3, 2, and 1 do not necessarily correspond to A, B, C, and D. The rubric is used to track students' progress throughout the UCA Core, not just their performance in a single course. Thus, a score of 4 represents the expected mastery of that skill or knowledge area by time a student graduates. That mastery may come earlier or later in a student's progression through the UCA Core, but generally speaking, scores of 1 and 2 are expected in lower-division courses, whereas scores of 3 and 4 are expected in upper-division and capstone courses.
- Enter scores into the Excel spreadsheet found on the UCA General Education website (http://uca.edu/gened/core-assessment-process/) and email to the UCA Core Director, Jacob Held (jmheld@uca.edu), before grades are due.

UCA CORE – Diversity Rubric C (Creative Works)

Specific Skill or Knowledge Area Related to the Goal	Student Learning Outcomes				
	4	3	2	1	0
Theory/Criticism/Technique	Identifies the most appropriate theory/criticism/technique and performs a sophisticated analysis.	Identifies a relevant theory/criticism/technique and performs a thorough analysis.	Identifies a general theory/criticism/technique and performs a basic or cursory analysis.	Identifies a theory/criticism/technique that could be used to analyze a work, but does not apply it.	Assign a zero for performance that does not meet a score of one (1).
Themes and ideas	Analyzes themes/ideas and relates them to perspectives/cultures with detailed and nuanced evidence.	Discusses a variety of themes/ideas and relates them to perspectives/cultures, but lacks detailed evidence.	Defines only the major themes/ideas and relates them to perspectives/cultures superficially.	Recognizes themes and ideas but unable to relate them to perspectives/cultures.	
Context	Analyzes the context(s) with sophisticated attention to the impact on the work(s) and/or other works.	Discusses context(s) and explains its impact on the work(s).	Defines the context(s) of the work(s), but explanation of its impact on the work(s) is limited.	Recognizes the general context(s) but cannot connect context to its impact on the work(s).	
Reflection	States a personal response supported by advanced concepts with depth and clarity.	States a personal response supported by advanced concepts but lacks depth and/or clarity.	States a personal response supported by basic concepts with depth and clarity.	States a personal response supported by basic concepts but lacks depth and/or clarity.	

Overall, has this student demonstrated appropriate knowledge and skills for this level in this discipline?   __ Yes   __No

__ This student did not turn in an acceptable response to the assignment (e.g., failed to turn in a paper, plagiarized, etc.)

Portions of this rubric were adapted from the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) VALUE Rubrics.

UCA CORE – Communication Rubric A (Oral)

This rubric is used to assess students' progress towards *Goal A* of the *Effective Communication* area of the UCA Core.

Effective Communication: the ability to develop and present ideas logically and effectively in order to enhance communication and collaboration with diverse individuals and groups.

Goal A: Students will use appropriate conventions and strategies in oral communication for various audiences and purposes.

This rubric assesses the following five specific skill or knowledge areas related to Goal A:

- **Central Message:** The topic, thesis, or main point of the communication that is consistent with the purpose of the assignment.
- **Organization:** The grouping of material in the communication, including a specific introduction, conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions.
- **Supporting Material/Evidence:** Explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities, or other kinds of information or analysis that support the central message.
- **Context and Audience:** The people and situations surrounding the communication, including the cognitive, social, and cultural factors that influence the audience and communicator.
- **Verbal and Nonverbal Delivery:** Posture, gesture, eye contact, vocal expressiveness (loudness, tone, emphasis), and vocal fillers ("um," "uh," "like," "you know," etc.).

How to use this rubric:

- Apply the rubric to at least one assignment. If different skill or knowledge areas are assessed by different assignments, then apply the respective rows of the rubric to those assignments that assess each specific skill or knowledge area. All skill or knowledge areas listed in this rubric must be assessed by the end of the course.
- For each specific skill or knowledge area, assign a score from 0 to 4 based on the student learning outcome that best matches the performance of the student on the assignment. *NOTE: The student's work should be scored in each area according to genre and disciplinary conventions (i.e., the formal and informal rules inherent in the expectations for communicating in particular forms and/or academic fields).*
- Although the rubric may inform the grading scheme used for the assignment, it should not replace it. Scores of 4, 3, 2, and 1 do not necessarily correspond to A, B, C, and D. The rubric is used to track students' progress throughout the UCA Core, not just their performance in a single course. Thus, a score of 4 represents the expected mastery of that skill or knowledge area by time a student graduates. That mastery may come earlier or later in a student's progression through the UCA Core, but generally speaking, scores of 1 and 2 are expected in lower-division courses, whereas scores of 3 and 4 are expected in upper-division and capstone courses.
- Enter scores into the Excel spreadsheet found on the UCA General Education website (http://uca.edu/gened/core-assessment-process/) and email to the UCA Core Director, Jacob Held (jmheld@uca.edu), before grades are due.

UCA CORE – Communication Rubric A (Oral)

Specific Skill or Knowledge Area Related to the Goal	Student Learning Outcomes				
	4	3	2	1	0
Central Message	Central message is compelling, reinforced, and strongly supported.	Central message is clear and consistent with the supporting material.	Central message is basically understandable but is not reinforced.	Central message can be deduced, but is not explicitly stated.	Assign a zero for performance that does not meet a score of one (1).
Organization	Organizational pattern is clear and consistent, polished; makes the content cohesive.	Organizational pattern is clear and consistent.	Organizational pattern is partially developed.	Organizational pattern is poorly developed and unclear.	
Supporting Material / Evidence	Employs timely and relevant material to provide effective support in a way that reflects a thorough understanding of the topic/thesis.	Selects sufficient and relevant supporting materials, but lack in analysis, comparisons, or credible authorities.	Uses some supporting materials with limited or incomplete explanations, examples, and/or descriptions.	Insufficient or inappropriate supporting materials used.	
Context and Audience	Demonstrates a thorough understanding of the context; uses compelling language appropriate to the audience	Demonstrates adequate consideration of the context and uses thoughtful language given the audience	Demonstrates some awareness of the context and uses mundane language given the audience	Demonstrates minimal attention to the context and uses unclear language given the audience	
Verbal and Nonverbal Delivery	Delivery makes the presentation compelling and speaker appears polished and confident.	Delivery makes the presentation interesting and speaker appears comfortable.	Delivery makes the presentation understandable but speaker appears tentative.	Delivery is understandable but speaker appears uncomfortable.	

Overall, has this student demonstrated appropriate knowledge and skills for this level in this discipline?   __ Yes   __No

__ This student did not turn in an acceptable response to the assignment (e.g., failed to turn in a paper, plagiarized, etc.)

Portions of this rubric were adapted from the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) VALUE Rubrics.

UCA CORE – Communication Rubric B (Written)

This rubric is used to assess students' progress towards *Goal B* of the *Effective Communication* area of the UCA Core.

Effective Communication: the ability to develop and present ideas logically and effectively in order to enhance communication and collaboration with diverse individuals and groups.

Goal B: Students will use appropriate conventions and strategies in written communication for various audiences and purposes.

This rubric assesses the following five specific skill or knowledge areas related to Goal B:

- **Central Message:** The topic, thesis, or main point of the communication that is consistent with the purpose of the assignment.
- **Organization:** The grouping of material in the communication, including a specific introduction, conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions.
- **Supporting Material/Evidence:** Explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities, or other kinds of information or analysis that support the central message.
- **Context and Audience:** The people and situations surrounding the communication, including the cognitive, social, and cultural factors that influence the audience and communicator.
- **Control of Syntax and Mechanics:** The use of language to communicate meaning, including word choice, sentence and paragraph structure, grammar, punctuation, and spelling.

How to use this rubric:

- Apply the rubric to at least one assignment. If different skill or knowledge areas are assessed by different assignments, then apply the respective rows of the rubric to those assignments that assess each specific skill or knowledge area. All skill or knowledge areas listed in this rubric must be assessed by the end of the course.
- For each specific skill or knowledge area, assign a score from 0 to 4 based on the student learning outcome that best matches the performance of the student on the assignment. ***NOTE****: The student's work should be scored in each area according to genre and disciplinary conventions (i.e., the formal and informal rules inherent in the expectations for communicating in particular forms and/or academic fields).*
- Although the rubric may inform the grading scheme used for the assignment, it should not replace it. Scores of 4, 3, 2, and 1 do not necessarily correspond to A, B, C, and D. The rubric is used to track students' progress throughout the UCA Core, not just their performance in a single course. Thus, a score of 4 represents the expected mastery of that skill or knowledge area by time a student graduates. That mastery may come earlier or later in a student's progression through the UCA Core, but generally speaking, scores of 1 and 2 are expected in lower-division courses, whereas scores of 3 and 4 are expected in upper-division and capstone courses.
- Enter scores into the Excel spreadsheet found on the UCA General Education website (http://uca.edu/gened/core-assessment-process/) and email to the UCA Core Director, Jacob Held (jmheld@uca.edu), before grades are due.

UCA CORE – Communication Rubric B (Written)

Specific Skill or Knowledge Area Related to the Goal	Student Learning Outcomes				
	4	3	2	1	0
Central Message	Central message is compelling, reinforced, and strongly supported.	Central message is clear and consistent with the supporting material.	Central message is basically understandable but is not reinforced.	Central message can be deduced, but is not explicitly stated.	Assign a zero for performance that does not meet a score of one (1).
Organization	Organizational pattern is clear and consistent, polished, and makes the content cohesive.	Organizational pattern is clear and consistent.	Organizational pattern is partially developed.	Organizational pattern is poorly developed and unclear.	
Supporting Material /Evidence	Employs timely and relevant material to provide effective support in a way that reflects a thorough understanding of the topic/thesis.	Selects sufficient and relevant supporting materials, but lack in analysis, comparisons, or credible authorities.	Uses some supporting materials with limited or incomplete explanations, examples, and/or descriptions.	Uses insufficient or inappropriate supporting materials.	
Context and Audience	Demonstrates a thorough understanding of the context, uses compelling language appropriate to the audience	Demonstrates adequate consideration of the context and uses thoughtful language given the audience	Demonstrates some awareness of the context and uses mundane language given the audience	Demonstrates minimal attention to the context and uses unclear language given the audience	
Control of Syntax and Mechanics	Demonstrates clear and fluid control of syntax and mechanics that skillfully communicates meaning to readers and is virtually error-free.	Uses syntax and mechanics that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity. The language has few errors.	Exhibits substantive errors in syntax and mechanics which, at times, impedes the clarity of the work.	Shows a serious pattern of error in syntax and mechanics that interferes with meaning.	

Overall, has this student demonstrated appropriate knowledge and skills for this level in this discipline?   __ Yes   __No

__ This student did not turn in an acceptable response to the assignment (e.g., failed to turn in a paper, plagiarized, etc.)

Portions of this rubric were adapted from the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) VALUE Rubrics.

UCA CORE – Communication Rubric C (Collaboration)

This rubric is used to assess students' progress towards *Goal C* of the *Effective Communication* area of the UCA Core.

Effective Communication: the ability to develop and present ideas logically and effectively in order to enhance communication and collaboration with diverse individuals and groups.

Goal C: Students will apply appropriate verbal and nonverbal strategies to promote collaboration.

This rubric assesses the following two specific skill or knowledge areas related to Goal C:

- **Individual Contributions:** The contributions of a single student that advances a group project, including the timely completion of assigned tasks, thorough and comprehensive work, articulating the merits of alternative ideas or proposals, building constructively upon the contributions of others, and being punctual, focused, and prepared.
- **Fosters Constructive Team Climate:** Student behaviors that promote collaboration among group members, including being respectful and positive, motivating and assisting teammates, and engaging with teammates in ways that facilitate their contributions.

How to use this rubric:

- Apply the rubric to at least one group assignment. **NOTE:** *This rubric was designed so that students could use it to conduct peer evaluations of fellow teammates.*
- For each specific skill or knowledge area, assign a score from 0 to 4 based on the student learning outcome that best matches the performance of the student on the assignment.
- Although the rubric may inform the grading scheme used for the assignment, it should not replace it. Scores of 4, 3, 2, and 1 do not necessarily correspond to A, B, C, and D. The rubric is used to track students' progress throughout the UCA Core, not just their performance in a single course. Thus, a score of 4 represents the expected mastery of that skill or knowledge area by time a student graduates. That mastery may come earlier or later in a student's progression through the UCA Core, but generally speaking, scores of 1 and 2 are expected in lower-division courses, whereas scores of 3 and 4 are expected in upper-division and capstone courses.
- Enter scores into the Excel spreadsheet found on the UCA General Education website (http://uca.edu/gened/core-assessment-process/) and email to the UCA Core Director, Jacob Held (jmheld@uca.edu), before grades are due.

UCA CORE – Communication Rubric C (Collaboration)

Specific Skill or Knowledge Area Related to the Goal	Student Learning Outcomes				
	4	3	2	1	0
Individual Contributions • Completes all assigned tasks in a timely manner. • Work is thorough, comprehensive and advances the project. • Articulates the merits of alternative ideas or proposals. • Constructively builds upon or synthesizes the contributions of others. • Punctual, focused, and prepared.	Consistently makes all the individual contributions bulleted to the left.	Consistently makes 4 of the individual contributions bulleted to the left.	Consistently makes 2-3 of the individual contributions bulleted to the left.	Consistently makes 1 of the individual contributions bulleted to the left.	Assign a zero for performance that does not meet the one (1) score.
Fosters Constructive Team Climate • 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 to team members. • Engages team members in ways that facilitate their contributions.	Consistently supports a constructive team climate by doing all of the bulleted behaviors to the left.	Consistently supports a constructive team climate by doing any 4 of the bulleted behaviors to the left.	Consistently supports a constructive team climate by doing any 2-3 of the bulleted behaviors to the left.	Consistently supports a constructive team climate by doing only 1 of the bulleted behaviors to the left.	

Overall, has this student demonstrated appropriate knowledge and skills for this level in this discipline?   __ Yes   __No

__ This student did not turn in an acceptable response to the assignment (e.g., failed to turn in a paper, plagiarized, etc.)

Portions of this rubric were adapted from the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) VALUE Rubrics.

UCA CORE – Responsible Living Rubric A (Ethics)

This rubric is used to assess students' progress towards *Goal A* of the *Responsible Living* area of the UCA Core.

Responsible Living: the ability to address real-world problems and find ethical solutions for individuals and society.

Goal A: Apply ethical principles to solve problems.

This rubric assesses the following three specific skill or knowledge areas related to Goal A:
- **Ethical Awareness:** Awareness of the core beliefs that consciously or unconsciously influence one's own and others' ethical conduct and reasoning. 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 Issue Recognition:** Recognition of various ethical issues and their interconnections in complex contexts (i.e., the obvious and subtle connections between/among the sub-parts or situational conditions of a scenario that bring two or more ethical dilemmas/issues into the problem; e.g., relationship of production of corn as part of the climate change issue).
- **Ethical Application:** The application of different ethical theories (e.g., utilitarian, natural law, virtue) or ethical concepts (rights, justice, duty) to analyze the ethical issues of a problem.

How to use this rubric:
- Apply the rubric to at least one assignment. If different skill or knowledge areas are assessed by different assignments, then apply the respective rows of the rubric to those assignments that assess each specific skill or knowledge area. All skill or knowledge areas listed in this rubric must be assessed by the end of the course.
- For each specific skill or knowledge area, assign a score from 0 to 4 based on the student learning outcome that best matches the performance of the student on the assignment.
- Although the rubric may inform the grading scheme used for the assignment, it should not replace it. Scores of 4, 3, 2, and 1 do not necessarily correspond to A, B, C, and D. The rubric is used to track students' progress throughout the UCA Core, not just their performance in a single course. Thus, a score of 4 represents the expected mastery of that skill or knowledge area by time a student graduates. That mastery may come earlier or later in a student's progression through the UCA Core, but generally speaking, scores of 1 and 2 are expected in lower-division courses, whereas scores of 3 and 4 are expected in upper-division and capstone courses.
- Enter scores into the Excel spreadsheet found on the UCA General Education website (http://uca.edu/gened/core-assessment-process/) and email the completed spreadsheet to the UCA Core Director, Jacob Held (jmheld@uca.edu), before grades are due.

UCA CORE – Responsible Living Rubric A (Ethics)

Specific Skill or Knowledge Area Related to the Goal	Student Learning Outcomes				
	4	3	2	1	0
Ethical Awareness	Analyzes core beliefs and their origins with depth and clarity.	Discusses core beliefs and their origins, but with minimal depth and/or clarity.	Describes basic core beliefs and/or their origins, but lacks depth or clarity.	Identifies only basic core beliefs.	Assign a zero for performance that does not meet a score of one (1).
Ethical Issue Recognition	Articulates BOTH the ethical issues in complex contexts AND their interconnections.	Discusses ethical issues in complex contexts, but does not fully describe their interconnections.	Describes basic ethical issues in their context, but poorly describes their interconnections.	Identifies some basic ethical issues, but does not identify their interconnections.	
Ethical Application	Applies ethical concepts accurately in formulating a position and defends the position by evaluating alternative courses of action.	Applies ethical concepts accurately in formulating a position, but does not fully defend the position by evaluating alternative courses of action.	Applies ethical concepts in formulating a position, but cannot identify alternative courses of action to defend the position.	States a position but does not adequately apply ethical concepts.	

Overall, has this student demonstrated appropriate knowledge and skills for this level in this discipline?   __ Yes   __No

__ This student did not turn in an acceptable response to the assignment (e.g., failed to turn in a paper, plagiarized, etc.)

Portions of this rubric were adapted from the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) VALUE Rubrics.

UCA CORE – Responsible Living Rubric B (Well-Being)

This rubric is used to assess students' progress towards *Goal B* of the *Responsible Living* area of the UCA Core.

Responsible Living: the ability to address real-world problems and find ethical solutions for individuals and society.

Goal B: Evaluate the effect that decisions have on the well-being of self, others, society and/or environment(s).

This rubric assesses the following two specific skill or knowledge areas related to Goal B:

- **Issue Recognition:** Recognition of various issues that affect well-being and their interconnections in complex contexts. The interconnections of issues in complex context refer to the obvious and subtle connections between/among the sub-parts or situational conditions of a scenario that bring two or more dilemmas/issues into the problem (e.g., relationship of health screenings to increased health care costs).
- **Impact of Decisions:** The consequences—good or bad—of decisions on the well-being of self, others, society and/or environment(s).

How to use this rubric:

- Apply the rubric to at least one assignment. If different skill or knowledge areas are assessed by different assignments, then apply the respective rows of the rubric to those assignments that assess each specific skill or knowledge area. All skill or knowledge areas listed in this rubric must be assessed by the end of the course.
- For each specific skill or knowledge area, assign a score from 0 to 4 based on the student learning outcome that best matches the performance of the student on the assignment.
- Although the rubric may inform the grading scheme used for the assignment, it should not replace it. Scores of 4, 3, 2, and 1 do not necessarily correspond to A, B, C, and D. The rubric is used to track students' progress throughout the UCA Core, not just their performance in a single course. Thus, a score of 4 represents the expected mastery of that skill or knowledge area by time a student graduates. That mastery may come earlier or later in a student's progression through the UCA Core, but generally speaking, scores of 1 and 2 are expected in lower-division courses, whereas scores of 3 and 4 are expected in upper-division and capstone courses.
- Enter scores into the Excel spreadsheet found on the UCA General Education website (http://uca.edu/gened/core-assessment-process/) and email to the UCA Core Director, Jacob Held (jmheld@uca.edu), before grades are due.

UCA CORE – Responsible Living Rubric B (Well-Being)

Specific Skill or Knowledge Area Related to the Goal	Student Learning Outcomes				Assign a zero for performance that does not meet a score of one (1).
	4	3	2	1	0
Issue Recognition	Articulates BOTH the issues in complex contexts AND their interconnections.	Discusses issues in complex contexts, but does not fully describe their interconnections.	Describes basic issues in their context, but poorly describes their interconnections.	Identifies some basic issues, but does not identify their interconnections.	
Impact of Decisions	Evaluates the impact of decisions.	Discusses the impact of decisions.	Describes the impact of decisions.	Recognizes the impact of decisions.	

Overall, has this student demonstrated appropriate knowledge and skills for this level in this discipline?   __ Yes   __No

__ This student did not turn in an acceptable response to the assignment (e.g., failed to turn in a paper, plagiarized, etc.)

Portions of this rubric were adapted from the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) VALUE Rubrics.