Welcome & introduction
Present: Susie Brubaker-Cole, Chair; Jim Coakley, COB; Stefani Dawn, APAA; T. Brett Deedon, ASOSU; Kevin Gable, FS; Anita Grunder, CEOAS; Mark Hoffman, CPPH; Christine Kelly, COE; Kerry Kincanon, ASC; David McIntyre, COS; Alex Powell, ASOSU; Tori Redman, ASOSU; Randy Rosenberger, COF; Marion Rossi, CLA; Rick Stoddart, OSU Libraries; Lisa Templeton, E-Campus; Becky Warner, Academic Affairs; Tara Williams, UHC, Joy Jorgensen
Guests: Dave King, Nancy Laurence, Tom Watts

1. Introduction to the Strategic Plan 3.0: Dave King
The process is being informed by earlier versions of the OSU Strategic plan and findings from campus wide forums, conversations and written responses from community members. The mission statement and 3 healthy aspirations will be the same.

Changes to goals and initiatives are being considered with a focus on condensing the initiatives to make them more relatable in the broad sense. Goal is to be able to shape strategic direction, to allow people to see how what they are doing moves the plan forward.

Steering subcommittees, augmented by members of the Provost Council are working on four areas:
- Group 1: learner success
- Group 2: programmatic areas
- Group 3: foundational pathways
- Group 4: overall narrative, drivers, vision and setup.

Group 1 -Learner Success is most pertinent to this group.

Draft strategic goal: “Oregon State University is committed to Learner Success by providing and promoting access to the full spectrum academic, co-curricular and non-credit programs and responsive services that reflect awareness of the diverse backgrounds and motivations of learners, while also recognizing the pivotal role of faculty and staff, in all domains of the learner’s experience, play in learner success.”

It has been decided that a few initiatives are better than many.
Draft initiatives:
- Learner success & Student-centered initiatives
- learner success & Faculty-centered initiatives
- Learner Success & Co-curricular initiatives
• Learner Success & Affordability initiatives
• Learner Success & Access initiatives

Draft metrics:
• Graduation Rates
  o 6-yr grad rate
  o Community college transfers
  o Online adult students who have returned to university studies
• Overall gpas
• 5yr post grad salaries
• Number of adult learners returning to education
• 3 yr retention rates
• Metrics related to first-year student program success
• Metrics related to health and well-being, e.g. CAPs visits, resolutions, etc.
• Metrics related to overall cost of education
• Level of support for students within certain populations
• Student mastery of specific skills
• 5 & 10-yr graduate salaries with some professional standing index that correlates to increasing responsibilities and leadership

The difference and importance of leading metrics and trailing metrics are being discussed.

A draft document will be forthcoming before winter term. Please submit your ideas and feedback to Dave King, Becky Warner, Kevin Gable or Susan Capalbo.

2. Announcements
• FYE – University Council on Student Engagement & Experience is charged with implementation. Mark H & Susie will co-chair the Council. The membership list and charge to the 2013-14 UCSEE is attached.
• Anita Grunder, Board of advisors CEOAS are sponsoring a career day for undergraduates, Nov. 1; 2-4:30 followed by tailgater.

3. Solicitation of agenda topics for the year
• Dec/Feb revisit strategic plan 3.0
• Dec/Cascades campus – invite key administrators
• Dec/Enrollment – enrollment trends – projections
• Dec/slowing growth of enrollment – waitlisting, Kate & Noah
• Accreditation
• OSU Institutional Board
• Math placement test – Aleks – enforce pre-reqs Tom Dick
• Gripe fest results
• FYE
• Classroom availability and space planning committee
Where are bottlenecks in upper division courses? What is the institutional response? Required major courses. Growth in section sizes. Missing graduate assistants

- Prior learning credit
- Leadership council of equity and inclusion
- Challenge – Undergraduate academic program review backlog
- Marine studies @ Hatfield
- Fundraising
- E-campus

4. Third Year Report due to the NWCCU this year: Becky Warner & Stefani Dawn
   This is year 3 of our on-going accreditation cycle. Stefani Dawn will lead the project.

   **Proposed timeline:** The review is due March 3. The accreditation team will be working backward from there.
   - October 21 – Section assignments
   - November 15 – Section assignments are due to APAA (some sections may need additional time)
   - January 15 – A draft will be distributed to on-campus reviewers.
   - March 3 – Due to NWCCU
   - April – Virtual meeting with 3 reviewers.
   - The review will address Standard 2 - Resources and capacity. See handout

   The accreditation report is similar to Strategic Plan, but that is aspirational, this about the core of the university mission. The core theme and objectives will remain the same. Indicators may change. What is needed? What is the threshold on these? The accreditation team will track changes and provide explanations for why the changes were needed.

   Members – please read through the attached documents and provide input.

5. Return to annual course scheduling model: Tom Watts
   A plea for enthusiastic compliance to help students plan courses in advance – which helps us forecast demand.
   This proposal seeks to leverage benefits from both term by term and annual systems.
   Logistics are still being worked out.
   Please review attached document.

Next meeting: December 19, 2013
Present: Azarenko, Brubaker-Cole, Buckley, Coakley, Colvin, Diebel, Edge, Gable, Grunder, Hoffman, Kelly, Kincanon, Mathern, Peterson, Rosenberger, Rossi, Spatafora, Stoddart, Templeton, Warner, Williams

1. Announcements
   - Info item: Progress report from UCSEE on FYE initiative (attached)
   - ASOSU Symposium on the First Year Experience, January 22, 2014, MU; all are welcome to attend
   - Hold the date: Feb 4 for Kansas State FYE director Greg Eiselein
   - Be aware of and share within your college the YouTube video by OSU’s black male students: [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Nb6mXj9aenk](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Nb6mXj9aenk) Steve Clark is coordinating a university response. Kate Peterson and Noah Buckley will reach out to the students who produced the video.

2. Enrollment Report – Kate Peterson (attached)
   - Reminder of key targets for UG student enrollment plan – 2012 -2017
   - Metrics and progress – in most cases, met or exceeded metrics
   - Minority enrollment – we still have progress to make, particularly in certain population groups
   - International enrollment = 98 countries represented at OSU
   - Location of OSU students (Corvallis Campus, Distance Students, Cascades Campus) is important to be attentive to when reading enrollment reports.

3. Enrollment 2014 waitlist – Kate Peterson and Noah Buckley
   - Recruiting and admission for Fall 2014 has changed. To control enrollment, growth we will no longer automatically admit every student who meets the minimum requirements.
   - Nov. 1 – evaluate pool of applicants competitively – the highest achievers with complete applications will be admitted on a rolling basis. Students at 3.5 and below will have to compete for spots. Scholarships will be awarded on a rolling basis to students who are admitted.
   - Feb. 1 – 2nd phase. All applicants that weren’t admitted on a rolling basis will be considered in a holistic way to shape the class in a manner that meets the university goals. There will also be a waitlist created. After May 1, students on the waitlist may be admitted depending upon the response to the ATD deadline.
   - This the first year that we will implement this method. By next year we will be able to assess the effectiveness.

4. College Summary Template for First Year Experience - Mark Hoffman and Susie Brubaker-Cole
Draft reporting template (attached).

- Use template to share activities by colleges
- Susie and Mark will be doing walk-about to meet with each college’s leadership.
- The templates are due mid-January
- Susie will send email with instructions shortly.

5. Discussion of HECC Task Force Draft on Credit for Prior Learning (attached) – Rebecca Mathern
   - Feedback for each standard is needed. The deadline for submitting feedback is tomorrow.
   - Each Oregon institution is charged with creating its own policy.
   - Look to other institutions for best practices.
   - Is cpl visible on transcripts?
   - Institution will need to determine how the courses will be documented and who will be responsible for keeping the documentation.
   - Assessment criteria should be decided by the units.
   - OUS support is going away after July 1.
   - Send feedback to Rebecca Mathern
   - It is inevitable that we will have to deal with this.

6. NWCCU Accreditation: Discussion of revisions to Core Theme 1 indicators – Becky Warner
   This is year 3.
   - We are looking more broadly at our measures of student success.
   - We are addressing standard 1 & 2 this year.
   - 3 objectives: access & clear pathway
   - What are the thresholds for each objective?
   - Indicator 2 – access to key milestone courses in the BC as well as those required for a majority of majors. How do we measure this?
   - Persistence rates are not included.
   - Transfer students aren’t included in 6yr grad metrics.
   - Obj 1.2 – indicator 2 is unclear.
   - Change #5 to graduate satisfaction
   - Obj 1.3 is in pretty good shape (remove the rate of student use of MyDegrees)
   - 6 yr graduation model: http://www.studentachievementmeasure.org/participants

Next meeting: February 20, 2014 – Cascades Campus will be invited.
October 21, 2013

TO: Oregon Postsecondary Institutions

FR: Craig Kolins and Marilyn Davis, Co-Chairs of the Higher Education Coordinating Commission’s Credit for Prior Learning Advisory Committee

RE: Credit for Prior Learning Standards

CC: Tim Nesbitt, Chair, HECC
    Ben Cannon, Executive Director, HECC
    Melody Rose, Interim Chancellor, OUS
    Gerald Hamilton, Interim Director, CCWD
    Larry Large, President, Alliance of Oregon Independent Colleges and Universities

On September 3, 2013, post-secondary stakeholders received a memo from Dr. Betty Duvall, former Chair of the Higher Education Coordinating Commission. The memo provided information about a set of Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) Standards being developed by the Commission’s CPL Advisory Committee.

The memo asked each institution to organize a cross-functional team with representatives from the faculty, instructional administrators, student services personnel (Admissions, Outreach, Advising, Financial Aid, Registration and Student Records) and others, as appropriate, to review the standards and to provide feedback to the Commission.

The attached standards have been formatted to facilitate institutional conversations for the purpose of providing feedback to the advisory committee. All institutional responses will be collected electronically at: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/8RMD2MV

The Commission is requesting institutions to complete the electronic survey by December 20, 2013. Questions and comments may be directed to Donna Lewelling via email at donna.j.lewelling@state.or.us or by phone at (503)947-2428.
Introduction:

House Bill 4059, passed by the 2012 Oregon Legislature, directed the Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC) to work with the State Board of Education, State Board of Higher Education, community college districts, independent not-for-profit institutions of higher education and the for-profit private career colleges to carry out specific goals for expanding and improving access to Credit for Prior Learning (CPL). CPL is defined as credit obtained through evidence-based assessment of learning that occurs outside of traditional college-level coursework. One of the goals for the bill was to “increase the number of students who receive academic credit for prior learning..., while ensuring that credit is awarded only for high quality course-level competencies.” The CPL Advisory Committee, under the auspices of the Commission, identified a set of implementation strategies in response to legislative goals outlined in the bill. One of strategies was to develop policies and state standards in collaboration with the higher education institutions to ensure colleges and universities develop and maintain high quality CPL opportunities for students.

The HECC directs Oregon postsecondary institutions that award CPL to adopt a set of standards. The decision to award CPL is determined by the institution. The institution’s decision must be transparent to students, faculty, staff and stakeholders. These standards shall build on the recognition and acknowledgement that credit awarded for prior learning is granted only for evidence of learning and not solely on the basis of experience. Foundational to these standards is faculty involvement and use of their expertise to assess credit awarded to students. Credit may be awarded through these types of assessments:

Credit by Assessment at the Postsecondary Level:
- Portfolio
- Institutional Challenge Exams and other forms of assessment
- Credit – By-Exam (CLEP, DANTES, etc.)
- ACE Credit Recommendation (Military Service)
- Industry Certifications

Credit by Agreement from Secondary Level:
- International Baccalaureate Program Exams
- Advanced Placement Exams

The HECC has identified eight standards that must be addressed by all Oregon postsecondary institutions. These areas include:
- Standard 1: Credit for Prior Learning
- Standard 2: Evidence-Based Assessment
- Standard 3: Tuition and Fee Structure
- Standard 4: Transferability and Transcription
- Standard 5: Data Collection and Reporting
- Standard 6: Faculty and Staff Development
- Standard 7: Oversight
- Standard 8: Transparency/Access
Higher Education Coordinating Commission
Credit for Prior Learning Standards

Standard 1: Credit for Prior Learning

1.1 For those areas in which CPL is awarded, Oregon’s postsecondary institutions shall develop institutional policies and procedures for awarding credit in response to the CPL Standards. The procedures must ensure credit is awarded only for high quality college-level competencies. The policies and procedures must be transparent to all students, faculty, staff and stakeholders.

1.2 Academic credit will be awarded and transcripted only for those courses offered by the institution and directly applicable to curriculum requirements at the college/university of enrollment and to the student’s declared certificate or degree program as outlined in college publications.

Please provide comments or institutional feedback regarding this standard:

Resources:


Oregon’s Statewide International Baccalaureate Alignment Policy for the 2013-14 Academic Year: http://www.ous.edu/sites/default/files/partner/k12/IBCourseCredit2013_14_Final.pdf

Oregon’s Advanced Placement Course Credit for the 2013-14 Academic Year: http://www.ous.edu/sites/default/files/partner/k12/APCourseCredit2013_14_Final.pdf
Standard 2: Evidence-Based Assessment

2.1 Institutions shall provide a guided process to assist students with organizing their documents for evaluation.

2.2 All credit must be based on sufficient evidence provided by the student and/or the institution. All evidence must be reviewed by the institution to document the credit awarded. The student must articulate and document the connection between what they have learned in another setting and the theoretical foundation, knowledge, and skills as defined by the course-specific learning outcomes of the credit to be awarded.

2.3 Evidence required by the institution must be based on nationally recognized CPL assessment methods. Multiple assessment processes/tools may be used to determine the amount of credit awarded, including, but not limited to, institutionally developed tests or final examinations, performance-based assessments, demonstrations, presentations, portfolios, and industry certifications.

2.4 Credit awarded shall be evaluated by appropriately qualified faculty to determine the amount of credit to be awarded.

Please provide comments or institutional feedback regarding this standard:

Resources:

Tennessee’s Recommended Standards in Prior Learning Assessment (PLA) Policy and Practice for Tennessee Public Colleges and Universities:  

Marylhurst University Prior Learning Assessment:  
http://www.marylhurst.edu/academics/prior-learning-assessment/
Higher Education Coordinating Commission
Credit for Prior Learning Standards

Standard 3: Tuition and Fee Structure

Oregon’s postsecondary institutions shall develop a tuition and fee structure for CPL that is transparent and accessible to all students, faculty, staff and stakeholders. Institutions should consider the following factors to identify direct and indirect costs related to assessing and awarding credit when determining the tuition and fee structure:

- Costs for student services to guide the student and to support the assessment process;
- Costs associated with faculty workload for the evaluation of CPL;
- Costs associated with recognizing and supporting faculty and staff who are involved in the assessment process including any costs related to training and staff development;
- Costs related to transcribing credit;
- Costs for developing portfolio infrastructure and conducting portfolio assessments; and
- Other costs associated with developing and assessing CPL such as challenge exams, review of ACE Credit Recommendations, etc.

Please provide comments or institutional feedback regarding this standard:

Resources:

“Fees charged for assessment should be based on the services performed in the process and not determined by the amount of credit awarded.” (CAEL Ten Standards for Assessing Learning)

The Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges Guidelines for Assessment of Prior Learning state the following:
- “The fees for assessment will be based on actual costs… The fees will be based on the amount of credit requested, not the amount of credit awarded.
- Fees should be published and consistently applied.
- Fees should be consistent to the extent possible across the system”
Higher Education Coordinating Commission
Credit for Prior Learning Standards

Standard 4: Transferability and Transcription

4.1 Oregon’s postsecondary institutions that award CPL shall work with partnering institutions to promote transferability of CPL.

4.2 Institutions must determine the applicability of CPL toward a course leading to a degree, certificate or elective credit.

4.3 Institutions shall determine the acceptability of transfer credit granted for CPL from other institutions.

4.4 All documentation and files regarding prior learning credit will be maintained as part of the student’s official institutional academic record.

4.5 All academic credit that is awarded must be transcripted to comply with state, federal regulations and accreditation policies and standards. Notations on the transcript shall clearly identify the type of CPL awarded. Types of CPL include:

Credit by Assessment at the Postsecondary Level:
- Portfolio
- Institutional Challenge Exams and other forms of assessment
- Credit – By-Exam (CLEP, DANTES, etc.)
- ACE Credit Recommendation (Military Service)
- Industry Certifications

Credit by Agreement @ Secondary Level:
- International Baccalaureate Program Exams
- Advanced Placement Exams

Please provide comments or institutional feedback regarding this standard:
Resources:

- CAEL Assessment Standards
  http://www.cael.org/pla.htm#Follow the Ten Standards for Assessing Learning

- Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities Standards:

  2.C.7 Credit for prior experiential learning, if granted, is: a) guided by approved policies and procedures; b) awarded only at the undergraduate level to enrolled students; c) limited to a maximum of 25% of the credits needed for a degree; d) awarded only for documented student achievement equivalent to expected learning achievement for courses within the institution’s regular curricular offerings; and e) granted only upon the recommendation of appropriately qualified teaching faculty. Credit granted for prior experiential learning is so identified on students’ transcripts and may not duplicate other credit awarded to the student in fulfillment of degree requirements. The institution makes no assurances regarding the number of credits to be awarded prior to the completion of the institution’s review process.

  2.C.8 The final judgment in accepting transfer credit is the responsibility of the receiving institution. Transfer credit is accepted according to procedures which provide adequate safeguards to ensure high academic quality, relevance to the students’ programs, and integrity of the receiving institution’s degrees. In accepting transfer credit, the receiving institution ensures that the credit accepted is appropriate for its programs and comparable in nature, content, academic quality, and level to credit it offers. Where patterns of student enrollment between institutions are identified, the institution develops articulation agreements between the institutions.
Standard 5: Data Collection & Reporting

Institutions shall collect and report data on the types of CPL awarded. Data to be collected include the number of credits granted for and the number of students who receive credit through CPL on the following types:

- Portfolio
- Institutional Challenge Exams and other forms of assessment
- Military Credit (ACE Credit Recommendation Service)
- International Baccalaureate Program Exams
- Advanced Placement Exam
- Credit granted for other Prior Learning

Please provide comments or institutional feedback regarding this standard:

Resources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas to be collected:</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio</td>
<td>Credit granted for the preparation and defense of a collection of evidence by a student to demonstrate and validate college-level credit for learning acquired outside of the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Challenge Exams and other forms of assessment</td>
<td>Credit granted through the assessment of course student learning offered by the institution. Credit granted for tests of learning – including DSST / DANTES, CLEP, Excelsior, NYU Foreign Language, etc.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Credit (ACE Credit Recommendation Service)</td>
<td>Credit granted through evaluation of ACE published credit recommendations for formal instructional programs offered by non-collegiate agencies, both civilian employers and the military. Or credit awarded through the evaluation of military experiential learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Baccalaureate Program Exams</td>
<td>Credit granted for International Baccalaureate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Placement Exams</td>
<td>Credit awarded through the evaluation of Advanced Placement Exam scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Credit for Prior Learning</td>
<td>Credit granted for other prior learning experiences Not listed in other areas. Such as credit granted for industry certifications for proof of applied knowledge and skills in an industry-identified area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dual Credit plays an important role in student completion. The credit is earned simultaneously to the learning, thus making this model for learning separate, yet parallel to CPL in Oregon.
Standard 6: Faculty and Staff Development

Institutions shall develop a policy and strategic plan for faculty and staff development for granting CPL. Widespread, overarching knowledge of the institutional opportunities for developing, assessing and recommending CPL should be foundational to this plan.

Please provide comments or institutional feedback regarding this standard:

Resources:

All personnel involved in the assessment of learning should pursue and receive adequate training and continuing professional development for the functions they perform. (CAEL Ten Standards for Assessing Learning).

Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities Standards:

2.C.7 Credit for prior experiential learning, if granted, is: a) guided by approved policies and procedures; b) awarded only at the undergraduate level to enrolled students; c) limited to a maximum of 25% of the credits needed for a degree; d) awarded only for documented student achievement equivalent to expected learning achievement for courses within the institution’s regular curricular offerings; and e) granted only upon the recommendation of appropriately qualified teaching faculty. Credit granted for prior experiential learning is so identified on students’ transcripts and may not duplicate other credit awarded to the student in fulfillment of degree requirements. The institution makes no assurances regarding the number of credits to be awarded prior to the completion of the institution’s review process.
Standard 7: Oversight

Institutions granting CPL shall organize a cross-functional CPL Leadership Team (student services, instruction, registrar, etc.). The team shall be responsible for conducting ongoing evaluations of institutional CPL policies, standards, procedures, and practices. The team will also be responsible for an evaluation of the performance of students granted credit for prior learning, in later classes within the same field, as well as overall academic performance. The HECC shall review the accomplishments of each team through a periodic audit process to ensure credit is awarded for high quality assessment activities.

*Please provide comments or institutional feedback regarding this standard:*

**Resources:**

Tennessee Prior Learning Assessment Task Force made recommendations for “the Periodic review of PLA policies”. These recommendations can be found on page 13 of the 2012 Recommended Standards Report:

Higher Education Coordinating Commission  
Credit for Prior Learning Standards  

Standard 8: Transparency/Access  

8.1 Institutional CPL policies shall clearly communicate to students, faculty, staff and stakeholders. Information must be available electronically at all institutions and be searchable using the term “Credit for Prior Learning”. Information on how to access the following shall be included:  

- Institutional CPL contacts;  
- Tuition and Fee Structure(s); and  
- Available CPL opportunities.  

8.2 Processes must be in place for a student to request CPL for a course offered by the institution.  

Please provide comments or institutional feedback regarding this standard:  

Resources:  

Tennessee Prior Learning Assessment Task Force made recommendations for “Maintaining Transparency and Consistency” These recommendations can be found on pages 13-14 of the 2012 Recommended Standards Report:  

What challenges does your institution expect with implementing the Standards?

Does your institution have recommendations for additional standards or edits to the existing standards? If so, please list them below.

Are there major financial barriers that will impact implementation of the Standards? If so, what are they?

The HECC will likely adopt the Standards in late spring 2014. The expectation is that institutional planning will occur in 2014-15 with implementation effective for 2015-16. Please list any barriers your institution may have implementing the standards.
Glossary of Terms

**Advanced Placement (AP) Exams**: A series of tests developed by the College Board initially for AP High School courses. This is also a type of early postsecondary educational opportunity.

**American Council on Education (ACE) Guidelines**: Published credit recommendations for formal instructional programs and examinations offered by non-collegiate agencies (including civilian employers, the military, professional associations, and other workplace related-training).

**Council for Adult Experiential Learning (CAEL)**: National nonprofit organization that works at all levels within the higher education, public, and private sectors. Responsible for the development of 10 standards related to Credit for Prior Learning.

**College Level Examination Program (CLEP) Exams**: Tests of college material offered by the College Board.

**CPL Leadership Team**: Institutional cross-functional team that is responsible for overseeing all CPL activities such as developing and conducting ongoing evaluations of institutional CPL policies, standards, procedures, and practices. Membership may be comprised of student services, instruction, registrars, etc.

**Credit for Prior Learning (CPL)**: Credit obtained through evidence-based assessment of learning that occurs outside of traditional college-level coursework. Per HB 4059, “prior learning” is defined as the knowledge and skills gained through work and life experience, through military training and experience and through formal and informal education and training from institutions of higher education in the United States and in other nations.

**Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Educational Support (DANTES) Subject Standardized Tests (DSSTs)**: DSSTs are examinations administered by Prometric. While originally being restricted to active and retired military personnel, these tests are now available to civilians.

**Dual Credit**: The awarding of secondary and postsecondary credit simultaneously for a course offered in a high school during regular school hours, as determined by local school board and community college/university board policy.

**Evidence-Based Assessment**: The process of documenting student knowledge, skills and abilities to demonstrate achievement of identified course outcomes.

**International Baccalaureate Program Exams (IB)**: An internationally accepted qualification for entry into institutes of higher education, much like the AP program. Designed for students ages 16 to 19, it is a two-year curriculum that leads up to a final examination. To receive a diploma, students must achieve a minimum score and have completed satisfactory participation in the creativity, action, service requirement.

**Portfolio**: Credit granted for the preparation and defense of a collection of evidence by a student to demonstrate and validate college-level credit for learning acquired outside of the classroom.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Brief description of program: features and goals</th>
<th>Size of program or proportion of students served within program</th>
<th>Related to/open to both first year and upper class students = All Specific to first-year students = FY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising (designs and services for particular needs of first year students)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Alert Systems -- course-based or population-based (proactively alerting students who are displaying behaviors/results not predictive of success)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Courses (e.g. Engineering Orientation, Biology Freshman Seminar, Orientation to Fisheries and Wildlife)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Effectiveness and Course Success Monitoring (initiatives or processes that attend to effectiveness of key 1st-year courses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Programs (living learning communities, or other residential partnerships)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support Resources (e.g., tutoring,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditions and affinity building (e.g., annual community events, programs or activities within college/program)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership and Mentorship Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs for Special Populations (e.g., underrepresented or international students)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment methods for FY Programs and FY Student Success Rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Core Theme 1: Undergraduate Education

Description: The undergraduate experience is at the core of a university’s mission. To achieve this, the university strives to provide an excellent teaching and learning environment, and achieve student access, persistence and success through graduation and beyond.

Objective 1.1: Provide broad and continuing access to undergraduate university degrees for the people of Oregon and beyond.

Indicators of achievement:
1. Applicants, admits and first-time enrolls (including admit rate and yield rate) by residency (In-state, out-of-state, international) and by campus (Corvallis, Cascades, Ecampus, DPP). For Oregon and out-of-state, disaggregate data by ethnicity, gender, age category, urban-rural status, and first generation-college status; compare to state demographic distributions.
2. Access to key milestone courses in the Baccalaureate Core as well as those required for a majority of majors.
3. Measurement of degree to which student financial need is met through non-loan-based aid.
4. OSU 6-year graduation rate for first-time, full-time degree seeking students and the graduation rate gap between under-represented minorities and overall rate.
5. Degrees earned by gender, ethnic group, urban-rural status, first-generation status, E-campus, Cascades, transfer and DPP students, and OSU mission areas.

Rationale:
Oregon State University’s mission as the state’s land grant university creates an imperative that the knowledge and skills inherent in an OSU degree are made available to Oregonians who reflect the state’s diversity. OSU’s mission further states that the university serves to promote the progress of Oregon, the nation and the world. We propose that such progress demands the graduation of bachelor degree recipients with the proper knowledge, skills, and motivation to implement that progress. Objective 1 highlights key markers that indicate the opening of doors and removal of barriers to students’ attainment of bachelor’s degrees. Indicator 1 provides the raw numbers of interest, selection and commitment to an OSU education, with comparisons in key categories of personal attributes, geographic origins, and parent education backgrounds. This allows us to determine if initial entry to the university is equitable across all manner of backgrounds and characteristics. The indicator also compares the representation of various Oregon demographic groups in OSU enrollments. Knowledge of underrepresentation for certain groups allows the university to optimize its recruiting and pre-college programs. Once admitted, students face a number of challenges in their quest for a degree. For example, limited access to courses and excessive accumulation of debt in financial aid may prevent students from persisting to their degree. Indicators 2 and 3 provide measures of these items, allowing the university to institute changes in its procedures to remove obstacles to degree attainment. While students continually learn during their tenure at OSU, attainment of a bachelor’s degree is the ultimate mark of a person that has successfully met the standards of the university. Indicator 4, the 6 year graduation rate permits determination on how many of an initial cohort of first-time undergraduates ultimately earn an OSU degree. Students leave a degree program for a variety of reasons, but a university should strive to ensure that they do not leave due to negative experiences or lack of institutional support. The 6 year graduation rate gives a partial measure of the effectiveness in university efforts to address institutional barriers. In addition, looking at the rate for under-represented minorities (national studies indicate such students have lower graduation rates than other groups).
allows for evaluation of the effectiveness of programs aimed at improving their rates. Finally, indicator 5 compares the degrees earned by various demographic groups, revealing the magnitude of successful undergraduate program completion.

**Objective 1.2:** Provide rigorous and effective undergraduate degree programs.

**Indicators of achievement:**
1. Percent of programs that have completed full-cycle student learning outcomes assessment.
2. Percent of active programs with completed periodic external program reviews.
3. Percent of Baccalaureate Core categories that have undergone full-cycle student learning outcomes assessment.
4. Participation rates in academic experiential learning — research, internships, service learning, global learning.
5. Alumni satisfaction on value of degree.

**Rationale:**
Objective 2 encompasses the quality of degree programs that lie at the foundation of OSU’s undergraduate education program. Excellent undergraduate programs produce graduates with the knowledge, skills and abilities necessary to contribute productively to professional, civic and personal realms. Full-cycle student learning outcomes assessment (outcomes defined, learning assessed, curriculum improved, cycle repeated) provides a means to evaluate effectiveness. The requisite disciplinary and liberal education knowledge, skills and abilities are captured collectively in the learning outcomes of degree programs and the Baccalaureate Core. Measuring student learning against these established learning outcomes provides evidence of educational program effectiveness. Findings from student learning assessments inform adjustments to curricular design and teaching methods and should lead to student learning improvements over time. All undergraduate programs undergo program review at least once every ten years. As part of this process, external reviewers who are leaders in their fields, provide feedback and recommendations to ensure that programs align with the national state of their disciplines. National research demonstrates positive educational outcomes for students who participate in experiential learning, and OSU academic programs value experiential learning as important opportunities to apply and extend curricular learning to real-world settings and important preparation for post-college challenges. Finally, the perception of the alumni, once they are in a position to reflect on the practical application of their OSU education, is a powerful indicator of program effectiveness.
Objective 1.3: Provide a supportive and healthy learning environment beyond the classroom for student success and development at all levels.

Indicators of achievement (wherever possible student data should be disaggregated by ethnicity, gender, age category, urban-rural status and first generation-college status):

1. Participation rates in first-year experience courses and percent retention of first-year experience course participants versus those that did not complete a first-year experience course.
2. First to second year retention rates for undergraduates.
3. Student-to-academic-advisor ratios and rate of student usage of MyDegrees auditing software by class year.
4. Corvallis campus student engagement in out-of-classroom behaviors that help to address major factors negatively affecting academic performance:
   - Ratio of Student Health Services practitioners (physicians, psychiatrists, nurse practitioners and physician assistants) FTE to student FTE at OSU; percent of student users of SHS rating quality of care good/excellent
   - Ratio of practitioner FTE (psychologists, social workers, counselor excluding trainees) to OSU student FTE; percent of student users of Counseling and Psychological Services rating quality of care good/excellent;
   - Percent of Disability Access Services’ students completing the academic year in good academic standing compared to overall student population.
5. NSSE Supportive Campus Environment benchmarks. By class level, survey responses on “quality of academic advising”, “providing you support to succeed academically”, “helping you cope with non-academic responsibilities”, “providing support to help you thrive socially”.

Rationale:
We initially raised this point in the rationale for Objective 1, but it bears repeating. Meeting our mission imperative of providing access to OSU degrees to the full range of Oregon’s diversity requires twofold actions: opening doors and removing barriers. Opening doors is accomplished via pre-college outreach, recruitment and matriculation. But many qualified students encounter procedural and cultural barriers to the successful completion of their degree. To fulfill its mission, the university must remove obstacles from the path of students who can benefit from an OSU degree and contribute to Oregon’s progress. Objective 3 comprises academic and student affairs services and programs that support success for students with diverse backgrounds and needs. While not comprehensive, these services and programs represent national best practices in foundational student services and reflect OSU priorities in student support. High-quality delivery of these services and programs produce conditions conducive to teaching and learning excellence from matriculation to graduation. First-year experience courses and academic advising provide students critical guidance in learning to identify and utilize university resources and opportunities. Academic tutoring, health and counseling services and disability access services will help students to identify, prevent and overcome difficulties that arise within academic and personal realms. Student participation and ratings of quality provide evidence of the accessibility, usefulness and relevance of these services and programs. The NSSE benchmarks provide a holistic snapshot of support and services that undergird students’ ability to persist to degree and achieve academic excellence.
Present: Anita Nina Azarenko, Grad School; Randy Bell, COE; Jim Coakley, COB; Stefani Dawn, APAA; Penny Diebel, CAS; Paul Duescher, COF; Dan Edge, Faculty Senate; Julie Greenwood, COS; Anita Grunder, CEOAS; Mark Hoffman, CPHHS; Christine Kelly, COE; Kerry Kincanon, Academic Success Center; Rebecca Mathern, Registrar’s Office; Cheryl Middleton, OSU Libraries; Kate Peterson, Enrollment Management; Randy Rosenberger, COF; Marion O. Rossi, CLA; Joey Spatafora, FAR/CAS; Lisa Templeton, OSU Extended Campus; Becky Warner, Academic Affairs; Tara Williams, UHC;

1. Announcements
   Welcome Julie Greenwood, new Associate Dean of College of Science.
   Guests: Marla Hacker and Becky Johnson, Cascades Campus

2. Growth at OSU Cascades – Marla Hacker and Becky Johnson
   Marla: Current state of affairs: Oregon State with an Edge!
   OSU Cascades offers Jr/Sr and Graduate level courses. They have 40 full time faculty with approximately 20 on tenure track.
   The Cat 1 processes are going well. All programs, even those that exist at OSU go through the process. This might change after the new board comes on line.
   Hiring is a partnership with OSU.

   Areas in need of attention: Promotion to full professor: need to clarify the service component.

   Unique degrees: Bachelor of Applied Science, Sustainability Double Degree, low residency programs

   Becky: Update on expansion at Cascades:
   Learning outcomes are identical for courses that are offered at both Cascades and OSU-Corvallis.
   The local community wants a full college experience, which may lead to the need for duplicate offerings. UO faculty and staff from previous UO presence at Cascades are now OSU employees.
   OSU Cascades and OSU Corvallis have separate budgets.
   Some services are shared with OSU Corvallis: Foundation, Research, Facilities, Univ. Relations & Marketing, IT.
   They are not eligible for centrally funded raises.
   Capitol requests are prioritized with Corvallis.
   Diplomas are identical.
   Differences in student profiles. More women, same split undergrad/grad.
   Cascades has active research profile.
   They expect to have 4-year programs ready by fall 2015. Campus planning is underway for 56 acre parcel of land. The initial build out will be on 10 acres.
The first academic building will be facing the mountains. All of the administrative, undergrad, and retail activities will happen in this building.
They are planning 300 beds in 2 residence halls. There will be an INTO OSU offering.
Challenges: getting the funding to build the physical infrastructure, ramping up quickly enough and mitigating the concerns of the local citizens.

Mark Hoffman talked about revamping some courses to the 200 level and wondered how that would affect Cascades. The college of business created pre business courses at the 300 level to align with Cascades. Becky encouraged Mark to liaison with other community colleges.

Cascades is planning what courses they need to offer at the lower division level to make sure that students are able to find courses that fulfill the bacc core requirements. The bacc core requirements are the same; however, they won’t have the same variety of courses to fill the requirements.

What is the role of Faculty Senate in the decisions that are being made? That question is under discussion.

Donations are through the OSU Foundation.

Instead of a library Cascades, has a learning commons. Students interact with the library electronically. They have one full-time Librarian at this time. As they expand, there will be many conversations about needs.

3. MyDegrees update – Rebecca Mathern
Transferring in a 200 level class to count for a 300 level course. OSU does not grant upper division credit for 200 level transfer classes even though they satisfy the college requirements. Reg office has been sending email to students affected by this, which causes a lot of confusion. MyDegrees has been reconfigured to reflect the lower division/upper division status of transfer courses. This approach is clear and easier to understand, so the reg office will stop sending confusing email to students.

4. Course Designators – Stefani Dawn
Currently course designators are associated with degree program titles. When the name of the degree changes the feeling is that the designators must also be changed. This causes students to accidently enroll in courses they’ve already received credit for. This affects hundreds of students in spite of proactive advising. The Curriculum Council is considering ways to manage this situation. They are proposing separating the course designator from the degree program titles. This makes it easier for units to change the name of their programs and gives them greater flexibility. The curriculum council is in the early stage of imagining how this might look. They are considering aligning course designators with cip codes.
Stefani is interested in exploring with different degree programs about how this might work. New policies will be developed with the curriculum council.
Rebecca and Stefani will develop some scenarios to illustrate what is meant, and this topic will reappear on the April UEC agenda for further discussion.

5. Strategic Plan – Becky Warner
   Improving the student experience is now goal 1.
   Strategies for reaching the goal are listed in draft plan.
   Please review the plan and give input back to Sabah and Becky within 2 weeks. It is on the web.

   Discussion: The plan is helpful, next up metrics. Learning goals for graduates aren’t in the plan at present.

   Washington Center in D.C. offers internships and they have some resources for partial scholarships.

Next meeting: April 17, 2014 (Course designators revisited.)
OSU-Cascades Update
Undergraduate Education Council
How does OSU-Cascades relate to OSU-Corvallis?

• Does anyone even say “OSU-Corvallis?”
• Is UCLA a branch campus of the University of California?
• Questions from UEC get at the heart of the matter:
  • If the degree does not show the campus source of the degree- how can we ensure the experiences are comparable?
  • How do we ensure that the UG experience at Cascades is a university experience? If it ends up a small class-size, no research, specialty degrees campus, is that in keeping with an integrated vision? Do we have an integrated vision? Should Cascades be a complement not a copy?
Are the experiences comparable?

• Should the focus be on whether learning outcomes are comparable?
  • E-Campus students have a very different experience but get same degree.
  • Should it be left to departments for quality control?

• Should we be a complement or copy?
  • Some of both.
  • Community needs standard degrees, which will be copies, and others that will be complements.

• No one wants to be “less than” or “not exactly”
Choose to focus on “with” not “without”
Background and relationship to Corvallis

- OSU competed for and was awarded campus in 2001
- President Ray set a vision for 5,000 students by 2025
- Separate budgets (State + tuition); some shared services
  - Charged by Foundation, Research, Facilities, URM, and IT
  - Not eligible for Provost’s initiatives or central funding of raises
  - Capital requests are prioritized with Corvallis projects
- Identical diplomas – our students/alums are yours
  - You don’t get revenues, but don’t pay costs
- Faculty have tenure homes in Corvallis
## Student Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cascades</th>
<th>Corvallis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-state</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Minority</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 25 undergrad</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research and innovation
Funding

- State
- Tuition
- Donations
3-5 year plan

• 4-year university by 2015
  - add lower division courses
• Residence hall and academic space in new campus
Strategic Decision

- Invest in sufficient land to develop a 3000-5000 student campus in Bend.
  - OSU purchased 56.6 acres to master plan the long term vision
- Eliminates real estate risk vs. acquiring existing buildings and not having land for expansion.
CREATE AN INTEGRATED LIVING, LEARNING, AND WORKING COMMUNITY - AN INNOVATIVE CAMPUS "WITH AN EDGE".

CREATE AN INSPIRING LEARNING ENVIRONMENT THAT ENGAGES AND PROMOTES INTERACTION AMONGST STUDENTS, FACULTY, AND COMMUNITY.

CREATE A CAMPUS THAT CAPTURES AND ENHANCES THE NATURE AND SPIRIT OF CENTRAL OREGON.

CREATE A PLACE AT THE INTERSECTION OF ACADEMIA AND INDUSTRY THAT SPURS AN ENTREPRENEURIAL SPIRIT IN THE REGION.
CHARACTER OF PLACE SITE
PROW ACADEMIC BUILDING CONCEPT

VIEW

ENTRY

OSU CASCADES BUILDING ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING | JANUARY 29 2014
PROGRAM OPPORTUNITIES 70 STUDENT CASE STUDY | STANFORD

70 TIERED 26 SF/STUDENT

OSU CASCADES | JANUARY 16 2014
Prow  Future Buildings
Greatest Challenges

- Future funding for infrastructure
- Establishing a unique OSU brand and attracting students
- Ramping up fast enough if demand projections are met
- Mitigating community concerns
1. Admissions Update – Kate Peterson
   It is still too early to know for sure what next year will look like, numbers will be more accurate in a couple of weeks. The May 1 ATD deadline is the best indicator we have for intent to enroll. OUS is still working on their predictions, there is a meeting scheduled on April 28th. The group from OUS that does predictions has been given a 1-year extension and then may move to HECC.
   - New Freshman admissions are up 2% - 100 students over last fall
   - New high achieving students is up 12% - 90-100 students
   - Transfer student numbers last year were flat, this year it looks like we will be up slightly.
   - High Achieving applications and diversity applications continue to increase.
   - Financial aid is stressed on remission dollars – but that is a good problem to have.
   - The average GPA for new students is 3.61. For High Achieving students the average GPA is 3.93. This is the most qualified group of honors applicants ever. The average GPA for transfer students is 3.33, which is an increase over last year.
   - Waitlist procedures were not implemented this year. If demand had been up 8-10% we would have had to implement. Our experience this year provides good data for evaluating the waitlist process.

2. First Year Experience Updates
   Susie – highlights from report:
   - Residential enhancements: every resident hall will have new position for academic support
   - Communications & Outreach: promotional materials are being designed, highlighting 4 signature components, living & learning in communities, academic advising, 1st yr experience courses, includes U-Engage and courses taught through colleges, and Orientation
   - Curriculum enhancement: New WR 121 curriculum has been developed. A new course attribute will be given to 1st year curriculum courses (actually sections) – if college courses/sections provide the same type of info that U-Engage courses do, and instructors attend training they can
be given the attribute. Courses/sections will be identified for next year with more coming on board in following years. Oversight will be in the Office of New Student Programs and Family Outreach. The benefit of doing this is: 1. We know it is good for the students, 2. Delegated courses may be eligible for funds to help support the curriculum, 3. If students cannot get into U-Engage courses they will have other options. These course designators will only be available Fall term 2014, but winter term is a good next steps discussion.

- University Math Department is implementing ALEX math placement – pre reqs will be enforced.

Hoffman - Overview and college “walkabouts”
- Susie and Mark visited all of the Undergraduate Colleges. The conversations were fruitful. In general there is strong support and interest in the program. College leadership was concerned about sustainability and talked about the need for support for undergraduate exploration. A summary of the meetings will be distributed to the UCSEE

Kincanon - FY Advising Syllabus
- First year advising council has been looking at first year advising and thinking carefully about the experience that students are having. Learning outcomes are being made highly visible and transparent for students in the First Year Advising Syllabus. The intent is to present fixed content and the potential for colleges/school/department specific content. Students will know what to expect at an advising appointment within their college/school/department.

The syllabus will be given to students at START. It includes:
- 1st year skills requirements
- Know the tools and know the rules
- Exploration
- Beyond the classroom piece – experiential education
- Learning goals for graduates
- The insert is a place for colleges/departments/schools to include nuanced information – College of Ag will create a template that includes a place for each unit to customize.

- To encourage students and advisors to utilize this document during advising an advising guide for advisors has been created.
- There is a group meeting to discuss how this maps onto the International pathways.
- An electronic version of the advising guide can be found at: http://oregonstate.edu/main/advisingsyllabus

Creighton - FY Checkpoints/early alert
- The goal is to identify students who have gone off the track and helping them get connected to resources to help them get back on track pretty quickly. Some ideas being explored include:
  - Reporting mid-term grades
  - Build on things we are already doing
  - Develop checkpoint programs that span 3 areas, touch-points, academics, advising, and residence halls
  - Course based element – having instructors identify students who are off-track
- Provide resources to help students who’ve been identified at specific moments in time.
- Advising checkpoints – identify the moments when advisors realize that students are off track – do outreach early
- Residential based intervention and outreach is another touch point
- The person with the best relationship with the student should do the outreach. The 3 point approach provides back up when one or the other isn’t able to reach the student. They will be using data to assess the effectiveness of the checkpoints.
- First year students said that they wanted to be contacted via email but would like to have a secondary method identified.
- Technology that can be leveraged to improve the process is being considered.
- The taskforce as started looking into the numbers of students who may be “at risk” either, academically, in advising, or in residence halls. A more holistic checkpoint system reaches students who are having difficulties in any or all of those areas.
- [http://oregonstate.edu/ase/firstyear/checkpoints](http://oregonstate.edu/ase/firstyear/checkpoints)

3. Provost’s Team for Oregon Higher Education Assessment – Stefanie Dawn
   - The Bac Core Review – DPD is scheduled for next year. Review forms will go out to course contacts. Announcements for workshops will be coming soon to help prepare for subsequent years.
   - A multi-state collaborative (9 states) with the goal of engaging faculty is interested in accountability for student learning. OSU will participate in the area of written communication. The process includes collecting, evaluating, and assessing student work. The pilot (data collections) starts in the Fall of 2014. Targeted faculty will be invited to participate. 300 & 400 level coursework will be used for work samples. The Bac Core committee sent invitations to selected faculty to gauge interest. There are different levels of participation/commitment. 1. Submit samples of student work. 2. Participate in state-wide conference in Portland in May. 3. Participate as a state- and national-level reviewer.

Stipend issue - deans are getting tired of distributing stipends – we need to find a better way to compensate faculty for additional work or travel. Managing the little pots of money is expensive.

Attachments:
- OSU Provosts Team details
- Multi-state collaborative FAQ
- A single document that contains all of the VALUE rubrics - the Multistate Collaborative will be focusing on Written Communication and Quantitative Literacy, and possibly Critical Thinking.

Next meeting: June 19, 2014 – Joint meeting UEC & UAC
The goal of the Provost’s Team for Oregon Higher Education Assessment is to engage faculty in one or more state- or national-level assessment activities to: ensure OSU faculty input into these activities; to provide input into OSU’s future participation in such activities; and to capacity-build within our own institution. These activities are:

- Submit student work in the Fall 2014 for the 9-state Multi-state Collaborative pilot project to assess student learning for written communication at the institutional and state level.
- Participate in a statewide conference in Portland on assessing written communication and quantitative literacy on May 30-31, 2014 (all 4-year institutions and community colleges are participating).
- Become a reviewer for the Multi-state Collaborative in November or December 2014.

Below are details about each of these activities, including estimated time commitments and responsibilities.

1. **Submit samples of student work**
   - **Faculty Involvement/Responsibility**: Provide samples of student work (written communication only) as part of the 9-state Multi-State Collaborative pilot project near the end of the Fall 2014 term. Samples must meet certain criteria. These criteria will be provided. You can use an existing assignment that meets key criteria or design an assignment to meet the criteria.
   - **Time Commitment/Activities**: 3-10 hours. Identify whether you have assignments that meet the criteria and submit samples and/or design an assignment. If samples are available electronically or in Blackboard, this will take less time. If samples are paper-based, they will need to be scanned prior to grading. All samples will be blinded (by the OSU Office of Academic Programs, Assessment, and Accreditation). You will not be expected to de-identify student work. Participate in process feedback conversations.
   - **Other Quick Information**: Samples will be submitted for review by a national panel of faculty (some OSU faculty may be able to participate in this, refer to #3 below). Analysis is at the University Level NOT course or individual student level (all data are aggregate and WILL NOT BE SHARED PUBLICLY). However, your data can be shared back with you if you wish.
   - Please refer to the document titled “MSC-FAQ” for details about the Multi-state Collaborative.

2. **Participate in a state-wide conference in Portland (all community colleges and 4-years institutions are participating in this conference).**
   - **Faculty Involvement/Responsibility**: Participate in one or both of the conference elements (written communication and/or quantitative literacy). On May 30, ~9 am -2 pm, written communication; May 30 (~ 2 – 5 p.m.) and May 31 (9 a.m. – 12 p.m.), 2014, quantitative literacy. A detailed agenda is currently being developed.
   - **Time Commitment/Activities**: 7 – 30 hours at the conference (+ driving); Participate in process feedback conversations.
   - **Other Quick Information**: The conference is focusing on (a) assessing student writing at the institutional and state level (using AAC&U VALUE Rubrics)(concepts can be applied to course
level assessment) and (b) discussing/defining how to assess quantitative literacy at the institutional and state level. The conference is being facilitated by national level leaders in these areas. You may participate in one or both of the areas (written communication or quantitative literacy).

- All conference costs will be paid.
- There are a limited number of spots available.
- **NOTE: Quantitative literacy** (QL) is the “ability to reason and solve quantitative problems from a wide array of authentic contexts and everyday life situations.” It does not focus on math courses per se, rather it is embedded in a wide variety of other courses (such as economics, some sciences, psychology, etc.). Assessing QL is also part of the Multi-state Collaborative and is a national conversation that is gaining traction it would be helpful to have OSU faculty input into this conversation.

3. **Participate as a state- and national-level reviewer for the Multi-State Collaborative for written communication or quantitative literacy.**

   - **Faculty Involvement/Responsibility:** Attend norming training sessions; travel to the national scoring session (location TBD, probably Boulder, CO); Participate in process feedback conversations.
   - **Time Commitment/Activities:** ~3-4 days (schedule not yet determined)
   - **Other Quick Information:** Preference will be given to those who participated in the May statewide conference.
   - Reviewers will have all travel costs paid and will be paid a stipend.
   - The number of available reviewer spots has not yet been determined.
   - Please refer to the document titled “MSC-FAQ” for details about the Multi-state Collaborative.
Multi-State Collaborative (MSC) to Advance Learning Outcomes Assessment
Frequently Asked Questions for Faculty Participants

The Multi-State Collaborative (MSC) is an agreement among signatory states to work together in the development and pilot testing of a process for system level learning outcomes assessment. Collaboration is needed between MSC workgroup members, signatory states, and institutions – faculty and administration.

Introduction: A Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document has been created to help interested faculty members understand the Multi-State Collaborative project and the components of the model. It provides information of particular interest to potential faculty participants and addresses what we expect to be faculty concerns.

OSU-specific notations are in orange.

What is the Multi-State Collaborative Project and who is involved?

- With the active support of the organization of State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO) and the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), nine states—Connecticut, Indiana, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Oregon, Rhode Island and Utah—have agreed to collaborate in the development and pilot testing of a different model for learning outcomes assessment—a model that is rooted in campus/system collaboration, in authentic student work and in faculty curriculum development and teaching activity. The model is based on the use of Essential Learning Outcomes and associated VALUE Rubrics developed by faculty members under the auspices of AAC&U's hugely successful LEAP initiative.

How did the Multi-State Collaborative (MSC) evolve and what is the push for multi-state assessment?

- MSC is based on the “Vision Project,” which began in Massachusetts. There, a broadly collaborative multi-campus leadership group worked to assess student learning outcomes, based on the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes and using VALUE rubrics. Once Massachusetts achieved status as a Leap State, state-level leaders created the MSC as their primary LEAP States initiative. Massachusetts wanted to see if other states would join the effort to assess learning outcomes and voluntarily share results.
- The MSC has been a collaborative initiative developed in the hopes of avoiding potential federal/state mandates of using standardized tests to determine what students are learning.
- The goal from the beginning has been to create a program of learning outcomes assessment that builds on faculty- and campus-based formative assessment while adding features that provide for public reporting of results for sectors of institutions (e.g. community colleges, state universities, universities) and for comparisons across states.

What is the timeline for this project?

- This is a large-scale, ambitious project that will take several years to design and implement. The project will start with a one-year phase that develops a pilot and a proof of concept. The pilot study’s purpose is three-fold: to provide evidence and support for proof of concept, proof of feasibility, and the validity and reliability of the model and the assessment tools. The big question to be answered in the first year is this: Can the project-states figure out collaboratively how to run a pilot study that samples student work and models an assessment and reporting protocol? Discoveries from the pilot will inform the development of a multi-state collaboration that can be implemented in the future.
How were the 9 states selected?

- The nine states self-selected into the Collaborative. Massachusetts sent out a proposal for a Multi-State Collaborative and asked for expressions of interest. A meeting with 23 interested states and follow-up interactions resulted in the Nine State Collaborative. State commissioners of higher education in these states volunteered to participate in this pilot after several months of discussion within their own states and in several national meetings in 2012-13.

What roles are faculty being asked to play?

- Faculty may choose to participate in different ways throughout the project.
  - Faculty will engage in professional development activities focused on creating, revising, and/or selecting assignments designed to generate student products demonstrating particular learning outcomes, and then will provide those student artifacts for analysis.
  - Faculty will participate in a face-to-face rating session with other faculty from the other states.
  - Faculty will be involved in analyzing the data, to provide their perspective on what the data suggest.
  - Faculty will bring insights back to their local states and campuses, and be instrumental in curricular redesign and closing the loop.

What are the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) being assessed?

- As a starting place, the Multi-State Collaborative project will examine 2 initial Student Learning Outcomes: Written Communication and Quantitative Literacy. (For the Fall 2014 pilot, Oregon State University will only be participating in collecting data for written communication.)
  - Written Communication (WC) - the development and expression of ideas in writing. Written communication involves learning to work in many genres and styles. It can involve working with many different writing technologies, and mixing texts, data, and images. Written communication abilities develop through iterative experiences across the curriculum.
  - Quantitative Literacy (QL) — also known as Numeracy or Quantitative Reasoning — is a "habit of mind," competency, and comfort in working with numerical data. Individuals with strong QL skills possess the ability to reason and solve quantitative problems from a wide array of authentic contexts and everyday life situations. They understand and can create sophisticated arguments supported by quantitative evidence and they can clearly communicate those arguments in a variety of formats (using words, tables, graphs, mathematical equations, etc., as appropriate).
  - Also being considered for the future is Critical Thinking (CT) — a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion. States and campuses will not be required to assess critical thinking but the Working Group of MSC will be interested in the experiences of those states and campuses who wish to use the Critical Thinking outcome and VALUE Rubric.

How will the Student Learning Outcomes be assessed?

- The agreement calls for Written Communication and Quantitative Literacy LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes to be used in this project, assessed using the LEAP VALUE Rubrics developed by teams of faculty members and other experts from public and private institutions of higher education across the United States from 2007-2010.
- MSC assessment encompasses all volunteer institutions, 4-year and 2-year, within each signatory state.
- Involved faculty will identify an existing assignment or develop an assignment and provide student work to the MSC Project to be assessed. For the pilot, the student work must align to the WC and/or QL Rubric described above.
- Student work samples will be collected in the Fall 2014 for the pilot.
- The institution/department may choose to assess the same student work as it relates to their degree program within their institution; however, MSC requires a separate evaluation to be conducted by trained faculty evaluators using the VALUE Rubrics indicated above.
● The student work will be evaluated both holistically (one overall score) and analytically (one score for each dimension) against each learning outcome and corresponding rubric.

**How will the results be used?**

● Campuses may use results however they choose.
● States will provide aggregated holistic and analytic scores among same sector institutions (e.g. 2-year, 4-year). Within state comparisons may be made with benchmarks established for same sector campuses. Disaggregated comparisons as possible by selected student body and institutional characteristics.
● MSC will request aggregated holistic and analytic scores among same sector institutions (e.g. 2 year, 4 year).

**But what if my institution has adapted the VALUE rubrics to be more appropriate to our campus?**

● Although LEAP outcomes and rubrics will be the common element, Collaborative members may wish to consider other assessment components for the model, such as assessments designed to fit with the Degree Qualifications Profile, the NILOA-developed Transparency Framework, results from licensure exams, and surveys of student engagement such as NSSE and CCSSE, among other possibilities.
● Many institutions have modified the VALUE rubrics to reflect their own unique needs. However, in order to place the findings from this project within a broader national context, it is essential that the student work samples selected to be scored at a multi-state level are evaluated using unmodified VALUE rubrics. Institutions could, of course, evaluate their student work using modified rubrics for their own purposes.

**How is the MSC process different from standardized assessments that are already being conducted at the state-level?**

● The still-under-development statewide assessment model is intended to deter mandated standardized tests through more rigorous demonstration of what students are learning in college. The aggregated rubric scores will be capable of providing normed evidence of the quality of student learning in state systems for external stakeholders while also giving faculty helpful information for improving teaching and student learning. Many state-level leaders acknowledge that standardized quantitative tests are not very useful for state policy purposes because they are difficult to interpret for lay audiences and do not lead to clear policy choices and decisions. Campus leaders often argue that state-mandated standardized tests are of little help for their efforts to use learning outcomes assessment in a formative way to improve the quality of student learning.

**What will the pilot study process consist of and who is involved?**

● Selection of Pilot Institution Participants: Three two-year institutions and three four-year institutions per state will be selected by the state to participate in the pilot study.
● State, Institution, and Student Characteristics: State and institution characteristics to be collected as part of the pilot study for evaluating the ability to organize aggregated data for state by state comparison.
● LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes: Each participating institution will be required to collect a sample of student artifacts for assessment of two LEAP essential learning outcomes: written communication and quantitative literacy.
● Assessment Timing: The student population from which student artifacts will be drawn for assessment will include those students nearing graduation as measured by credit completion.
● Sampling Process and Unit of Analysis: institutions are to generate their sample following the sampling process that works best for their institution’s structure, curricula and student body. Participating institutions would be required to clearly and comprehensively detail their sampling process with an effort aimed at creating a representative sample of students from whom student work will be collected. At OSU, sampling and blinding student work will be performed by the Office of Academic Programs, Assessment, and Accreditation.
• Assignment Design: Faculty at pilot institutions will need to identify an existing assignment that meets a minimum number of criteria (these criteria are currently being developed) or faculty can intentionally design an assignment that works for their class and the pilot study. Faculty are encouraged to consider the intentionality behind the design of their assignment, i.e., did s/he intentionally design the assignment to elicit from the student demonstration of a specific competency? Can the faculty member point to assignment prompts that would call upon the student to construct an appropriate answer?
• Assignment Criteria/Template: A broad assignment template/criteria will be provided to ensure the appropriateness of assignments for assessment using the VALUE rubrics as the assessment instrument, consistency in the student work submitted important for the reliability of the scoring process, and to realistically allow for scoring time constraints.
• Sample Size and Submission: The Pilot Study Subgroup recommends the collection of 150 artifacts per outcome per institution with the restriction of one artifact per student. Ideally an assignment will meet multiple outcomes. Institutions should attempt to limit the number of artifacts per course and limit the number of artifacts collected per faculty member across multiple courses. Faculty should submit completed student work electronically at any point in time during the pilot study semester recognizing that submitted student work is being assessed for learning and acquired competencies accumulated over the students’ entire academic path as opposed to the current course from which the artifact is being drawn.
• Scoring Process and Protocols: Because the pilot study is designed to evaluate the validity and reliability of the model, the pilot study sub-group recommends centralized scoring for pilot one.
• Results: Assessment results of the pilot study will be aggregated and reported out by segment (4-year institutions or 2-year institutions) for all dimensions of the rubric for each learning outcome. There will be no public presentation of results from the pilot study with exception of identified trends in the data.

What is the time commitment and expectations for faculty for each phase if I am interested in participating?
• Exact time commitment is dependent on the number of institutions participating, number of assignments (student work) submitted to be evaluated through the MSC, and the number of faculty evaluators.
• The time commitment will vary amongst faculty. Volunteer faculty will need to select one assignment (student work) that directly aligns to one of the VALUE Rubrics indicated above. If faculty are familiar with the VALUE Rubrics – the time needed is minimal. If, however, faculty are not familiar with the VALUE Rubrics or dimensions identified in each, there may be more of a time commitment to ensure the student work they select directly aligns.
• The decision on whether to become a faculty evaluator will also increase the time commitment needed.

If I choose to participate, are there any resources available?
• Some resources will be made available to campuses to help in this process and campuses should be able to provide opportunities to gain experience with LEAP based assessment and assignment design. Compensation will be provided for faculty members who volunteer to score student artifacts.

What are the benefits for faculty and students participating?
• Benefits may include: 1) an opportunity to work with other faculty to develop an assessment process based on authentic student work, 2) a chance to learn more about using rubrics to assess learning, specifically the VALUE rubrics, and 3) an opportunity to learn how assessment is conducted. Based on this knowledge, faculty may come across new ideas on how to improve their own teaching, and faculty may receive a clearer understanding of what they want to accomplish in their own courses.
• When participating in rating, benefits may include: 1) Ability to view and evaluate student work from other states, 2) a chance to receive training on how to assess, and 3) an opportunity to share knowledge with colleagues and peers.
• When participating in data analysis, benefits may include: 1) sharing the faculty perspective on what the data suggest, 2) being instrumental in curricular redesign and closing the loop in their states and local campuses, and 3) providing input into the pilot study process.
• Any level of participation provides an opportunity for input into the state and national assessment conversation, as well as, the pilot study process. At OSU we will solicit input from you regarding our ongoing participation.
**What is an assessable artifact and what types of assignments can be used as the assessable artifact?**

- An assessable artifact is simply a graded assignment in the course that addresses the WC, QL, or CT VALUE Rubrics. (At OSU we are only collecting data on WC).
- By using assignments and the student work to fulfill the assignments from the class for assessment, the instructor does not have to design any other kind of assessable material. However, the instructor will need to ensure the selected student work directly aligns to the appropriate rubric. Designing an aligned assignment takes practice and requires using the selected rubric to guide the design.
- This graded assignment ensures that students take it seriously and allows instructors to really know if students can perform the SLO.
- By using materials designed by faculty for assessing individual performance in the class, the artifact that can also be used in program assessment.
- The assessable artifact is any assignment that a faculty member believes will best demonstrate a student’s ability to meet the LEAP Learning Outcome that the course addresses.
- The assessable assignment in this project will be one from a student that is nearing completion of the degree in a 2-year or 4-year institution.
- Over time the program will allow for a variety of formats to be submitted. For the pilot and immediate future only written assignments will be used.

**How will an appropriate sample be ensured?**

- Sample sizes and sample processes may not provide meaningful (i.e. valid and reliable) results at the institutional level. Rather the goal of the pilot is a proof of concept. Faculty who are engaged in this pilot project will be instrumental in shaping the future of this project and development of *Getting Started: A Guide for Faculty Participants in the Multi-State Collaborative*.

**Where can I find the rubrics that will be used to assess the assignments?**

- Please go to [http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/index_p.cfm?CFID=64960905&CFTOKEN=11588533](http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/index_p.cfm?CFID=64960905&CFTOKEN=11588533). Once you have entered your email address you will be able to download all the VALUE rubrics (16 of them). The MSC project will only be using the Written Communication, Quantitative Literacy, and possibly Critical Thinking.

**I prefer confidentially for both myself and my students – how can you ensure confidentiality?**

- Each institution will be responsible for ensuring confidentiality. Once the faculty member submits the student work, the institution will be asked to scrub all identifying information including student name, faculty name, and course section/id if needed. The institution will provide a ‘code’ to each student work. At OSU, this will be done by the Office of Academic Programs, Assessment, and Accreditation. When an evaluator reviews the student work against the rubric, all they will see is the ‘code’ given by the institution.
- The institution may choose to keep identifying information for internal assessment purposes and/or to run demographic and institutional data in aggregate form only.

**How can comparing states and institutions be a good thing? That sounds dangerous to me.**

- The project leadership has taken this concern seriously. Keeping the results aggregated by sector within states will protect individual institutions. State comparisons overall and by sector should prompt policy-level questions that are helpful—questions having to do with state-level investment in higher education, for example. Discussion among states about investment in higher education should be a good thing for institutions.

**I am concerned that the results of the assessment may be used against faculty. Who will see the results?**

- Even though student work will be stripped of all identifying information before inclusion in the MSC project, institutions have the ability to maintain demographic and institutional data which can provide trend data over time.
- All assessment data will be in aggregate form only – at the campus, state, and MSC levels.
If the institution chooses to participate, is there any paperwork that will need to be completed? IRB, Student Informed Consent, etc.

- Based on IRB guidelines, the pilot study in particular would qualify for exemption or at a minimum expedited review given that there is minimal if any risk to the students, student identification will be protected (the de-identification process ensures results cannot be traced back to an individual student, institution, faculty member, or course. The study will take place in commonly accepted education settings involving normal educational practices – collection and assessment of classroom embedded student work – providing information about student learning that can be used formatively for instructional (pedagogical) or curricula change. The assessment model involves collecting course embedded student work in order to assess student learning. Results regarding the level of student learning in the pilot study will not be public knowledge. This may be considered standard educational activity for improvement in educational practices. While the data (when the model is fully implemented) will be made public, it will only be done so in the aggregate and will not be traceable to an individual student, course, program, or faculty member. There are no risks to the students from whom work is to be collected and assessed and the identities of the student subjects’ will be protected. Assessment results will not be identifiable to an individual student and there is not potential harm to the student participant.

- The IRB may waive the requirement for informed consent or may grant waivers of written consent. These waivers may be granted for research that involves no more than minimal risk to subjects, the waiver will not adversely affect the rights and welfare of the subjects, the research could not otherwise be practically carried out without the waiver, and, when appropriate, subjects will be provided with additional pertinent information after participation.

Who are the evaluators?

- The evaluators will be instructors from the participating institutions within the 9 states listed above. They may or may not be the instructors who volunteered to submit student work to be evaluated; however preference will be given to faculty who have submitted student work to the pilot project.

- The evaluators will not be asked to assess an assignment from students in their classes.

If I am interested in being an evaluator, who should I contact?

- Stefani Dawn, Interim Director, OSU Academic Programs, Assessment, and Accreditation. Stefani.dawn@oregonstate.edu, 541-737-0919.

Will there be any formalized training for faculty who are either participating in the MSC or evaluating the assignments?

- Each participating state will develop processes for training. Training will either be offered through the instructors’ home institution or the participating state will hold a training session for all institutions within their home state.

Civic Engagement VALUE Rubric

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org

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

Definition

Civic engagement is “working to make a difference in the civic life of our communities and developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values and motivation to make that difference. It means promoting the quality of life in a community, through both political and non-political processes.” (Excerpted from Civic Responsibility and Higher Education, edited by Thomas Ehrlich, published by Oryx Press, 2000, Preface, page vi.) In addition, civic engagement encompasses actions wherein individuals participate in activities of personal and public concern that are both individually life-enriching and socially beneficial to the community.

Framing Language

Preparing graduates for their public lives as citizens, members of communities, and professionals in society has historically been a responsibility of higher education. Yet the outcome of a civic-minded graduate is a complex concept. Civic learning outcomes are framed by personal identity and commitments, disciplinary frameworks and traditions, pre-professional norms and practice, and the mission and values of colleges and universities. This rubric is designed to make the civic learning outcomes more explicit. Civic engagement can take many forms, from individual volunteerism to organizational involvement to electoral participation. For students this could include community-based learning through service-learning classes, community-based research, or service within the community. Multiple types of work samples or collections of work may be utilized to assess this, such as:

- The student creates and manages a service program that engages others (such as youth or members of a neighborhood) in learning about and taking action on an issue they care about. In the process, the student also teaches and models processes that engage others in deliberative democracy, in having a voice, participating in democratic processes, and taking specific actions to affect an issue.
- The student researches, organizes, and carries out a deliberative democracy forum on a particular issue, one that includes multiple perspectives on that issue and how best to make positive change through various courses of action.
- As a result, other students, faculty, and community members are engaged to take action on an issue.
- The student works on and takes a leadership role in a complex campaign to bring about tangible changes in the public’s awareness or education on a particular issue, or even a change in public policy. Through this process, the student demonstrates multiple types of civic action and skills.

The student integrates their academic work with community engagement, producing a tangible product (piece of legislation or policy, a business, building or civic infrastructure, water quality or scientific assessment, needs survey, research paper, service program, or organization) that has engaged community constituents and responded to community needs and assets through the process.

In addition, the nature of this work lends itself to opening up the review process to include community constituents that may be a part of the work, such as teammates, colleagues, community/agency members, and those served or collaborating in the process.

Glossary

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

- Civic identity: When one sees her or himself as an active participant in society with a strong commitment and responsibility to work with others towards public purposes.
- Service-learning class: A course-based educational experience in which students participate in an organized service activity and reflect on the experience in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of personal values and civic responsibility.
- Communication skills: Listening, deliberation, negotiation, consensus building, and productive use of conflict.
- Civic life: The public life of the citizen concerned with the affairs of the community and nation as contrasted with private or personal interests.
- Politics: A process by which a group of people, whose opinions or interests might be divergent, reach collective decisions that are generally regarded as binding on the group and enforced as common policy. Political life enables people to accomplish goals they could not realize as individuals. Politics necessarily arises whenever groups of people live together, since they must always reach collective decisions of one kind or another.
- Government: "The formal institutions of a society with the authority to make and implement binding decisions about such matters as the distribution of resources, allocation of benefits and burdens, and the management of conflicts." (Retrieved from the Center for Civic Engagement Web site, May 5, 2009.)
- Civic/community contexts: Organizations, movements, campaigns, a place or locus where people and/or living creatures inhabit, which may be defined by a locality (school, national park, non-profit organization, town, state, nation) or defined by shared identity (i.e., African-Americans, North Carolinians, Americans, the Republican or Democratic Party, refugees, etc.). In addition, contexts for civic engagement may be defined by a variety of approaches intended to benefit a person, group, or community, including community service or volunteer work, academic work.
CIVIC ENGAGEMENT VALUE RUBRIC

Definition

Civic engagement is “working to make a difference in the civic life of our communities and developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values, and motivation to make that difference. It means promoting the quality of life in a community through both political and non-political processes.” (Excerpted from Civic Responsibility and Higher Education, edited by Thomas Ehrlich, published by Oryx Press, 2000, Preface, page vi.) In addition, civic engagement encompasses actions wherein individuals participate in activities of personal and public concern that are both individually life enriching and socially beneficial to the community.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diversity of Communities and Cultures</th>
<th>Capstone</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates evidence of adjustment in own attitudes and beliefs because of working within and learning from diversity of communities and cultures. Promotes others' engagement with diversity.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflects on how own attitudes and beliefs are different from those of other cultures and communities. Exhibits curiosity about what can be learned from diversity of communities and cultures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has awareness that own attitudes and beliefs are different from those of other cultures and communities. Exhibits little curiosity about what can be learned from diversity of communities and cultures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis of Knowledge</th>
<th>Capstone</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connects and extends knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzes knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline making relevant connections to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begins to connect knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic Identity and Commitment</th>
<th>Capstone</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides evidence of experience in civic-engagement activities and describes what she/he has learned about her/himself as it relates to a reinforced and clarified sense of civic identity and continued commitment to public action.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides evidence of experience in civic-engagement activities and describes what she/he has learned about her/himself as it relates to a growing sense of civic identity and commitment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence suggests involvement in civic-engagement activities is generated from expectations or course requirements rather than from a sense of civic identity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides little evidence of her/his experience in civic-engagement activities and does not connect experiences to civic identity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic Communication</th>
<th>Capstone</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tailors communication strategies to effectively express, listen, and adapt to others to establish relationships to further civic action.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectively communicates in civic context, showing ability to do all of the following: express, listen, and adapt ideas and messages based on others' perspectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicates in civic context, showing ability to do more than one of the following: express, listen, and adapt ideas and messages based on others' perspectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicates in civic context, showing ability to do one of the following: express, listen, and adapt ideas and messages based on others' perspectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic Action and Reflection</th>
<th>Capstone</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates independent experience and shows initiative in team leadership of complex or multiple civic engagement activities, accompanied by reflective insights or analysis about the aims and accomplishments of one's actions.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates independent experience and team leadership of civic action, with reflective insights or analysis about the aims and accomplishments of one's actions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has clearly participated in civically focused actions and begins to reflect or describe how these actions may benefit individual(s) or communities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has experimented with some civic actions but shows little internalized understanding of their aims or effects and little commitment to future action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic Contexts/Structures</th>
<th>Capstone</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates ability and commitment to collaboratively work across and within community contexts and structures to achieve a civic aim.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates ability and commitment to work actively within community contexts and structures to achieve a civic aim.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates experience identifying intentional ways to participate in civic contexts and structures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiments with civic contexts and structures, tries out a few to see what fits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

Definition

Creative thinking is both the capacity to combine or synthesize existing ideas, images, or expertise in original ways and the experience of thinking, reacting, and working in an imaginative way characterized by a high degree of innovation, divergent thinking, and risk taking.

Framing Language

Creative thinking, as it is fostered within higher education, must be distinguished from less focused types of creativity such as, for example, the creativity exhibited by a small child's drawing, which stems not from an understanding of connections, but from an ignorance of boundaries. Creative thinking in higher education can only be expressed productively within a particular domain. The student must have a strong foundation in the strategies and skills of the domain in order to make connections and synthesize. While demonstrating solid knowledge of the domain's parameters, the creative thinker, at the highest levels of performance, pushes beyond those boundaries in new, unique, or atypical recombinations, uncovering or critically perceiving new syntheses and using or recognizing creative risk-taking to achieve a solution.

The Creative Thinking VALUE Rubric is intended to help faculty assess creative thinking in a broad range of transdisciplinary or interdisciplinary work samples or collections of work. The rubric is made up of a set of attributes that are common to creative thinking across disciplines. Examples of work samples or collections of work that could be assessed for creative thinking may include research papers, lab reports, musical compositions, a mathematical equation that solves a problem, a prototype design, a reflective piece about the final product of an assignment, or other academic works. The work samples or collections of work may be completed by an individual student or a group of students.

Glossary

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

- Exemplar: A model or pattern to be copied or imitated (quoted from www.dictionary.reference.com/browse/exemplar).
- Domain: Field of study or activity and a sphere of knowledge and influence.
**Creative Thinking VALUE Rubric**

*for more information, please contact value@aacu.org*

**Definition**

Creative thinking is both the capacity to combine or synthesize existing ideas, images, or expertise in original ways and the experience of thinking, reacting, and working in an imaginative way characterized by a high degree of innovation, divergent thinking, and risk taking.

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

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

### Acquiring Competencies

This step refers to acquiring strategies and skills within a particular domain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflect: Evaluates creative process and product using domain-appropriate criteria.</th>
<th>Create: Creates an entirely new object, solution or idea that is appropriate to the domain.</th>
<th>Adapt: Successfully adapts an appropriate exemplar to his/her own specifications.</th>
<th>Model: Successfully reproduces an appropriate exemplar.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Taking Risks

May include personal risk (fear of embarrassment or rejection) or risk of failure in successfully completing assignment, i.e. going beyond original parameters of assignment, introducing new materials and forms, tackling controversial topics, advocating unpopular ideas or solutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actively seeks out and follows through on untested and potentially risky directions or approaches to the assignment in the final product.</th>
<th>Incorporates new directions or approaches to the assignment in the final product.</th>
<th>Considers new directions or approaches without going beyond the guidelines of the assignment.</th>
<th>Stays strictly within the guidelines of the assignment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Solving Problems

Not only develops a logical, consistent plan to solve problem, but recognizes consequences of solution and can articulate reason for choosing solution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Having selected from among alternatives, develops a logical, consistent plan to solve the problem.</th>
<th>Considers and rejects less acceptable approaches to solving problem.</th>
<th>Only a single approach is considered and is used to solve the problem.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Embracing Contradictions

Integrates alternate, divergent, or contradictory perspectives or ideas fully.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incorporates alternate, divergent, or contradictory perspectives or ideas in an exploratory way.</th>
<th>Includes (recognizes the value of) alternate, divergent, or contradictory perspectives or ideas in a small way.</th>
<th>Acknowledges (mentions in passing) alternate, divergent, or contradictory perspectives or ideas.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Innovative Thinking

Novelty or uniqueness (of idea, claim, question, format, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extends a novel or unique idea, question, format, or product to create new knowledge or knowledge that crosses boundaries.</th>
<th>Creates a novel or unique idea, question, format, or product.</th>
<th>Experiments with creating a novel or unique idea, question, format, or product.</th>
<th>Reformulates a collection of available ideas.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Connecting, Synthesizing, Transforming

Transforms ideas or solutions into entirely new forms.

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

**Definition**

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

**Framing Language**

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

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

**Glossary**

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

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

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org

**Definition**

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

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

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

### Explanation of issues

**Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding.**

**Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions.**

**Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.**

**Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description.**

### Evidence

**Selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion**

**Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly.**

**Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning.**

**Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning.**

**Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/evaluation. Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question.**

### Influence of context and assumptions

**Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.**

**Identifies own and others' assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.**

**Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa).**

**Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions). Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position.**

### Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis)

**Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) are acknowledged. Others' points of view are synthesized within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).**

**Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue. Others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).**

**Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue.**

**Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious.**

### Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences)

**Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical and reflect student's informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order.**

**Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.**

**Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.**

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

**Definition**

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

**Framing Language**

This rubric is intended to help faculty evaluate work samples and collections of work that demonstrate student learning about ethics. Although the goal of a liberal education should be to help students turn what they’ve learned in the classroom into action, pragmatically it would be difficult, if not impossible, to judge whether or not students would act ethically when faced with real ethical situations. What can be evaluated using a rubric is whether students have the intellectual tools to make ethical choices.

The rubric focuses on five elements: Ethical Self Awareness, Ethical Issue Recognition, Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts, Application of Ethical Principles, and Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts. Students’ Ethical Self Identity evolves as they practice ethical decision-making skills and learn how to describe and analyze positions on ethical issues. Presumably, they will choose ethical actions when faced with ethical issues.

**Glossary**

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

- **Core Beliefs**: Those fundamental principles that consciously or unconsciously influence one’s ethical conduct and ethical thinking. Even when unacknowledged, core beliefs shape one’s responses. Core beliefs can reflect one’s environment, religion, culture or training. A person may or may not choose to act on their core beliefs.
- **Ethical Perspectives/concepts**: The different theoretical means through which ethical issues are analyzed, such as ethical theories (e.g., utilitarian, natural law, virtue) or ethical concepts (e.g., rights, justice, duty).
- **Complex, multi-layered (gray) context**: The sub-parts or situational conditions of a scenario that bring two or more ethical dilemmas (issues) into the mix/problem/context for student’s identification.
- **Cross-relationships among the issues**: Obvious or subtle connections between/among the sub-parts or situational conditions of the issues present in a scenario (e.g., relationship of production of corn as part of climate change issue).
**Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric**

**Definition**

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

*for more information, please contact value@aacu.org*

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical Self-Awareness</th>
<th>Capstone</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td>Student discusses in detail/analyzes both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs and discussion has greater depth and clarity.</td>
<td>Student discusses in detail/analyzes both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs.</td>
<td>Student states both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>Student names the theory or theories, can present the gist of said theory or theories, and accurately explains the details of the theory or theories used.</td>
<td>Student can name the major theory or theories she/he uses, can present the gist of said theory or theories, and attempts to explain the details of the theory or theories used, but has some inaccuracies.</td>
<td>Student states both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>Student states both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs.</td>
<td>Student can name the major theory she/he uses, and is only able to present the gist of the named theory.</td>
<td>Student states either their core beliefs or articulates the origins of the core beliefs but not both.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>Student states either their core beliefs or articulates the origins of the core beliefs but not both.</td>
<td>Student only names the major theory she/he uses.</td>
<td>Student only names the major theory she/he uses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ethical Issue Recognition</strong></th>
<th><strong>Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts</strong></th>
<th><strong>Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td>Student can recognize ethical issues when presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context AND can recognize cross-relationships among the issues.</td>
<td>Student can independently apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, accurately, and is able to consider full implications of the application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>Student can recognize ethical issues when issues are presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context OR can grasp cross-relationships among the issues.</td>
<td>Student can independently (to a new example) apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, accurately, but does not consider the specific implications of the application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues and grasp (incompletely) the complexities or interrelationships among the issues.</td>
<td>Student can apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, independently (to a new example) and the application is inaccurate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues but fails to grasp complexity or interrelationships.</td>
<td>Student can apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question with support (using examples, in a class, in a group, or a fixed-choice setting) but is unable to apply ethical perspectives/concepts independently (to a new example).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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

**Definition**

The ability to know when there is a need for information, to be able to identify, locate, evaluate, and effectively and responsibly use and share that information for the problem at hand. - Adopted from the National Forum on Information Literacy

**Framing Language**

This rubric is recommended for use evaluating a collection of work, rather than a single work sample in order to fully gauge students’ information skills. Ideally, a collection of work would contain a wide variety of different types of work and might include: research papers, editorials, speeches, grant proposals, marketing or business plans, PowerPoint presentations, posters, literature reviews, position papers, and argument critiques to name a few. In addition, a description of the assignments with the instructions that initiated the student work would be vital in providing the complete context for the work. Although a student's final work must stand on its own, evidence of a student’s research and information gathering processes, such as a research journal/diary, could provide further demonstration of a student’s information proficiency and for some criteria on this rubric would be required.
**Information Literacy VALUE Rubric**

*for more information, please contact value@aau.org*

**Definition**

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determine the Extent of Information Needed</th>
<th>Capstone 4</th>
<th>Milestones 3</th>
<th>Benchmark 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectively defines the scope of the research question.</td>
<td>Defines the scope of the research question or thesis. Can determine key concepts. Types of information (sources) selected to directly relate to concepts or answer research question.</td>
<td>Defines the scope of the research question or thesis incompletely. (parts are missing, rubric boxes are too broad or too narrow, etc.) Can determine key concepts. Types of information (sources) selected to partially relate to concepts or answer research question.</td>
<td>Has difficulty defining the scope of the research question or thesis. Has difficulty determining key concepts. Types of information (sources) selected do not relate to concepts or answer research question.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Access the Needed Information | Accesses information using effective, well-designed search strategies and most appropriate information sources. | Accesses information using variety of search strategies and some relevant information sources. Demonstrates ability to refine search. | Accesses information using simple search strategies, retrieves information from limited and similar sources. |

| Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically | Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position. | Identifies own and others' assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position. | Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa). |

| Use Information Effectively to Accomplish a Specific Purpose | Communicates, organizes and synthesizes information from sources to fully achieve a specific purpose, with clarity and depth. | Communicates, organizes and synthesizes information from sources. The information is not yet synthesized, so the intended purpose is not fully achieved. | Communicates information from sources. The information is fragmented and/or used incorrectly paraphrased, etc.), so the intended purpose is not achieved. |

| Access and Use Information Ethically and Legally | Students use correctly all of the following information use strategies (use of citations and references, choice of paraphrasing, summarizing, or quoting, using information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution) and demonstrate a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information. | Students use correctly three of the following information use strategies (use of citations and references, choice of paraphrasing, summarizing, or quoting, using information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution) and demonstrates a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information. | Students use correctly two of the following information use strategies (use of citations and references, choice of paraphrasing, summarizing, or quoting, using information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution) and demonstrates a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information. | Students use correctly one of the following information use strategies (use of citations and references, choice of paraphrasing, summarizing, or quoting, using information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution) and demonstrates a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information. |
The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

Definition

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

Framing Language

This rubric is designed for use in a wide variety of disciplines. Since the terminology and process of inquiry are discipline-specific, an effort has been made to use broad language which reflects multiple approaches and assignments while addressing the fundamental elements of sound inquiry and analysis (including topic selection, existing, knowledge, design, analysis, etc.) The rubric language assumes that the inquiry and analysis process carried out by the student is appropriate for the discipline required. For example, if analysis using statistical methods is appropriate for the discipline then a student would be expected to use an appropriate statistical methodology for that analysis. If a student does not use a discipline-appropriate process for any criterion, that work should receive a performance rating of "1" or "0" for that criterion.

In addition, this rubric addresses the products of analysis and inquiry, not the processes themselves. The complexity of inquiry and analysis tasks is determined in part by how much information or guidance is provided to a student and how much the student constructs. The more the student constructs, the more complex the inquiry process. For this reason, while the rubric can be used if the assignments or purposes for work are unknown, it will work most effectively when those are known. Finally, faculty are encouraged to adapt the essence and language of each rubric criterion to the disciplinary or interdisciplinary context to which it is applied.

Glossary

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

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

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

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

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic selection</th>
<th>Capstone 4</th>
<th>Milestones 3</th>
<th>Benchmark 2</th>
<th>Benchmark 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifies a creative, focused, and manageable topic that addresses potentially significant yet previously less-explored aspects of the topic.</td>
<td>Identifies a focused and manageable/doable topic that appropriately addresses relevant aspects of the topic.</td>
<td>Identifies a topic that while manageable/doable, is too narrowly focused and leaves out relevant aspects of the topic.</td>
<td>Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Knowledge, Research, and/or Views</th>
<th>Capstone 4</th>
<th>Milestones 3</th>
<th>Benchmark 2</th>
<th>Benchmark 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Synthesizes in-depth information from relevant sources representing various points of view/approaches.</td>
<td>Presents in-depth information from relevant sources representing various points of view/approaches.</td>
<td>Presents information from relevant sources representing limited points of view/approaches.</td>
<td>Presents information from irrelevant sources representing limited points of view/approaches.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Process</th>
<th>Capstone 4</th>
<th>Milestones 3</th>
<th>Benchmark 2</th>
<th>Benchmark 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All elements of the methodology or theoretical framework are skillfully developed. Appropriate methodology or theoretical frameworks may be synthesized from across disciplines or from relevant subdisciplines.</td>
<td>Critical elements of the methodology or theoretical framework are appropriately developed, however, more subtle elements are ignored or unaccounted for.</td>
<td>Critical elements of the methodology or theoretical framework are missing, incorrectly developed, or unfocused.</td>
<td>Inquiry design demonstrates a misunderstanding of the methodology or theoretical framework.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Capstone 4</th>
<th>Milestones 3</th>
<th>Benchmark 2</th>
<th>Benchmark 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizes and synthesizes evidence to reveal insightful patterns, differences, or similarities related to focus.</td>
<td>Organizes evidence to reveal important patterns, differences, or similarities related to focus.</td>
<td>Organizes evidence, but the organization is not effective in revealing important patterns, differences, or similarities.</td>
<td>Lists evidence, but it is not organized and/or is unrelated to focus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conclusions</th>
<th>Capstone 4</th>
<th>Milestones 3</th>
<th>Benchmark 2</th>
<th>Benchmark 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>States a conclusion that is a logical extrapolation from the inquiry findings.</td>
<td>States a conclusion focused solely on the inquiry findings. The conclusion arises specifically from and responds specifically to the inquiry findings.</td>
<td>States a general conclusion that, because it is so general, also applies beyond the scope of the inquiry findings.</td>
<td>States an ambiguous, illogical, or unsupportable conclusion from inquiry findings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limitations and Implications</th>
<th>Capstone 4</th>
<th>Milestones 3</th>
<th>Benchmark 2</th>
<th>Benchmark 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insightfully discusses in detail relevant and supported limitations and implications.</td>
<td>Discusses relevant and supported limitations and implications.</td>
<td>Presents relevant and supported limitations and implications.</td>
<td>Presents limitations and implications, but they are possibly irrelevant and unsupported.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

**Definition**

Integrative learning is an understanding and a disposition that a student builds across the curriculum and co-curriculum, from making simple connections among ideas and experiences to synthesizing and transferring learning to new, complex situations within and beyond the campus.

**Framing Language**

Fostering students’ abilities to integrate learning—across courses, over time, and between campus and community life—is one of the most important goals and challenges for higher education. Initially, students connect previous learning to new classroom learning. Later, significant knowledge within individual disciplines serves as the foundation, but integrative learning goes beyond academic boundaries. Indeed, integrative experiences often occur as learners address real-world problems, unscribed and sufficiently broad, to require multiple areas of knowledge and multiple modes of inquiry, offering multiple solutions and benefiting from multiple perspectives. Integrative learning also involves internal changes in the learner. These internal changes, which indicate growth as a confident, lifelong learner, include the ability to adapt one’s intellectual skills, to contribute in a wide variety of situations, and to understand and develop individual purpose, values and ethics. Developing students’ capacities for integrative learning is central to personal success, social responsibility, and civic engagement in today’s global society. Students face a rapidly changing and increasingly connected world where integrative learning becomes not just a benefit, but a necessity.

Because integrative learning is about making connections, this learning may not be as evident in traditional academic artifacts such as research papers and academic projects unless the student, for example, is prompted to draw implications for practice. These connections often surface, however, in reflective work, self-assessment, or creative endeavors of all kinds. Integrative assignments foster learning between courses or by connecting courses to experientially-based work. Work samples or collections of work that include such artifacts give evidence of integrative learning. Faculty are encouraged to look for evidence that the student connects the learning gained in classroom study to learning gained in real life situations that are related to other learning experiences, extra-curricular activities, or work. Through integrative learning, students pull together their entire experience inside and outside of the formal classroom; thus, artificial barriers between formal study and informal or tacit learning become permeable. Integrative learning, whatever the context or source, builds upon connecting both theory and practice toward a deepened understanding.

Assignments to foster such connections and understanding could include, for example, composition papers that focus on topics from biology, economics, or history; mathematics assignments that apply mathematical tools to important issues and require written analysis to explain the implications and limitations of the mathematical treatment, or art history presentations that demonstrate aesthetic connections between selected paintings and novels. In this regard, some majors (e.g., interdisciplinary majors or problem-based field studies) seem to inherently evoke characteristics of integrative learning and result in collections of work that significantly demonstrate this outcome. However, fields of study that require accumulation of extensive and high-consensus content knowledge (such as accounting, engineering, or chemistry) also involve the kinds of complex and integrative constructions (e.g., ethical dilemmas and social consciousness) that seem to be highlighted so extensively in

**Glossary**

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

1. **Academic knowledge**: Disciplinary learning, learning from academic study, texts, etc.
2. **Content**: The information conveyed in the work samples or collections of work.
3. **Contexts**: Actual or simulated situations in which a student demonstrates learning outcomes. New and challenging contexts encourage students to stretch beyond their current frames of reference.
4. **Co-curriculum**: A parallel component of the academic curriculum that is in addition to formal classroom (student government, community service, residence hall activities, student organizations, etc.).
5. **Experience**: Learning that takes place in a setting outside of the formal classroom, such as workplace, service learning site, internship site or another.
6. **Form**: The external frameworks in which information and evidence are presented, ranging from choices for particular work sample or collection of works (such as a research paper, PowerPoint, video recording, etc.) to choices in make-up of the eportfolio.
7. **Performance**: A dynamic and sustained act that brings together knowing and doing (creating a painting, solving an experimental design problem, developing a public relations strategy for a business, etc.); performance makes learning observable.
8. **Reflection**: A meta-cognitive act of examining a performance in order to explore its significance and consequences.
9. **Self Assessment**: Describing, interpreting, and judging a performance based on stated or implied expectations followed by planning for further learning.
# Integrative Learning VALUE Rubric

For more information, please contact value@aacu.org

## Definition

Integrative learning is an understanding and a disposition that a student builds across the curriculum and cocurriculum, from making simple connections among ideas and experiences to synthesizing and transferring learning to new, complex situations within and beyond the campus.

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

## Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connections to Experience</th>
<th>Capstone 4</th>
<th>Milestones 3</th>
<th>Benchmark 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connects relevant experience and academic knowledge</td>
<td>Meaningfully synthesizes connections among experiences outside of the formal classroom (including life experiences and academic experiences such as internships and travel abroad) to deepen understanding of fields of study and to broaden own points of view.</td>
<td>Effectively selects and develops examples of life experiences, drawn from a variety of contexts (e.g., family life, artistic participation, civic involvement, work experience), to illuminate concepts/theories/frameworks of fields of study.</td>
<td>Compares life experiences and academic knowledge to infer differences, as well as similarities, and acknowledge perspectives other than own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections to Discipline</td>
<td>Independently creates wholes out of multiple parts (synthesizes) or draws conclusions by combining examples, facts, or theories from more than one field of study or perspective.</td>
<td>Independently connects examples, facts, or theories from more than one field of study or perspective.</td>
<td>When prompted, connects examples, facts, or theories from more than one field of study or perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>Adapts and applies, independently, skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation to new situations to solve difficult problems or explore complex issues in original ways.</td>
<td>Adapts and applies skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation to new situations to solve problems or explore issues.</td>
<td>Uses skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation in a new situation to contribute to understanding of problems or issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Communication</td>
<td>Fulfills the assignment(s) by choosing a format, language, or graph (or other visual representation) in ways that enhance meaning, making clear the interdependence of language and meaning, thought, and expression.</td>
<td>Fulfills the assignment(s) by choosing a format, language, or graph (or other visual representation) to explicitly connect content and form, demonstrating awareness of purpose and audience.</td>
<td>Fulfills the assignment(s) by choosing a format, language, or graph (or other visual representation) that connects in a basic way what is being communicated (content) with how it is said (form).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection and Self-Assessment</td>
<td>Envisions a future self (and possibly makes plans that build on past experiences) that have occurred across multiple and diverse contexts.</td>
<td>Evaluates changes in own learning over time, recognizing complex contextual factors (e.g., works with ambiguity and risk, deals with frustration, considers ethical frameworks).</td>
<td>Articulates strengths and challenges (within specific performances or events) to increase effectiveness in different contexts (through increased self-awareness).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Note:**
- Cells marked with a zero indicate work that does not meet benchmark level performance.
- Cells marked with a zero encourage evaluators to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark level performance.

---

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

**Definition**

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


**Framing Language**

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

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

**Glossary**

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

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

**Definition**


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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge/Capstone</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cultural self-awareness</strong></td>
<td>Articulates insights into own cultural rules and biases (e.g., seeking complexity, aware of how her/his experiences have shaped these rules, and how to recognize and respond to cultural biases, resulting in a shift in self-description.)</td>
<td>Recognizes new perspectives about own cultural rules and biases (e.g., not looking for sameness; comfortable with the complexities that new perspectives offer.)</td>
<td>Identifies own cultural rules and biases (e.g. with a strong preference for those rules shared with own cultural group and sees the same in others.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge</strong></td>
<td><strong>Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.</td>
<td>Demonstrates adequate understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.</td>
<td>Demonstrates partial understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skills</strong></td>
<td><strong>Empathy</strong></td>
<td>Interprets intercultural experience from the perspectives of own and more than one worldview and demonstrates ability to act in a supportive manner that recognizes the feelings of another cultural group.</td>
<td>Recognizes intellectual and emotional dimensions of more than one worldview and sometimes uses more than one worldview in interactions.</td>
<td>Identifies components of other cultural perspectives but responds in all situations with own worldview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skills</strong></td>
<td><strong>Verbal and nonverbal communication</strong></td>
<td>Articulates a complex understanding of cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication (e.g., demonstrates understanding of the degree to which people use physical contact while communicating in different cultures or use direct/indirect and explicit/implicit meanings) and is able to skillfully negotiate a shared understanding based on those differences.</td>
<td>Recognizes and participates in cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication and begins to negotiate a shared understanding based on those differences.</td>
<td>Identifies some cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication and is aware that misunderstandings can occur based on those differences but is still unable to negotiate a shared understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Curiosity</strong></td>
<td>Asks complex questions about other cultures, seeks out and articulates answers to these questions that reflect multiple cultural perspectives.</td>
<td>Asks deeper questions about other cultures and seeks out answers to these questions.</td>
<td>Asks simple or surface questions about other cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Openness</strong></td>
<td>Initiates and develops interactions with culturally different others. Suspends judgment in valuing her/his interactions with culturally different others.</td>
<td>Begins to initiate and develop interactions with culturally different others. Begins to suspend judgment in valuing her/his interactions with culturally different others.</td>
<td>Expresses openness to most, if not all, interactions with culturally different others. Has difficulty suspending any judgment in her/his interactions with culturally different others, and is aware of own judgment and expresses a willingness to change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can by shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

Definition

Lifelong learning is “all purposeful learning activity, undertaken on an ongoing basis with the aim of improving knowledge, skills and competence”. An endeavor of higher education is to prepare students to be this type of learner by developing specific dispositions and skills described in this rubric while in school. (From The European Commission. 2000. Commission staff working paper: A memorandum on lifelong learning. Retrieved September 3, 2003, www.see-educoop.net/education_in/pdf/lifelong-oth-enl-t02.pdf.)

Framing Language

This rubric is designed to assess the skills and dispositions involved in lifelong learning, which are curiosity, transfer, independence, initiative, and reflection. Assignments that encourage students to reflect on how they incorporated their lifelong learning skills into their work samples or collections of work by applying above skills and dispositions will provide the means for assessing those criteria. Work samples or collections of work tell what is known or can be done by students, while reflections tell what students think or feel or perceive. Reflection provides the evaluator with a much better understanding of who students are because through reflection students share how they feel about or make sense of their learning experiences. Reflection allows analysis and interpretation of the work samples or collections of work for the reader. Reflection also allows exploration of alternatives, the consideration of future plans, and provides evidence related to students’ growth and development. Perhaps the best fit for this rubric are those assignments that prompt the integration of experience beyond the classroom.
### Definition

Lifelong learning is “all purposeful learning activity, undertaken on an ongoing basis with the aim of improving knowledge, skills and competence”. An endeavor of higher education is to prepare students to be this type of learner by developing specific dispositions and skills (described in this rubric) while in school. (From The European Commission, 2000. Commission staff working paper: A memorandum on lifelong learning. Retrieved September 3, 2003, from www.see-educoop.net/education_in/pdf/lifelong-oth-enl-t02.pdf.)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capstone</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curiosity</strong></td>
<td>Explores a topic in depth, yielding a rich awareness and/or little-known information indicating intense interest in the subject.</td>
<td>Explores a topic with some evidence of depth, providing occasional insight and/or information indicating mild interest in the subject.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>Completes required work, generates and pursues opportunities to expand knowledge, skills, and abilities.</td>
<td>Completes required work and identifies opportunities to expand knowledge, skills, and abilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>Educational interests and pursuits exist and flourish outside classroom requirements. Knowledge and/or experiences are pursued independently.</td>
<td>Beyond classroom requirements, pursues substantial, additional knowledge and/or actively pursues independent educational experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>Makes explicit references to previous learning and applies in an innovative (new and creative) way that knowledge and those skills to demonstrate comprehension and performance in novel situations.</td>
<td>Makes references to previous learning and shows evidence of applying that knowledge and those skills to demonstrate comprehension and performance in novel situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>Reviews prior learning (past experiences inside and outside of the classroom) in depth to reveal significantly changed perspectives about educational and life experiences, which provide foundation for expanded knowledge, growth, and maturity over time.</td>
<td>Reviews prior learning (past experiences inside and outside of the classroom) with some depth, revealing slightly clarified meanings or indicating a somewhat broader perspectives about educational or life events.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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

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

Definition

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

Framing Language

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

Glossary

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capstone</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td>Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable and is skillful and makes the content of the presentation cohesive.</td>
<td>Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable within the presentation.</td>
<td>Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is intermittently observable within the presentation.</td>
<td>Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is not observable within the presentation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language</strong></td>
<td>Language choices are imaginative, memorable, and compelling, and enhance the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.</td>
<td>Language choices are thoughtful and generally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.</td>
<td>Language choices are mundane and commonplace and partially support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.</td>
<td>Language choices are unclear and minimally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is not appropriate to audience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery</strong></td>
<td>Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation compelling, and speaker appears polished and confident.</td>
<td>Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation interesting, and speaker appears comfortable.</td>
<td>Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation understandable, and speaker appears tentative.</td>
<td>Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) detract from the understandability of the presentation, and speaker appears uncomfortable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting Material</strong></td>
<td>A variety of types of supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that significantly supports the presentation or establishes the presenter’s credibility/authority on the topic.</td>
<td>Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that generally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter’s credibility/authority on the topic.</td>
<td>Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that partially supports the presentation or establishes the presenter’s credibility/authority on the topic.</td>
<td>Insufficient supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make reference to information or analysis that minimally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter’s credibility/authority on the topic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Message</strong></td>
<td>Central message is compelling (precisely stated, appropriately repeated, memorable, and strongly supported.)</td>
<td>Central message is clear and consistent with the supporting material.</td>
<td>Central message is basically understandable but is not often repeated and is not memorable.</td>
<td>Central message can be deduced, but is not explicitly stated in the presentation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROBLEM SOLVING VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org

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

Definition

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

Framing Language

Problem-solving covers a wide range of activities that may vary significantly across disciplines. Activities that encompass problem-solving by students may involve problems that range from well-defined to ambiguous in a simulated or laboratory context, or in real-world settings. This rubric distills the common elements of most problem-solving contexts and is designed to function across all disciplines. It is broad-based enough to allow for individual differences among learners, yet is concise and descriptive in its scope to determine how well students have maximized their respective abilities to practice thinking through problems in order to reach solutions.

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

Glossary

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

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

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org

Definition

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Define Problem</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capstone</strong> <strong>4</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates the ability to construct a clear and insightful problem statement with evidence of all relevant contextual factors.</td>
<td>Begins to demonstrate the ability to construct a problem statement with evidence of most relevant contextual factors, but problem statement is superficial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Milestones</strong> <strong>3</strong></td>
<td>Identifies multiple approaches for solving the problem that apply within a specific context.</td>
<td>Identifies only a single approach for solving the problem that does apply within a specific context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark</strong> <strong>1</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates the ability to construct a problem statement with evidence of most relevant contextual factors, and problem statement is adequately detailed.</td>
<td>Demonstrates a limited ability in identifying a problem statement or related contextual factors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Identify Strategies**

Identifies multiple approaches for solving the problem that apply within a specific context.

**Propose Solutions/Hypotheses**

Proposes one or more solutions/hypotheses that indicates a deep comprehension of the problem. Solutions/hypotheses are sensitive to contextual factors as well as all of the following: ethical, logical, and cultural dimensions of the problem.

Proposes one or more solutions/hypotheses that indicates comprehension of the problem. Solutions/hypotheses are sensitive to contextual factors as well as the one of the following: ethical, logical, or cultural dimensions of the problem.

Proposes one solution/hypothesis that is "off the shelf" rather than individually designed to address the specific contextual factors of the problem.

Proposes a solution/hypothesis that is difficult to evaluate because it is vague or only indirectly addresses the problem statement.

**Evaluate Potential Solutions**

Evaluation of solutions is deep and elegant (for example, contains thorough and insightful explanation) and includes, deeply and thoroughly, all of the following: considers history of problem, reviews logic/reasoning, examines feasibility of solution, and weighs impacts of solution.

Evaluation of solutions is adequate (for example, contains thorough explanation) and includes the following: considers history of problem, reviews logic/reasoning, examines feasibility of solution, and weighs impacts of solution.

Evaluation of solutions is brief (for example, explanation lacks depth) and includes the following: considers history of problem, reviews logic/reasoning, examines feasibility of solution, and weighs impacts of solution.

Evaluation of solutions is superficial (for example, contains cursory, surface level explanation) and includes the following: considers history of problem, reviews logic/reasoning, examines feasibility of solution, and weighs impacts of solution.

**Implement Solution**

Implements the solution in a manner that addresses thoroughly and deeply multiple contextual factors of the problem.

Implements the solution in a manner that addresses multiple contextual factors of the problem in a surface manner.

Implements the solution in a manner that addresses the problem statement but ignores relevant contextual factors.

Implements the solution in a manner that does not directly address the problem statement.

**Evaluate Outcomes**

Reviews results relative to the problem defined with thorough, specific considerations of need for further work.

Reviews results relative to the problem defined with some consideration of need for further work.

Reviews results in terms of the problem defined with little, if any, consideration of need for further work.

Reviews results superficially in terms of the problem defined with no consideration of need for further work.
The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

Definition

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

Quantitative Literacy Across the Disciplines

Current trends in general education reform demonstrate that faculty are recognizing the steadily growing importance of Quantitative Literacy (QL) in an increasingly quantitative and data-dense world. AAC&U’s recent survey showed that concerns about QL skills are shared by employers, who recognize that many of today’s students will need a wide range of high level quantitative skills to complete their work responsibilities. Virtually all of today’s students, regardless of career choice, will need basic QL skills such as the ability to draw information from charts, graphs, and geometric figures, and the ability to accurately complete straightforward estimations and calculations.

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

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

This rubric provides for faculty a definition for QL and a rubric describing four levels of QL achievement which might be observed in work products within work samples or collections of work. Members of AAC&U’s rubric development team for QL hope that these materials will aid in the assessment of QL – but, equally important, we hope that they will help institutions and individuals in the effort to more thoroughly embed QL across the curriculum of colleges and universities.

Framing Language

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

Finally, QL skills can be applied to a wide array of problems of varying difficulty, confounding the use of this rubric. For example, the same student might demonstrate high levels of QL achievement when working on a simplistic problem and low levels of QL achievement when working on a very complex problem. Thus, to accurately assess a students QL achievement it may be necessary to measure QL achievement within the context of problem complexity, much as is done in diving competitions where two scores are given, one for the difficulty of the dive, and the other for the skill in accomplishing the dive. In this context, that would mean giving one score for the complexity of the problem and another score for the QL achievement in solving the problem.
**Definition**

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

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

**Capstone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretation</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ability to explain information presented in mathematical forms (e.g., equations, graphs, diagrams, tables, words)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Provides accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms. Makes appropriate inferences based on that information.</strong> For example, accurately explains the trend data shown in a graph and makes reasonable predictions regarding what the data suggest about future events.</td>
<td><strong>Provides somewhat accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms, but occasionally makes minor errors related to computations or units. For instance, accurately explains trend data shown in a graph, but may miscalculate the slope of the trend line.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ability to convert relevant information into various mathematical forms (e.g., equations, graphs, diagrams, tables, words)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Skillfully converts relevant information into an insightful mathematical portrayal in a way that contributes to a further or deeper understanding of the problem.</strong> For instance, accurately explains the trend data shown in a graph, but will frequently misinterpret the nature of that trend, perhaps by confusing positive and negative trends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Calculation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Calculations attempted are essentially all successful and sufficiently comprehensive to solve the problem. Calculations are also presented elegantly (clearly, concisely, etc.).</strong></td>
<td><strong>Calculations attempted are either unsuccessful or represent only a portion of the calculations required to comprehensively solve the problem.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application / Analysis</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ability to make judgments and draw appropriate conclusions based on the quantitative analysis of data, while recognizing the limits of this analysis</strong></td>
<td><strong>Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for deep and thoughtful judgments, drawing insightful, carefully qualified conclusions from this work.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assumptions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ability to make and evaluate important assumptions in estimation, modeling, and data analysis</strong></td>
<td><strong>Explicitly describes assumptions. Attempts to describe assumptions.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td><strong>Expressing quantitative evidence in support of the argument or purpose of the work (in terms of what evidence is used and how it is formatted, presented, and contextualized)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Uses quantitative information in connection with the argument or purpose of the work, though data may be presented in a less than completely effective format or some parts of the explication may be uneven.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Milestones**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretation</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provides accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms. For instance, accurately explains the trend data shown in a graph.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Provides somewhat accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms, but occasionally makes minor errors related to computations or units. For instance, accurately explains trend data shown in a graph, but may miscalculate the slope of the trend line.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attempts to explain information presented in mathematical forms, but draws incorrect conclusions about what the information means. For example, attempts to explain the trend data shown in a graph, but will frequently misinterpret the nature of that trend, perhaps by confusing positive and negative trends.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skillfully converts relevant information into an insightful mathematical portrayal in a way that contributes to a further or deeper understanding of the problem.</strong> For instance, accurately explains the trend data shown in a graph, but will frequently misinterpret the nature of that trend, perhaps by confusing positive and negative trends.</td>
<td><strong>Completes conversion of information but resulting mathematical portrayal is only partially appropriate or accurate.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Completes conversion of information but resulting mathematical portrayal is inappropriate or inaccurate.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Calculations attempted are essentially all successful and sufficiently comprehensive to solve the problem. Calculations are also presented elegantly (clearly, concisely, etc.).</strong></td>
<td><strong>Calculations attempted are either unsuccessful or represent only a portion of the calculations required to comprehensively solve the problem.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Calculations are attempted but are both unsuccessful and not comprehensive.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for deep and thoughtful judgments, drawing insightful, carefully qualified conclusions from this work.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for competent judgments, drawing reasonable and appropriately qualified conclusions from this work.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for tentative, basic judgments, although is hesitant or uncertain about drawing conclusions from this work.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explicitly describes assumptions. Attempts to describe assumptions.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Explicitly describes assumptions.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Explicitly describes assumptions.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses quantitative information in connection with the argument or purpose of the work, though data may be presented in a less than completely effective format or some parts of the explication may be uneven.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Uses quantitative information, but does not effectively connect it to the argument or purpose of the work.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Presents an argument for which quantitative evidence is pertinent, but does not provide adequate explicit numerical support. (May use quasi-quantitative words such as “many,” “few,” “increasing,” “small,” and the like in place of actual quantities.)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Definition

Reading is "the process of simultaneously extracting and constructing meaning through interaction and involvement with written language" (Snow et al., 2002). (From www.rand.org/pubs/research_briefs/RB8021/index.html)

Framing Language

To paraphrase Phaedrus, texts do not explain, nor answer questions about, themselves. They must be located, approached, decoded, comprehended, analyzed, interpreted, and discussed, especially complex academic texts used in college and university classrooms for purposes of learning. Historically, college professors have not considered the teaching of reading necessary other than as a "basic skill" in which students may require "remediation." They have assumed that students come with the ability to read and have placed responsibility for its absence on teachers in elementary and secondary schools. This absence of reading instruction in higher education must, can, and will change, and this rubric marks a direction for this change. Why the change? Even the strongest, most experienced readers making the transition from high school to college have not learned what they need to know and do to make sense of texts in the context of professional and academic scholarship to say nothing about readers who are either not as strong or as experienced. Also, readers mature and develop their repertoire of reading performances naturally during the undergraduate years and beyond as a consequence of meeting textual challenges. This rubric provides some initial steps toward finding ways to measure undergraduate students' progress along the continuum. Our intention in creating this rubric is to support and promote the teaching of undergraduates as readers to take on increasingly higher levels of concerns with texts and to read as one of "those who comprehend." Readers, as they move beyond their undergraduate experiences, should be motivated to approach texts and respond to them with a reflective level of curiosity and the ability to apply aspects of the texts they approach to a variety of aspects in their lives. This rubric provides the framework for evaluating both students' developing relationship to texts and their relative success with the range of texts their coursework introduces them to. It is likely that users of this rubric will detect that the cell boundaries are permeable, and the criteria of the rubric are to a degree, interrelated.

Glossary

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

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

- **Comprehension:** The extent to which a reader "gets" the text, both literally and figuratively. Accomplished and sophisticated readers will have moved from being able to "get" the meaning of the language of the text to being able to "get" the implications of the text, and the counterarguments one might suggest in response to it. A helpful and accessible discussion of comprehension is found in Chapter 2 of the RAND report, Reading for Understanding: www.rand.org/pubs/monograph_reports/MR1465/MR1465_ch2.pdf.

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

- **Genre:** A particular kind of "text" defined by a set of disciplinary conventions or agreements learned through participation in academic discourse. Genre governs what texts can be about, how they are structured, what to expect from them, what can be done with them, how to use them.

- **Interpretation:** Determining or construing the meaning of a text or part of a text in a particular way based on textual and contextual information.

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

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

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

- **Relationship to text:** The set of expectations and intentions a reader brings to a particular text or set of texts.

- **Searches intentionally for relationships:** An active and highly-aware quality of thinking closely related to inquiry and research.

- **Takes texts apart:** Discerns the level of importance or abstraction of textual elements and sees big and small pieces as parts of the whole meaning (compare to Analysis above).

- **Metacognition:** This is not a word that appears explicitly anywhere in the rubric, but it is implicit in a number of the criteria it raises, e.g., What might our country be like if the Civil War had not happened? How would Hamlet be different if Hamlet had simply killed the King? Metacognition, (a term typically attributed to the cognitive psychologist J.H. Flavell) applied to reading refers to the awareness, deliberateness, and reflectivity defining the activities and strategies that readers must control in order to work their way effectively through different sorts of texts, from lab reports to sonnets, from math texts to historical narratives, or from grants applications to graphic novels, for example. Metacognition refers here as well to an accomplished reader's ability to consider the ethos reflected in any such text, to know that one is present and should be considered in any use of, or response to, a text.
## Reading VALUE Rubric

**Definition**

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capstone</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehension</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes possible implications of the text for contexts, perspectives, or issues beyond the assigned task within the classroom or beyond the author’s explicit message (e.g., might recognize broader issues at play, or might pose challenges to the author’s message and presentation).</td>
<td>Uses the text, general background knowledge, and/or specific knowledge of the author’s context to draw more complex inferences about the author’s message and attitude.</td>
<td>Evaluates how textual features (e.g., sentence and paragraph structure or tone) contribute to the author’s message; draws basic inferences about context and purpose of text.</td>
<td>Apprehends vocabulary appropriately to paraphrase or summarize the information the text communicates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genres</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses ability to identify texts within and across genres, monitoring and adjusting reading strategies and expectations based on generic nuances of particular texts.</td>
<td>Articulates distinctions among genres and their characteristic conventions.</td>
<td>Reflects on reading experiences across a variety of genres, reading both with and against the grain experimentally and intentionally.</td>
<td>Applies tacit genre knowledge to a variety of classroom reading assignments in productive, if unreflective, ways.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship to Text</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Making meanings with texts in their contexts</strong></td>
<td>Evaluates texts for scholarly significance and relevance within and across the various disciplines, evaluating them according to their contributions and consequences.</td>
<td>Uses texts in the context of scholarship to develop a foundation of disciplinary knowledge and to raise and explore important questions.</td>
<td>Engages texts with the intention and expectation of building topical and world knowledge.</td>
<td>Approaches texts in the context of assignments with the intention and expectation of finding right answers and learning facts and concepts to display for credit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interacting with texts in parts and as wholes</strong></td>
<td>Evaluates strategies for relating ideas, text structure, or other textual features in order to build knowledge or insight within and across texts and disciplines.</td>
<td>Identifies relations among ideas, text structure, or other textual features, to evaluate how they support an advanced understanding of the text as a whole.</td>
<td>Recognizes relations among parts or aspects of a text, such as effective or ineffective arguments or literary features, in considering how these contribute to a basic understanding of the text as a whole.</td>
<td>Identifies aspects of a text (e.g., content, structure, or relations among ideas) as needed to respond to questions posed in assigned tasks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Making sense with texts as blueprints for meaning</strong></td>
<td>Provides evidence not only that s/he can read by using an appropriate epistemological lens but that s/he can also engage in reading as part of a continuing dialogue within and beyond a discipline or a community of readers.</td>
<td>Articulates an understanding of the multiple ways of reading and the range of interpretive strategies particular to one's discipline(s) or in a given community of readers.</td>
<td>Demonstrates that s/he can read purposefully, choosing among interpretive strategies depending on the purpose of the reading.</td>
<td>Can identify purpose(s) for reading, relying on an external authority such as an instructor for clarification of the task.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reader's Voice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participating in academic discourse about texts</strong></td>
<td>Discusses texts with an independent intellectual and ethical disposition so as to further or maintain disciplinary conversations.</td>
<td>Elaborates on the texts (through interpretation or questioning) so as to deepen or enhance an ongoing discussion.</td>
<td>Discusses texts in structured conversations (such as in a classroom) in ways that contribute to a basic, shared understanding of the text.</td>
<td>Comments about texts in ways that preserve the author's meanings and link them to the assignment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

**Definition**

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

**Framing Language**

Students participate on many different teams, in many different settings. For example, a given student may work on separate teams to complete a lab assignment, give an oral presentation, or complete a community service project. Furthermore, the people the student works with are likely to be different in each of these different teams. As a result, it is assumed that a work sample or collection of work that demonstrates a student's teamwork skills could include a diverse range of inputs. This rubric is designed to function across all of these different settings.

Two characteristics define the ways in which this rubric is to be used. First, the rubric is meant to assess the teamwork of an individual student, not the team as a whole. Therefore, it is possible for a student to receive high ratings, even if the team as a whole is rather flawed. Similarly, a student could receive low ratings, even if the team as a whole works fairly well. Second, this rubric is designed to measure the quality of a process, rather than the quality of an end product. As a result, work samples or collections of work will need to include some evidence of the individual's interactions within the team. The final product of the team's work (e.g., a written lab report) is insufficient, as it does not provide insight into the functioning of the team.

It is recommended that work samples or collections of work for this outcome come from one (or more) of the following three sources: (1) students' own reflections about their contribution to a team's functioning; (2) evaluation or feedback from fellow team members about students' contribution to the team's functioning; or (3) the evaluation of an outside observer regarding students' contributions to a team's functioning. These three sources differ considerably in the resource demands they place on an institution. It is recommended that institutions using this rubric consider carefully the resources they are able to allocate to the assessment of teamwork and choose a means of compiling work samples or collections of work that best suits their priorities, needs, and abilities.
## Teamwork VALUE Rubric

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org

**Definition**

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Capstone</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contributes to Team Meetings</strong></td>
<td>Helps the team move forward by articulating the merits of alternative ideas or proposals.</td>
<td>Offers alternative solutions or courses of action that build on the ideas of others.</td>
<td>Offers new suggestions to advance the work of the group.</td>
<td>Shares ideas but does not advance the work of the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitates the Contributions of Team Members</strong></td>
<td>Engages team members in ways that facilitate their contributions to meetings by both constructively building upon or synthesizing the contributions of others as well as noticing when someone is not participating and inviting them to engage.</td>
<td>Engages team members in ways that facilitate their contributions to meetings by constructively building upon or synthesizing the contributions of others.</td>
<td>Engages team members in ways that facilitate their contributions to meetings by restating the views of other team members and/or asking questions for clarification.</td>
<td>Engages team members by taking turns and listening to others without interrupting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Contributions Outside of Team Meetings</strong></td>
<td>Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished is thorough, comprehensive, and advances the project. Proactively helps other team members complete their assigned tasks to a similar level of excellence.</td>
<td>Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished is thorough, comprehensive, and advances the project.</td>
<td>Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished advances the project.</td>
<td>Completes all assigned tasks by deadline.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fosters Constructive Team Climate</strong></td>
<td>Supports a constructive team climate by doing all of the following:</td>
<td>Supports a constructive team climate by doing any three of the following:</td>
<td>Supports a constructive team climate by doing any two of the following:</td>
<td>Supports a constructive team climate by doing any one of the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication.</td>
<td>Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication.</td>
<td>Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication.</td>
<td>Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work.</td>
<td>• Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work.</td>
<td>• Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work.</td>
<td>• Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it.</td>
<td>• Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it.</td>
<td>• Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it.</td>
<td>• Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members.</td>
<td>• Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members.</td>
<td>• Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members.</td>
<td>• Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responds to Conflict</strong></td>
<td>Addresses destructive conflict directly and constructively, helping to manage/resolve it in a way that strengthens overall team cohesiveness and future effectiveness.</td>
<td>Identifies and acknowledges conflict and stays engaged with it.</td>
<td>Redirecting focus toward common ground, toward task at hand (away from conflict).</td>
<td>Passively accepts alternate viewpoints/ideas/opinions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Written Communication VALUE Rubric

for more information, please contact value@acac.org

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

Definition

Written communication is the development and expression of ideas in writing. Written communication involves learning to work in many genres and styles. It can involve working with many different writing technologies, and mixing texts, data, and images. Written communication abilities develop through iterative experiences across the curriculum.

Framing Language

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

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

Evaluators using this rubric must have information about the assignments or purposes for writing guiding writers' work. Also recommended is including reflective work samples of collections of work that address such questions as: What decisions did the writer make about audience, purpose, and genre as s/he compiled the work in the portfolio? How are those choices evident in the writing -- in the content, organization and structure, reasoning, evidence, mechanical and surface conventions, and citational systems used in the writing? This will enable evaluators to have a clear sense of how writers understand the assignments and take it into consideration as they evaluate.

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

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

Glossary

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

- Content Development: The ways in which the text explores and represents its topic in relation to its audience and purpose.
- Context of and purpose for writing: The context of writing is the situation surrounding a text: who is reading it? who is writing it? Under what circumstances will the text be shared or circulated? What social or political factors might affect how the text is composed or interpreted? The purpose for writing is the writer's intended effect on an audience. Writers might want to persuade or inform; they might want to report or summarize information; they might want to work through complexity or confusion; they might want to argue with other writers, or with themselves; they might want to convey urgency or amuse; they might write for themselves or for an assignment or to remember.
- Disciplinary conventions: Formal and informal rules that constitute what is seen generally as appropriate within different academic fields, e.g. introductory strategies, use of passive voice or first person point of view, expectations for thesis or hypothesis, expectations for kinds of evidence and support that are appropriate to the task at hand, use of primary and secondary sources to provide evidence and support arguments and to document critical perspectives on the topic. Writers will incorporate sources according to disciplinary and genre conventions, according to the writer's purpose for the text. Through increasingly sophisticated use of sources, writers develop an ability to differentiate between their own ideas and the ideas of others, credit and build upon work already accomplished in the field or issue they are addressing, and provide meaningful examples to readers.
- Evidence: Source material that is used to extend, in purposeful ways, writers' ideas in a text.
- Genre conventions: Formal and informal rules for particular kinds of texts and/or media that guide formatting, organization, and stylistic choices, e.g. lab reports, academic papers, poetry, webpages, or personal essays.
- Sources: Texts (written, oral, behavioral, visual, or other) that writers draw on as they work for a variety of purposes -- to extend, argue with, develop, define, or shape their ideas, for example.
## Written Communication VALUE Rubric

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org

### Definition
Written communication is the development and expression of ideas in writing. Written communication involves learning to work in many genres and styles. It can involve working with many different writing technologies, and mixing texts, data, and images. Written communication abilities develop through iterative experiences across the curriculum.

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

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

### Context of and Purpose for Writing
Includes considerations of audience, purpose, and the circumstances surrounding the writing task(s).

- **Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.**
- **Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus on the assigned task(s) (e.g., the task aligns with audience, purpose, and context).**
- **Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience’s perceptions and assumptions).**
- **Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).**

### Content Development
Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work.

- **Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work.**
- **Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work.**
- **Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work.**

### Genre and Disciplinary Conventions
Formal and informal rules inherent in the expectations for writing in particular forms and/or academic fields (please see glossary).

- **Demonstrates detailed attention to and successful execution of a wide range of conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) including organization, content, presentation, formatting, and stylistic choices.**
- **Demonstrates consistent use of important conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s), including organization, content, presentation, and stylistic choices.**
- **Follows expectations appropriate to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) for basic organization, content, and presentation.**
- **Attempts to use a consistent system for basic organization and presentation.**

### Sources and Evidence
Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing.

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

### Control of Syntax and Mechanics
Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free.

- **Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the portfolio has few errors.**
- **Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors.**
- **Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.**