

| | Page |
|---|------|
| 1. THE UK CORE – GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS | |
| a. Intellectual Inquiry – The Nature of Inquiry in the Humanities | |
| i. Course Template | 3 |
| ii. Rubric | 5 |
| b. Citizenship – Community, Culture and Citizenship in the USA | |
| i. Course Template | 7 |
| ii. Rubric | 8 |
| 2. AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES | |
| a. Written Communication Value Rubric | 10 |
| b. Reading Value Rubric | 12 |
| c. Oral Communication Value Rubric | 14 |
| d. Civic Engagement Value Rubric | 16 |

Overview of Rubrics:

The documents here are included solely for **reference**. I rely heavily on rubrics for most of my assessments. The templates and rubrics have played an outsized role in my own pedagogy.

I have concentrated much of my teaching on first- and second-year courses, and a number of these fulfill a **University of Kentucky CORE** requirement. For instance, PHI100 Introduction to Philosophy fulfills an Intellectual Inquiry requirement; and PHI205 Food Ethics fulfills the Citizenship requirement. The design of any CORE class is prescribed to some degree by the relevant UK Core Template and Rubric. Hence, I include these CORE documents in this dossier.

As I have noted elsewhere, I have worked over the years to refine and simplify my pedagogy. My classes are outcomes-based. Indeed, three outcomes particularly define my teaching. Of course, students in higher level classes are expected to achieve higher-level results. Nevertheless, there are certain skills which define my work in the classroom as a philosopher. In general, then, at the conclusion of my classes, students should be able to:

1. write clearly, precisely, and elegantly,
2. read college-level texts with a high degree of comprehension, and
3. verbally express themselves coherently and fluidly.

Additionally, my Food Ethics class fulfills the Citizenship requirement imposed on all UK students. Consequently, students who take this class should be able to:

4. demonstrate an understanding of historical, societal, and cultural difference, and
5. demonstrated how these differences influence issues of social justice and/or civic responsibility.

Finally, when designing my **assessment rubrics**, I rely on the AACU Value Rubrics as a guide. Those AACU rubrics included here are the rubrics most fundamental to my work. Consequently, these rubrics have had a significant role in the evaluative aspect of my work as a teacher.

Intellectual Inquiry – Humanities

The Humanities are united in their reflection upon the human condition as embodied in works of art and literature (including folklore, popular culture, film and digital media), philosophical and religious contemplation and argumentation, language systems, and historical narratives and the activities and events they relate. The principal activities of humanists and, therefore, the principal skills to be inculcated in students relate to *interpretation* and *analysis*, and the *evaluation* of competing interpretations of the same or similar texts and phenomena. In a course fulfilling the Humanities Gen Ed requirement students should learn to interpret, evaluate and analyze such creations of the human intellect.

Students will demonstrate the ability to construct their own artistic, literary, philosophical, religious, linguistic, and historical interpretations according to the standards of the discipline. It is hoped that students learn to recognize (a) the validity of different points of view – whether these points of view devolve from differences of class, race, gender, nationality or even historical period – and (b) a degree of tolerance and mistrust of dogmatism. Further it is hoped that students will be able to recognize some aspects of human life that might be considered eternal and constant and distinguish these aspects from those which are contingent products of history and culture.

- 1) Demonstrate the ability to present and critically evaluate competing interpretations through analysis and argumentation in writing and orally.
- 2) Demonstrate the ability to distinguish different artistic, literary, philosophical, religious, linguistic, and historical schools and periods according to the varying approaches and viewpoints characterized therein.
- 3) Demonstrate the ability to identify the values and presuppositions that underlie the world-views of different cultures and different peoples over time as well as one's own culture. Students will therefore analyze and interpret at least one of the following: works of art, literature, folklore, film, philosophy and religion, language systems or historical narratives (or the primary sources of historical research).
- 4) Demonstrate disciplinary literacy (vocabulary, concepts, methodology) in written work, oral presentations and in classroom discussions.
- 5) Demonstrate the ability to conduct a sustained piece of analysis of some work of art, literature, folklore (or popular culture), film (or other digital media), philosophy, religion, language system, or historical event or existing historical narrative that makes use of logical argument, coherent theses, and evidence of that discipline, with use of library sources when applicable. The student's analysis should demonstrate appropriate information literacy in a particular discipline of the humanities, which, depending on the nature of the assignment might include, for example:

- posing questions that shape an inquiry and identify sources necessary for this purpose
- getting and checking facts
- getting overviews, opposing views, background information, context
- recognizing and finding primary sources and distinguish primary from secondary sources
- identifying scholarly publications (monographs, articles, essays)
 - locating them (library stacks, Internet, other libraries)
 - citing them (MLA, Chicago styles)
- assessing the value of sources

UK Core Intellectual Inquiry in the Humanities Rubric

UK Core Learning Outcome 1: *Students will demonstrate an understanding of and ability to employ the processes of intellectual inquiry.*

Outcomes and Assessment Framework: Students will: (A) be able to identify multiple dimensions of a good question; determine when additional information is needed, find credible information efficiently using a variety of reference sources, and judge the quality of information as informed by rigorously developed evidence; (B) explore multiple and complex answers to questions/issues/problems within and across the four broad knowledge areas: arts and creativity, humanities, social and behavioral sciences, and natural/ physical/mathematical sciences; (C) evaluate theses and conclusions in light of credible evidence; (D) explore the ethical implications of differing approaches, methodologies or conclusions; and (E) develop potential solutions to problems based on sound evidence and reasoning.

| | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Does Not Meet Expectations |
|---|--|---|--|
| Ability to identify multiple dimensions of a good question | Demonstrates thorough intellectual inquiry and fine discrimination in analysis or critical evaluation of texts and/or arguments. Demonstrates an understanding of the complexity of the question or problem under consideration. | Demonstrates intellectual inquiry in analysis or critical evaluation of texts and/or arguments. Understands partially the complexity of the question or problem under consideration. | To a very limited extent, incorporates inquiry in analysis or critical evaluation of texts and/or arguments. Does not understand the complexity of the question or problem under consideration at all. |
| Ability to explore multiple and complex answers to questions, issues or problems within the Humanities | Skillfully explores and evaluates the complexity of key questions, problems, and arguments in relation to texts or narratives. Explores different points of view on an argument or question. Written with fluency and avoids oversimplification. | Demonstrates complexity of key questions, problems, and arguments in relation to texts or narratives, but misses key points. Explores at least one point of view. Some problems with writing. | Does not explore the complexity of key questions, problems, and arguments in relation to texts or narratives. Serious problems with writing. |

| | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Does Not Meet Expectations |
|--|---|---|---|
| Ability to evaluate theses and conclusions in light of credible evidence | Using appropriate evidence and appropriate disciplinary literacy, critically evaluates claims, arguments and conclusions pertaining to the subject and texts under consideration. Well-argued, and (where applicable) reference sources used. | Using some evidence and some appropriate disciplinary literacy, evaluates some claims, arguments and conclusions pertaining to the subject and texts under consideration. Some problems with argumentation and/or use of reference sources. | Using the minimum of evidence, tries to evaluate some claims, arguments and/or conclusions. Minimum disciplinary literacy. Major problems with argumentation and references sources. |
| Ability to explore the implications of differing approaches, methodologies or conclusions | Critically evaluates texts/arguments by using at least one approach, methodology, or interpretive model. Shows awareness of other competing interpretations and of their possible implications. | Evaluates texts/arguments by using at least one approach or interpretive model, but there are problems with argumentation/analysis. Does not recognize other competing interpretations and implications. | Attempts to evaluate by using at least one approach, but there are serious problems with argumentation/analysis. Demonstrates no awareness of other interpretations. |
| Develop potential solutions to problems based on sound evidence and reasoning | In the course of written analysis of a text or texts, proposes coherent answers to problems or questions, using clear, logical argumentation supported by solid evidence, such as illustrations, examples and/or quotations | In the course of written analysis of a text or texts, proposes answers to problems or questions, but there are flaws in the argumentation, and gaps in the evidence | Attempts to offer written analysis of a text or texts, but does not propose any answers to problems or questions. There are serious flaws in the argumentation, and major gaps in the evidence. |

**Community, Culture and
Citizenship in a Diverse U.S. Society**

Courses in this area lay the foundation for effective and responsible participation in a diverse society by preparing students to make informed choices in the complex or unpredictable cultural contexts that can arise in U.S. communities. These courses may be disciplinary or interdisciplinary and should engage students in interactive learning techniques such as debates, digital documentaries, guided discussions, service-learning projects, and simulations, as well as develop their information literacy. Students completing this requirement will achieve the following learning outcomes:

- A. Demonstrate an understanding of historical, societal, and cultural differences, such as those arising from race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, language, nationality, religion, political and ethical perspectives, and socioeconomic class.
- B. Demonstrate a basic understanding of how these differences influence issues of social justice and/or civic responsibility.
- C. Demonstrate an understanding of historical, societal, and cultural contexts relevant to the subject matter of the course.
- D. Demonstrate an understanding of at least two of the following, as they pertain to the subject matter of the course:
 - a. Societal, cultural, and institutional change over time
 - b. Civic engagement
 - c. Regional, national, or cross-national comparisons
 - d. Power and resistance
- E. Participate in at least two assessable individual or group projects that focus on personal and/or collective decision-making. The projects should require students to identify and evaluate conflicts, compromises, and/or ethical dilemmas. These projects shall demonstrate a basic understanding of effective and responsible participation in a diverse society.

UK Core Citizenship Rubric

UK Core Learning Outcome 4: *Students will demonstrate an understanding of the complexities of citizenship and the process for making informed choices as engaged citizens in a diverse, multilingual world.*

Outcomes and Assessment Framework: Students will (A) recognize historical and cultural differences arising from issues such as race, ethnicity, age, gender, sexuality, language, nationality, religion, political and ethical perspectives, and socioeconomic class; students will (B) demonstrate a basic understanding of how these differences influence issues of social justice and/or civic responsibility, both within the U.S. and globally; students will (C) recognize and evaluate the ethical dilemmas, conflicts, and trade-offs involved in personal and collective decision making. Topics will (D) include at least 2 of the following: societal and institutional change over time; civic engagement; cross-national/comparative issues; power and resistance.

| | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Does Not Meet Expectations |
|--|--|--|--|
| Identifies an issue or problem | Demonstrates the ability to construct a clear and insightful problem statement with evidence of all relevant contextual factors. | Demonstrates the ability to construct a problem statement with evidence of most relevant contextual factors, but problem statement is superficial. | Demonstrates a limited ability in identifying a problem statement or related contextual factors. |
| Provides background information about the problem (historical, cultural, social justice, or civic responsibility) | Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of the complexity of elements of the problem in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs & practices. | Demonstrates partial understanding of the complexity of elements of the problem in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs & practices. | Demonstrates surface understanding of the complexity of elements of the problem in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs & practices. |
| Presents multiple perspectives | Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of and can reasonably defend against the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/concepts and the student's defense is adequate and effective. | Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/concepts but does not respond to them (and ultimately objections, assumptions and implications are compartmentalized by student and do not affect student's position.) | Student states a position but cannot state the objections to and assumptions and limitations of the different perspectives/concepts. |

| | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Does Not Meet Expectations |
|---|---|---|--|
| Proposes solutions/ hypotheses | Proposes one or more solutions/hypotheses that indicate a deep comprehension of the problem. Solution/hypotheses are sensitive to contextual factors. | Proposes one or more solutions/ hypotheses that indicate partial comprehension of the problem. Solutions/ hypotheses are sensitive to contextual factors. | Proposes a solution/hypothesis that is difficult to evaluate because it is vague or only indirectly addresses the problem statement. |
| Argument is evidence-based and logical | Synthesizes in depth information from relevant sources representing various points of view/approaches. | Presents information from relevant sources representing limited points of view/approaches. | Presents information from irrelevant sources representing limited points of view/approaches. |

WRITTEN COMMUNICATION VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org



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

Definition

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

Framing Language

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

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

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

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

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

Glossary

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

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

WRITTEN COMMUNICATION VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org



Definition

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

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

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

READING 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

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)

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 contribute 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 that the language of the text provides to being able to "get" the implications of the text, the questions it raises, and the counterarguments one might suggest in response to it. A helpful and accessible discussion of 'comprehension' is found in Chapter 2 of the RAND report, Reading for Understanding: www.rand.org/pubs/monograph_reports/MR1465/MR1465.ch2.pdf.
- **Epistemological lens:** The knowledge framework a reader develops in a specific discipline as s/he moves through an academic major (e.g., essays, textbook chapters, literary works, journal articles, lab reports, grant proposals, lectures, blogs, webpages, or literature reviews, for example). The depth and breadth of this knowledge provides the foundation for independent and self-regulated responses to the range of texts in any discipline or field that students will encounter.
- **Genre:** A particular kind of "text" defined by a set of disciplinary conventions or agreements learned through participation in academic discourse. Genre governs what texts can be about, how they are structured, what to expect from them, 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 descriptors, and is certainly a term that we find frequently in discussions of successful and rich learning. Metacognition, (a term typically attributed to the cognitive psychologist J.H. Flavell) applied to reading refers to the awareness, deliberateness, and reflexivity defining the activities and strategies that readers must control in order to work their ways effectively through different sorts of texts, from lab reports to sonnets, from math texts to historical narratives, or from grant 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.

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org



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.

| | Capstone 4 | Milestones 3 2 | | Benchmark 1 |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| Comprehension | Recognizes possible implications of the text for contexts, perspectives, or issues beyond the assigned task within the classroom or beyond the author's explicit message (e.g., might recognize broader issues at play, or might pose challenges to the author's message and presentation). | Uses the text, general background knowledge, and/or specific knowledge of the author's context to draw more complex inferences about the author's message and attitude. | Evaluates how textual features (e.g., sentence and paragraph structure or tone) contribute to the author's message; draws basic inferences about context and purpose of text. | Apprehends vocabulary appropriately to paraphrase or summarize the information the text communicates. |
| Genres | Uses ability to identify texts within and across genres, monitoring and adjusting reading strategies and expectations based on generic nuances of particular texts. | Articulates distinctions among genres and their characteristic conventions. | Reflects on reading experiences across a variety of genres, reading both with and against the grain experimentally and intentionally. | Applies tacit genre knowledge to a variety of classroom reading assignments in productive, if unreflective, ways. |
| Relationship to Text <i>Making meanings with texts in their contexts</i> | Evaluates texts for scholarly significance and relevance within and across the various disciplines, evaluating them according to their contributions and consequences. | Uses texts in the context of scholarship to develop a foundation of disciplinary knowledge and to raise and explore important questions. | Engages texts with the intention and expectation of building topical and world knowledge. | Approaches texts in the context of assignments with the intention and expectation of finding right answers and learning facts and concepts to display for credit. |
| Analysis <i>Interacting with texts in parts and as wholes</i> | Evaluates strategies for relating ideas, text structure, or other textual features in order to build knowledge or insight within and across texts and disciplines. | Identifies relations among ideas, text structure, or other textual features, to evaluate how they support an advanced understanding of the text as a whole. | Recognizes relations among parts or aspects of a text, such as effective or ineffective arguments or literary features, in considering how these contribute to a basic understanding of the text as a whole. | Identifies aspects of a text (e.g., content, structure, or relations among ideas) as needed to respond to questions posed in assigned tasks. |
| Interpretation <i>Making sense with texts as blueprints for meaning</i> | Provides evidence not only that s/he can read by using an appropriate epistemological lens but that s/he can also engage in reading as part of a continuing dialogue within and beyond a discipline or a community of readers. | Articulates an understanding of the multiple ways of reading and the range of interpretive strategies particular to one's discipline(s) or in a given community of readers. | Demonstrates that s/he can read purposefully, choosing among interpretive strategies depending on the purpose of the reading. | Can identify purpose(s) for reading, relying on an external authority such as an instructor for clarification of the task. |
| Reader's Voice <i>Participating in academic discourse about texts</i> | Discusses texts with an independent intellectual and ethical disposition so as to further or maintain disciplinary conversations. | Elaborates on the texts (through interpretation or questioning) so as to deepen or enhance an ongoing discussion. | Discusses texts in structured conversations (such as in a classroom) in ways that contribute to a basic, shared understanding of the text. | Comments about texts in ways that preserve the author's meanings and link them to the assignment. |

ORAL COMMUNICATION VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org



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

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.

| | Capstone 4 | Milestones | | Benchmark 1 |
|----------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| | | 3 | 2 | |
| Organization | 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. | Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable within the presentation. | Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is intermittently observable within the presentation. | Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is not observable within the presentation. |
| Language | Language choices are imaginative, memorable, and compelling, and enhance the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience. | Language choices are thoughtful and generally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience. | Language choices are mundane and commonplace and partially support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience. | Language choices are unclear and minimally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is not appropriate to audience. |
| Delivery | Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation compelling, and speaker appears polished and confident. | Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation interesting, and speaker appears comfortable. | Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation understandable, and speaker appears tentative. | Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) detract from the understandability of the presentation, and speaker appears uncomfortable. |
| Supporting Material | 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. | 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. | 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. | 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. |
| Central Message | Central message is compelling (precisely stated, appropriately repeated, memorable, and strongly supported.) | Central message is clear and consistent with the supporting material. | Central message is basically understandable but is not often repeated and is not memorable. | Central message can be deduced, but is not explicitly stated in the presentation. |

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:

- ⑩ 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.
- ⑩ The student researches, organizes, and carries out a deliberative democracy forum on a particular issue, one that includes multiple perspectives on that issue and how best to make positive change through various courses of public action. As a result, other students, faculty, and community members are engaged to take action on an issue.
- ⑩ 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.
- ⑩ 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 life, which is devoted to the pursuit of private and 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

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org



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.

| | Capstone 4 | Milestones 3 2 | | Benchmark 1 |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| Diversity of Communities and Cultures | 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. | 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. | 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. | Expresses attitudes and beliefs as an individual, from a one-sided view. Is indifferent or resistant to what can be learned from diversity of communities and cultures. |
| Analysis of Knowledge | 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. | 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. | Begins to connect knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/ field/ discipline to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government. | Begins to identify knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/ field/ discipline that is relevant to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government. |
| Civic Identity and Commitment | Provides evidence of experience in civic-engagement activities and describes what she/he has learned about her or himself as it relates to a reinforced and clarified sense of civic identity and continued commitment to public action. | Provides evidence of experience in civic-engagement activities and describes what she/he has learned about her or himself as it relates to a growing sense of civic identity and commitment. | Evidence suggests involvement in civic-engagement activities is generated from expectations or course requirements rather than from a sense of civic identity. | Provides little evidence of her/his experience in civic-engagement activities and does not connect experiences to civic identity. |
| Civic Communication | Tailors communication strategies to effectively express, listen, and adapt to others to establish relationships to further civic action | Effectively communicates in civic context, showing ability to do all of the following: express, listen, and adapt ideas and messages based on others' perspectives. | 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. | Communicates in civic context, showing ability to do one of the following: express, listen, and adapt ideas and messages based on others' perspectives. |
| Civic Action and Reflection | Demonstrates independent experience and <i>shows initiative in team leadership</i> of complex or multiple civic engagement activities, accompanied by reflective insights or analysis about the aims and accomplishments of one's actions. | Demonstrates independent experience and <i>team leadership of</i> civic action, with reflective insights or analysis about the aims and accomplishments of one's actions. | Has clearly <i>participated</i> in civically focused actions and begins to reflect or describe how these actions may benefit individual(s) or communities. | Has <i>experimented</i> with some civic activities but shows little internalized understanding of their aims or effects and little commitment to future action. |
| Civic Contexts/Structures | Demonstrates ability and commitment to <i>collaboratively work across and within</i> community contexts and structures <i>to achieve a civic aim</i> . | Demonstrates ability and commitment to work actively <i>within</i> community contexts and structures <i>to achieve a civic aim</i> . | Demonstrates experience identifying intentional ways to <i>participate in</i> civic contexts and structures. | Experiments with civic contexts and structures, <i>tries out a few to see what fits</i> . |