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City Tech General Education Workbook

This workbook was created to facilitate General Education assessment at City Tech. The workbook includes several tools – the College Council list of General Education competencies, AAC&U VALUE rubrics, City Tech-designed rubrics, and several worksheets to assist faculty with content validity – for those participating in assessment. Additionally, the workbook has a timeline for City Tech’s General Education assessment through 2022. Detailed timelines noting important dates for the upcoming academic year are also included. The workbook is organized by General Education competency, thus all the documents for each Gen Ed competency (AAC&U Rubric, worksheets, and detailed timeline) are grouped together for easy reference. We hope that you find the contents of this workbook useful.

The AIR Team
# City Tech General Education

## Important General Education Learning Goals—adopted by College Council March 2013

New York City College of Technology aspires to be a living laboratory where General Education

- is represented by a mutually accepted core of knowledge, skills, and values that permeate all courses, not only in the liberal arts and sciences, but also across the majors.
- makes rich use of the physical, historical, economic, and cultural aspects of our location in a diverse urban community
- stresses active learning and creative problem solving
- encourages engagement in personal, professional, and civic communities
- integrates theory/knowledge and hands-on application
- maintains a global focus/perspective
- is communications intensive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KNOWLEDGE</th>
<th>Breadth of knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop knowledge from a range of disciplinary perspectives, and develop the ability to deepen and continue learning.</td>
<td>Value knowledge and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understand and appreciate the range of academic disciplines and their relationship to the fields of professional and applied study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use the arts, sciences and humanities as a forum for the study of values, ethical principles, and the physical world.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth of knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engage in an in-depth, focused, and sustained program of study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursue disciplined, inquiry-based learning in the major.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lifelong learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Show curiosity and the desire to learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire tools for lifelong learning—how to learn, how they learn, knowledge of resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SKILLS</th>
<th>Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquire and use the tools needed for communication, inquiry, analysis, and productive work.</td>
<td>Communicate in diverse settings and groups, using written (both reading and writing), oral (both speaking and listening), and visual means, and in more than one language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inquiry/Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Derive meaning from experience, as well as gather information from observation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand and employ both quantitative and qualitative analysis to describe and solve problems, both independently and cooperatively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employ scientific reasoning and logical thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use creativity to solve problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEGRATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work productively within and across disciplines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Understand and navigate systems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integrate Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Resolve difficult issues creatively by employing multiple systems and tools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Make meaningful and multiple connections among the liberal arts and the areas of study leading to a major or profession.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUES, ETHICS, AND RELATIONSHIPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understand and apply values, ethics, and diverse perspectives in personal, professional, civic, and cultural/global domains.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional/Personal Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrate intellectual honesty and personal responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discern consequences of decisions and actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrate intellectual agility and the ability to manage change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work with teams, including those of diverse composition. Build consensus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Respect and use creativity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethics/Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Transform information into knowledge, and knowledge into judgment and action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assume responsibility for social justice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community/Civic Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrate social and civic knowledge [regarding social, political, economic, and historical issues].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understand organizations and histories underlying government in global context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Apply knowledge and analyze social, political, economic, and historical issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Show ability to contribute actively by applying knowledge to the identification and analysis of societal and professional problems to enact solutions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global/Multicultural Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrate expanded cultural and global awareness and sensitivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discern multiple perspectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use awareness of cultural differences to bridge cultural and linguistic barriers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrate proficiencies and capacities in dealing with a diverse society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communicate across cultural and linguistic barriers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### City Tech General Education Assessment Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education Learning Outcome</th>
<th>S16</th>
<th>F16</th>
<th>S17</th>
<th>F17</th>
<th>S18</th>
<th>F18</th>
<th>S19</th>
<th>F19</th>
<th>S20</th>
<th>F20</th>
<th>S21</th>
<th>F21</th>
<th>S22</th>
<th>F22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creative thinking</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>IRR</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations and lifelong</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>IRR</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry and analysis</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>IRR</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative learning</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>IRR</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural knowledge and</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>IRR</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information literacy</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Engagement</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Reasoning</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td>IRR/DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Literacy</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>IRR/DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>AEI</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>DC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Code for Abbreviations**

- **DC** = Data Collection
- **IRR/DC** = Inter-rater reliability and Data Collection
- **IRR** = Inter-rater reliability
- **AEI** = Analysis of data, evaluation of report, drafting of improvement plan
- **II** = Implementation of improvement plan
- **CA** = Communication about assessment and selection of assignment
- **P** = Pilot data collection
Launching the General Education Assessment Cycle

- **Proovost**
  - Chooses departments for General Education assessment

- **AIR & Chairs**
  - AIR office notifies department chairs

- **Chairs**
  - Selects course to be assessed

- **Faculty**
  - Pilot data collected
  - Identify existing assignment/develop an assignment for assessment using AAC&U as a framework
  - Reach out to course instructors

- **Course coordinators & faculty co-chairs**
  - Informed of course selection
Civic Engagement
Civic Engagement VALUE Rubric

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:

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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 (e.g., 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@aaau.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 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>Capstone</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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/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/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 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.
- Demonstrates independent experience and team leadership of civic action, with reflective insights or analysis about the aims and accomplishments of one's actions.
- Has clearly participated in civically focused actions and begins to reflect or describe how these actions may benefit individual(s) or communities.
- Has experimented 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 collaboratively work across and within community contexts and structures to achieve a civic aim.
- Demonstrates ability and commitment to work actively within community contexts and structures to achieve a civic aim.
- Demonstrates experience identifying intentional ways to participate in civic contexts and structures.
- Experiments with civic contexts and structures, tries out a few to see what fits.
Assignment Worksheet for Civic Engagement

Name: _______________________________ Department: _______________________________

1. Please describe the assignment you plan to use with the General Education assessment.

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

2. Please review the assignment and verify the assignment addresses the performance criteria by checking the box on the right.

1. Diversity of Communities and Cultures
   
2. Analysis of Knowledge
   
3. Civic Identity and Commitment
   
4. Civic Communication
   
5. Civic Action and Reflection
   
6. Civic Contexts/Structures
Content Validity Worksheet for Civic Engagement

Reviewer Name: ___________________ Reviewer Department: ____________________________

Department Assignment Sample: _______________________________________________________

Instructions: Please read over your assignment carefully and familiarize yourself with the City Tech Civic Engagement Rubric. Please document how the assignment (and instructions) will cover each of the following Performance Criteria:

Diversity of Communities and Cultures
___________________________________________________
___________________________________________________

Analysis of Knowledge
___________________________________________________
___________________________________________________

Civic Identity and Commitment
___________________________________________________

Civic Communication
___________________________________________________
___________________________________________________

Civic Action and Reflection
___________________________________________________
___________________________________________________

Civic Contexts/Structures
___________________________________________________
___________________________________________________
**Detailed Timeline: Civic Engagement**

**Assessment Planning 2016-17 to 2018-19**

**Spring 2016**

February  
Gen Ed Assignment and Content Validity worksheets and corresponding AAC&U VALUE rubric sent to participating faculty, assessment faculty co-chairs and assessment department liaisons.

March 11th  
Working meeting to discuss selected assignment, content validity and online rubrics  
1:30 – 3:30 p.m. N 119.

April 15th  
Final assignments submitted to AIR.

April 25th  
Online rubrics will be available to faculty.

May 6th  
Chairs notify all departmental faculty of participation for Fall 2016 full-scale data collection in Gen Ed assessment.

May 31st  
Due Date: Student work scored using online rubrics  
3 copies of student work submitted to AIR office  
-1 copy each of “Excellent,” “Average,” and “Poor” student work

**Fall 2016**

September 23rd  
Rubric and assignment revision completed.  
Distribute final rubric to faculty.

Full-scale data collection planning meeting for participating faculty in N119,  
1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

Nov/Dec  
Full-scale data collection begins.  
Assignments given to students in participating courses.
Student assignments are scored using revised rubric.

Dec 23rd  Due Date:  Student work scored using TK20
3 copies of student work uploaded to TK20
- 1 copy each of “Excellent,” “Average,” and “Poor” student work

**SPRING 2017**

Jan 30th  Gen. Ed. Assessment results received from AIR.
February  Report results to Gen Ed Committee and department chairs.
April  Departments discuss Fall 2016 results and consult with Faculty Commons for support to formulate action items to improve and/or sustain Gen Ed competencies.
May  Action items finalized with plans for implementation in Fall 2017 and additional consulting with Faculty Commons for Best Practices/Pedagogical Support (if requested by departments).

Chairs notify all departmental faculty of action items for Fall 2017 implementation.

**FALL 2017 – SPRING 2018**

Implementation of improvement plan.

**FALL 2018**

Full-scale data collection to re-assess Gen Ed competency.
Creative Thinking
Creative Thinking VALUE Rubric

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 re-combinations, 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>Acquiring Competencies</th>
<th>Capstone</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflect: Evaluates creative process and product using domain-appropriate criteria.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create: Creates an entirely new object, solution or idea that is appropriate to the domain.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapte: Successfully adapts an appropriate exemplar to his/her own specifications.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model: Successfully reproduces an appropriate exemplar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking Risks May include personal risk (fear of embarrassment or rejection) or risk of failure in successfully completing assignment, e.g., going beyond original parameters of assignment, introducing new materials and forms, tackling controversial topics, advocating unpopular ideas or solutions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively seeks out and follows through on untested and potentially risky directions or approaches to the assignment in the final product.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporates new directions or approaches to the assignment in the final product.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considers new directions or approaches without going beyond the guidelines of the assignment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stays strictly within the guidelines of the assignment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solving Problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not only develops a logical, consistent plan to solve problem, but recognizes consequences of solution and can articulate reason for choosing solution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having selected from among alternatives, develops a logical, consistent plan to solve the problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considers and rejects less acceptable approaches to solving problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only a single approach is considered and is used to solve the problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embracing Contradictions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrates alternate, divergent, or contradictory perspectives or ideas fully.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporates alternate, divergent, or contradictory perspectives or ideas in an exploratory way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes (recognizes the value of) alternate, divergent, or contradictory perspectives or ideas in a small way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledges (mentions in passing) alternate, divergent, or contradictory perspectives or ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Thinking Novelty or uniqueness (of idea, claim, question, form, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extends a novel or unique idea, question, format, or product to create new knowledge or knowledge that crosses boundaries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates a novel or unique idea, question, format, or product.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiments with creating a novel or unique idea, question, format, or product.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformulates a collection of available ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting, Synthesizing, Transforming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transforms ideas or solutions into entirely new forms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesizes ideas or solutions into a coherent whole.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connects ideas or solutions in novel ways.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes existing connections among ideas or solutions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assignment Worksheet for Creative Thinking

Name: ___________________________  Department: ______________________________

1. Please describe the assignment you plan to use with the General Education assessment.

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

2. Please review the assignment and verify the assignment addresses the performance criteria by checking the box on the right.

   1. Acquiring Competencies  
   2. Taking Risks  
   3. Solving Problems  
   4. Embracing Contradictions  
   5. Innovative Thinking  
   6. Connecting, Synthesizing, Transforming
Content Validity for Creative Thinking

Reviewer Name: ___________________________ Reviewer Department: ___________________________

Department Assignment Sample: ____________________________________________________________

Instructions: Please read over your assignment carefully and familiarize yourself with the City Tech Creative Thinking Rubric. Please document how the assignment (and instructions) will cover each of the following Performance Criteria:

**Acquiring Competencies**

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

Taking Risks

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

Solving Problems

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

Embracing Contradictions

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

Innovative Thinking

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

Connecting, Synthesizing, Transforming

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________
**Detailed Timeline: Creative Thinking**

**Assessment Planning 2016-17 to 2019-20**

**FALL 2016**

- **September**
  - Gen Ed Assignment and Content Validity worksheets and corresponding AAC&U VALUE rubric sent to participating faculty, assessment faculty co-chairs and assessment department liaisons.

- **October 28th**
  - Working meeting to discuss selected assignment, content validity and TK20 1:30 – 3:30 p.m. N 119.

- **Nov/Dec**
  - Final Assignment loaded to S drive.
  - Full-scale data collection begins.
  - Assignments given to students in participating courses.
  - Student assignments are scored using revised rubric.

- **Dec 23rd**
  - Due Date: Student work scored using TK20
  - 3 copies of student work uploaded to TK20
    - 1 copy each of “Excellent,” “Average,” and “Poor” student work

**SPRING 2017 – FALL 2017**

- **February**
  - AIR Gen Ed Assessment analyses distributed to chairs, faculty and administrators.

- **To be scheduled**
  - Inter-rater reliability meeting with participating faculty
  - Revise rubrics and course assignments.

- **Nov/Dec**
  - Final Assignment loaded to S drive.
  - Full-scale data collection begins.
  - Assignments given to students in participating courses.
  - Student assignments are scored using revised rubric.

- **Dec 23rd**
  - Due Date: Student work scored using TK20
  - 3 copies of student work uploaded to TK20
    - 1 copy each of “Excellent,” “Average,” and “Poor” student work
**SPRING 2018**

**Jan 30th**  
Gen. Ed. Assessment results received from AIR.

**February**  
Report results to General Education Committee and department chairs.

**April**  
Departments discuss Fall 2017 results and consult with Faculty Commons for support to formulate action items to improve and/or sustain Gen Ed competencies.

**May**  
Action items finalized with plans for implementation in Fall 2018 and additional consulting with Faculty Commons for Best Practices/Pedagogical Support (if requested by departments).

Chairs notify all departmental faculty of action items for Fall 2018 implementation.

Chairs select courses for Gen Ed assessment for Fall 2018 and notify AIR.

**FALL 2018 – SPRING 2020**

Implementation of improvement plan.

**FALL 2020**

Full-scale data collection to re-assess Gen Ed competency.
Critical Thinking
Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric

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

Name: ___________________________  Department: ______________________________

1. Please describe the assignment you plan to use with the General Education assessment.

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

2. Please review the assignment and verify the assignment addresses the performance criteria by checking the box on the right.

1. Explanation of Issues
   □

2. Evidence: selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion
   □

3. Influence of Context and Assumptions
   □

4. Student's Position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis)
   □

5. Conclusions and Related Outcomes (implications and consequences)
   □
**Content Validity for Critical Thinking**

Reviewer Name: ________________________  Reviewer Department: ________________________________

Department Assignment Sample: ______________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Instructions: Please read over your assignment carefully and familiarize yourself with the City Tech Critical Thinking Rubric. Please document how the assignment (and instructions) will cover each of the following Performance Criteria:

**Explanation of Issues**

____________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________

**Evidence: selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion**

____________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________

**Influence of Context and Assumptions**

____________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________

**Student's Position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis)**

____________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________

**Conclusions and Related Outcomes (implications and consequences)**

____________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________
Detailed Timeline: Critical Thinking

Assessment Planning 2016-17 to 2018-19

Spring 2016

February  Gen Ed Assignment and Content Validity worksheets and corresponding AAC&U VALUE rubric sent to participating faculty, assessment faculty co-chairs and assessment department liaisons.

March 11th  Working meeting to discuss selected assignment, content validity and online rubrics 1:30 – 3:30 p.m. N 119.

April 15th  Final assignments submitted to AIR.

April 25th  Online rubrics will be available to faculty.

May 6th  Chairs notify all departmental faculty of participation for Fall 2016 full-scale data collection in Gen Ed assessment.

May 31st  Due Date:  Student work scored using online rubrics

3 copies of student work submitted to AIR office
- 1 copy each of “Excellent,” “Average,” and “Poor” student work

Fall 2016

September 23rd  Rubric and assignment revision completed.

Distribute final rubric to faculty.

Full-scale data collection planning meeting for participating faculty in N119, 1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

Nov/Dec  Full-scale data collection begins.

Assignments given to students in participating courses.

Student assignments are scored using revised rubric.

Dec 23rd  Due Date:  Student work scored using TK20

3 copies of student work uploaded to TK20
- 1 copy each of “Excellent,” “Average,” and “Poor” student work
**SPRING 2017**

Jan 30th  Gen. Ed. Assessment results received from AIR.

February  Report results to Gen Ed Committee and department chairs.

April  Departments discuss Fall 2016 results and consult with Faculty Commons for support to formulate action items to improve and/or sustain Gen Ed competencies.

May  Action items finalized with plans for implementation in Fall 2017 and additional consulting with Faculty Commons for Best Practices/Pedagogical Support (if requested by departments).

Chairs notify all departmental faculty of action items for Fall 2017 implementation.

**FALL 2017–SPRING 2018**

Implementation of improvement plan.

**FALL 2018**

Full-scale data collection to re-assess Gen Ed competency.
Ethical Reasoning
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**

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**

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

**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.

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>

**Ethical Self-Awareness**

- **Student**
  - Discusses in detail/analyzes both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs and discussion has greater depth and clarity.
- **Student**
  - Discusses in detail/analyzes both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs.
- **Student**
  - States both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs.
- **Student**
  - States either their core beliefs or articulates the origins of the core beliefs but not both.

**Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts**

- **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.
- **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.
- **Student**
  - Can name the major theory she/he uses, and is only able to present the gist of the named theory.
- **Student**
  - Only names the major theory she/he uses.

**Ethical Issue Recognition**

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

**Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts**

- **Student**
  - Can independently apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, accurately, and is able to consider full implications of the application.
- **Student**
  - Can independently apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, accurately, but does not consider the specific implications of the application.
- **Student**
  - Can apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, independently (to a new example) and the application is inaccurate.
- **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).

**Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts**

- **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, and respond to the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/concepts, but the student's response is inadequate.
- **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.
Assignment Worksheet for Ethical Reasoning

Name: ____________________________ Department: ____________________________

1. Please describe the assignment you plan to use with the General Education assessment.

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

2. Please review the assignment and verify the assignment addresses the performance criteria by checking the box on the right.

   1. Ethical Self-Awareness

   2. Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts

   3. Ethical Issue Recognition

   4. Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts

   5. Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts
Content Validity for Ethical Reasoning

Reviewer Name: _______________________
Reviewer Department: ________________________
Department Assignment Sample: __________________________________________________________

Instructions: Please read over your assignment carefully and familiarize yourself with the City Tech Ethical Reasoning Rubric. Please document how the assignment (and instructions) will cover each of the following Performance Criteria:

**Ethical Self-Awareness**

____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________

**Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts**

____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________

**Ethical Issue Recognition**

____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________

**Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts**

____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________

**Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts**

____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________
Detailed Timeline: Ethical Reasoning

Assessment Planning 2016-17 to 2018-19

Spring 2016

February
Gen Ed Assignment and Content Validity worksheets and corresponding AAC&U VALUE rubric sent to participating faculty, assessment faculty co-chairs and assessment department liaisons.

March 11th
Working meeting to discuss selected assignment, content validity and online rubrics
1:30 – 3:30 p.m. N 119.

April 15th
Final assignments submitted to AIR.

April 25th
Online rubrics will be available to faculty.

May 6th
Chairs notify all departmental faculty of participation for Fall 2016 full-scale data collection in Gen Ed assessment.

May 31st
Due Date: Student work scored using online rubrics
3 copies of student work submitted to AIR office
- 1 copy each of “Excellent,” “Average,” and “Poor” student work

Fall 2016

September 23rd
Rubric and assignment revision completed.
Distribute final rubric to faculty.
Full-scale data collection planning meeting for participating faculty in N119,
1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

Nov/Dec
Full-scale data collection begins.
Assignments given to students in participating courses.
Student assignments are scored using revised rubric.

Dec 23rd
Due Date: Student work scored using TK20
3 copies of student work uploaded to TK20
- 1 copy each of “Excellent,” “Average,” and “Poor” student work
SPRING 2017

Jan 30th  Gen. Ed. Assessment results received from AIR.

February  Report results to Gen Ed Committee and department chairs.

April  Departments discuss Fall 2016 results and consult with Faculty Commons for support to formulate action items to improve and/or sustain Gen Ed competencies.

May  Action items finalized with plans for implementation in Fall 2017 and additional consulting with Faculty Commons for Best Practices/Pedagogical Support (if requested by departments).

Chairs notify all departmental faculty of action items for Fall 2017 implementation.

FALL 2017–SPRING 2018

Implementation of improvement plan.

FALL 2018

Full-scale data collection to re-assess Gen Ed competency.
Foundations & Skills for Lifelong Learning
Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning 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

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.
**Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning VALUE Rubric**

For more information, please contact value@aacu.org

**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.sec-educoop.net/education_in/pdf/lifelong-oth-enl-02.pdf.)

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>

**Curiosity**

Explores a topic in depth, yielding a rich awareness and/or little-known information indicating intense interest in the subject.  
Explores a topic in depth, yielding insight and/or information indicating interest in the subject.  
Explores a topic with some evidence of depth, providing occasional insight and/or information indicating mild interest in the subject.  
Explores a topic at a surface level, providing little insight and/or information beyond the very basic facts indicating low interest in the subject.

**Initiative**

Completes required work, generates and pursues opportunities to expand knowledge, skills, and abilities.  
Completes required work, identifies and pursues opportunities to expand knowledge, skills, and abilities.  
Completes required work and identifies opportunities to expand knowledge, skills, and abilities.  
Completes required work.

**Independence**

Educational interests and pursuits exist and flourish outside classroom requirements. Knowledge and/or experiences are pursued independently.  
Beyond classroom requirements, pursues substantial, additional knowledge and/or actively pursues independent educational experiences.  
Beyond classroom requirements, pursues additional knowledge and/or shows interest in pursuing independent educational experiences.  
 Begins to look beyond classroom requirements, showing interest in pursuing knowledge independently.

**Transfer**

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.  
Makes references to previous learning and shows evidence of applying that knowledge and those skills to demonstrate comprehension and performance in novel situations.  
Makes references to previous learning and attempts to apply that knowledge and those skills to demonstrate comprehension and performance in novel situations.  
Makes vague references to previous learning but does not apply knowledge and skills to demonstrate comprehension and performance in novel situations.

**Reflection**

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.  
Reviews prior learning (past experiences inside and outside of the classroom) in depth, revealing fully clarified meanings or indicating broader perspectives about educational or life events.  
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.  
Reviews prior learning (past experiences inside and outside of the classroom) at a surface level, without revealing clarified meaning or indicating a broader perspective about educational or life events.
Assignment Worksheet for Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning

Name: ___________________________ Department: ___________________________

1. Please describe the assignment you plan to use with the General Education assessment.
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

2. Please review the assignment and verify the assignment addresses the performance criteria by checking the box on the right.

1. Curiosity 
2. Initiative 
3. Independence 
4. Transfer 
5. Reflection
Content Validity for Foundations & Skills for Lifelong Learning

Reviewer Name: ________________________ Reviewer Department: __________________________

Department Assignment Sample: ________________________________________________________

Instructions: Please read over your assignment carefully and familiarize yourself with the City Tech Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning Rubric. Please document how the assignment (and instructions) will cover each of the following Performance Criteria:

Curiosity

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________

Initiative

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________

Independence

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________

Transfer

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________

Reflection

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________
Detailed Timeline: Foundations & Skills for Lifelong Learning

Assessment Planning 2016-17 to 2019-20

**Fall 2016**

**September**

Gen Ed Assignment and Content Validity worksheets and corresponding AAC&U VALUE rubric sent to participating faculty, assessment faculty co-chairs and assessment department liaisons.

**October 28th**

Working meeting to discuss selected assignment, content validity and TK20

1:30 – 3:30 p.m. N 119.

**Nov/Dec**

Final Assignment loaded to S drive.

Full-scale data collection begins.

Assignments given to students in participating courses.

Student assignments are scored using revised rubric.

**Dec 23rd**

Due Date: Student work scored using TK20

3 copies of student work uploaded to TK20

- 1 copy each of “Excellent,” “Average,” and “Poor” student work

**Spring 2017 – Fall 2017**

**February**

AIR Gen Ed Assessment analyses distributed to chairs, faculty and administrators.

**To be scheduled**

Inter-rater reliability meeting with participating faculty

Revise rubrics and course assignments.

**Nov/Dec**

Final Assignment loaded to S drive.

Full-scale data collection begins.

Assignments given to students in participating courses.

Student assignments are scored using revised rubric.
Dec 23rd  Due Date:  Student work scored using TK20

3 copies of student work uploaded to TK20
   - 1 copy each of “Excellent,” “Average,” and “Poor” student work

**SPRING 2018**

Jan 30th  Gen. Ed. Assessment results received from AIR.

February  Report results to General Education Committee and department chairs.

April  Departments discuss Fall 2017 results and consult with Faculty Commons for
       support to formulate action items to improve and/or sustain Gen Ed competencies.

May  Action items finalized with plans for implementation in Fall 2018 and additional
     consulting with Faculty Commons for Best Practices/Pedagogical Support (if
     requested by departments).
     Chairs notify all departmental faculty of action items for Fall 2018 implementation.
     Chairs select courses for Gen Ed assessment for Fall 2018 and notify AIR.

**FALL 2018 – SPRING 2020**

Implementation of improvement plan.

**FALL 2020**

Full-scale data collection to re-assess Gen Ed competency.
Information Literacy
## Information Literacy Rubric
(Modified from AAC&U VALUE Rubric)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understands and addresses the scope and objectives of a manageable research topic</td>
<td>Defines the scope and objectives of a manageable research topic in a concrete and focused manner.</td>
<td>Begins to define the scope and objectives of the research topic in a focused manner.</td>
<td>Defines scope and objectives of the research topic in a broad, narrow, or vague manner.</td>
<td>Has difficulty identifying the scope and objectives of the research topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify credible and relevant sources</td>
<td>Able to identify all relevant and credible sources (know the difference between primary and secondary sources; identify peer reviewed journals; choose the best evidence).</td>
<td>Able to identify most relevant and credible sources but not all (few discrepancies with identifying primary and secondary sources, peer reviewed journals and choosing the best evidence).</td>
<td>Able to identify some relevant and credible sources but not all (many discrepancies with identifying primary and secondary sources, peer reviewed journals and choosing the best evidence).</td>
<td>Does not identify differences between sources, does not select the best evidence available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use information effectively to accomplish specific purpose, and present information in a clear and meaningful way</td>
<td>Communicates, organizes and synthesizes information from sources to fully achieve a specific purpose, with clarity and depth.</td>
<td>Communicates, organizes and synthesizes information from sources. Intended purpose is achieved.</td>
<td>Communicates and organizes information from sources. The information is not yet synthesized, so the intended purpose is not fully achieved.</td>
<td>Communicates information from sources. The information is fragmented and/or used inappropriately (misquoted, taken out of context, or incorrectly paraphrased, etc.), so the intended purpose is not achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cite sources in an appropriate style</td>
<td>Correctly provides in-text citations and reference list in a discipline-specific style.</td>
<td>Provides in-text citations and reference list in a discipline-specific style, but with few errors.</td>
<td>Provides in-text citations and reference, but with many errors or in a style not discipline-specific.</td>
<td>Does not cite any information sources used in assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporates ideas of others in an ethical manner; summarizing, paraphrasing and quoting are correct and appropriate</td>
<td>Applies principles of academic integrity in the use of information – all sources are quoted, paraphrased and cited correctly and appropriately.</td>
<td>Cites most sources correctly when quoting and paraphrasing; uses quoted material sparingly and appropriately.</td>
<td>Cites some (but not all) sources correctly when quoting and paraphrasing, but employs excessive use of quoted material.</td>
<td>Plagiarizes the work of others: uses quoted material excessively and/or does not use in-text or bibliographic citations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assignment Worksheet for Information Literacy

Name: ____________________________  Department: ______________________________

1. Please describe the assignment you plan to use with the General Education assessment.

____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

2. Please review the assignment and verify the assignment addresses the performance criteria by checking the box on the right.

   1. Understands and Addresses the Scope and Objectives of the Research Topic  □
   2. Identifies Credible and Relevant Sources  □
   3. Presents Information in a Clear and Meaningful Way  □
   4. Cites Sources in an Appropriate Style  □
   5. Incorporate Ideas of Others in an Ethical Manner; Summarizing, Paraphrasing, and Quoting are Correct and Appropriate. □
**Content Validity for Information Literacy**

Reviewer Name: ______________________ Reviewer Department: ______________________

Department Assignment Sample: ______________________________________________________

Instructions: Please read over your assignment carefully and familiarize yourself with the City Tech Information Literacy Rubric. Please document how the assignment (and instructions) will cover each of the following Performance Criteria:

**Understands and Addresses the Scope and Objectives of the Research Topic**

___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________

**Identifies Credible and Relevant Sources**

___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________

**Presents Information in a Clear and Meaningful Way**

___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________

**Cites Sources in an Appropriate Style**

___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________

**Incorporates Ideas of Others in an Ethical Manner; Summarizing, Paraphrasing and Quoting are Correct and Appropriate**

___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________
Detailed Timeline: Information Literacy

Assessment Planning 2015-16 to 2020-21

**Fall 2015**

September       Drafting of improvement.

**Fall 2016 – Spring 2018**

L4 and Gen Ed support.

Implementation of improvement plan.

**Fall 2018**

Chairs select one course for Information Literacy assessment.

Full-scale data collection.

**Spring 2019**

April            AIR returns Information Literacy results.

Report results to General Education Committee and department chairs.

Departments discuss results and consult with Faculty Commons support to
formulate action items to improve and/or sustain Gen Ed competencies.

May              Action items finalized with plans for implementation in Fall 2018 and additional
consulting with Faculty Commons for Best Practices/Pedagogical Support (if
requested by departments).

Chairs notify all departmental faculty of action items for Fall 2019
implementation.

Chairs select courses for Gen Ed assessment for Fall 2019 and notify AIR.

**Fall 2019 – Spring 2021**

Implementation of improvement plan.
Inquiry & Analysis
Inquiry and Analysis 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 by 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.
**INQUIRY AND ANALYSIS VALUE RUBRIC**

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org

**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.

_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>Milestones</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic selection</strong></td>
<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/double topic that appropriately addresses relevant aspects of the topic.</td>
<td>Identifies a topic that while manageable/double, is too narrowly focused and leaves out relevant aspects of the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Knowledge, Research, and/or Views</strong></td>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design Process</strong></td>
<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>Inquir design demonstrates a misunderstanding of the methodology or theoretical framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis</strong></td>
<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, the organization is not effective in revealing important patterns, differences, or similarities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusions</strong></td>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limitations and Implications</strong></td>
<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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Assignment Worksheet for Inquiry & Analysis

Name: ____________________________ Department: ____________________________

1. Please describe the assignment you plan to use with the General Education assessment.

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

2. Please review the assignment and verify the assignment addresses the performance criteria by checking the box on the right.

1. Topic Selection

2. Existing Knowledge, Research, and/or Views

3. Design Process

4. Analysis

5. Conclusions

6. Limitations and Implications
**Content Validity for Inquiry & Analysis**

Reviewer Name: ______________________  Reviewer Department: __________________________

Department Assignment Sample: _______________________________________________________

Instructions: Please read over your assignment carefully and familiarize yourself with the City Tech Inquiry and Analysis Rubric. Please document how the assignment (and instructions) will cover each of the following Performance Criteria:

---

**Topic Selection**

---

**Existing Knowledge, Research, and/or Views**

---

**Design Process**

---

**Analysis**

---

**Conclusions**

---

**Limitations and Implications**

---
Detailed Timeline: Inquiry & Analysis

Assessment Planning 2016-17 to 2019-20

**Fall 2016**

**September**
- Gen Ed Assignment and Content Validity worksheets and corresponding AAC&U VALUE rubric sent to participating faculty, assessment faculty co-chairs and assessment department liaisons.

**October 28th**
- Working meeting to discuss selected assignment, content validity and TK20
  - 1:30 – 3:30 p.m. N 119.

**Nov/Dec**
- Final Assignment loaded to S drive.
  - Full-scale data collection begins.
  - Assignments given to students in participating courses.
  - Student assignments are scored using revised rubric.

**Dec 23rd**
- Due Date: Student work scored using TK20
  - 3 copies of student work uploaded to TK20
    - 1 copy each of “Excellent,” “Average,” and “Poor” student work

**Spring 2017 – Fall 2017**

**February**
- AIR Gen Ed Assessment analyses distributed to chairs, faculty and administrators.

**To be scheduled**
- Inter-rater reliability meeting with participating faculty
  - Revise rubrics and course assignments.

**Nov/Dec**
- Final Assignment loaded to S drive.
  - Full-scale data collection begins.
  - Assignments given to students in participating courses.
  - Student assignments are scored using revised rubric.
Dec 23rd  
Due Date: Student work scored using TK20  
3 copies of student work uploaded to TK20  
   - 1 copy each of “Excellent,” “Average,” and “Poor” student work

**SPRING 2018**

Jan 30th  
Gen. Ed. Assessment results received from AIR.

February  
Report results to General Education Committee and department chairs.

April  
Departments discuss Fall 2017 results and consult with Faculty Commons for  
support to formulate action items to improve and/or sustain Gen Ed competencies.

May  
Action items finalized with plans for implementation in Fall 2018 and additional  
consulting with Faculty Commons for Best Practices/Pedagogical Support (if  
requested by departments).

   Chairs notify all departmental faculty of action items for Fall 2018 implementation.

   Chairs select courses for Gen Ed assessment for Fall 2018 and notify AIR.

**FALL 2018 – SPRING 2020**

   Implementation of improvement plan.

**FALL 2020**

   Full-scale data collection to re-assess Gen Ed competency.
Integrative Learning
Integrative Learning VALUE Rubric

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 rubric 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, unscripted 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 to 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 work samples or collections of work that demonstrate significant 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 self-reflection in arts and humanities, but they may be embedded in individual performances and less evident. The key in the development of such work samples or collections of work will be in designing structures that include artifacts and reflective writing or feedback that support students' examination of their learning and give evidence that, as graduates, they will extend their integrative abilities into the challenges of personal, professional, and civic life.

Glossary

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

- **Academic Knowledge**: Disciplinary learning; learning from academic study, texts, etc.
- **Content**: The information conveyed in the work sample or collections of work.
- **Context**: 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.
- **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.)
- **Experience**: Learning that takes place in a setting outside of the formal classroom, such as workplace, service learning site, internship site or another.
- **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.
- **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.
- **Reflection**: A meta-cognitive act of examining a performance in order to explore its significance and consequences.
- **Self Assessment**: Describing, interpreting, and judging a performance based on stated or implied expectations followed by planning for further learning.
**Integrative Learning VALUE Rubric**

**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.

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>Connections to Experience</th>
<th>Capstone 4</th>
<th>Milestones 3</th>
<th>Benchmark 2</th>
<th>Definition</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>
<td>Identifies connections between life experiences and those academic texts and ideas perceived as similar and related to own interests.</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>
<td>When prompted, presents examples, facts, or theories from more than one field of study or perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serves (makes) connections across disciplines, perspectives</td>
<td>Transfer Adapts and applies skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation to new situations</td>
<td>Adapts and applies skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation to solve difficult problems or explore complex issues in original ways.</td>
<td>Uses skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation to contribute to understanding of problems or issues.</td>
<td>Uses, in a basic way, skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation in a new situation.</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>
<td>Fulfills the assignment(s) (e.g., to produce an essay, a poster, a video, a PowerPoint presentation, etc.) in an appropriate 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>
<td>Describes own performances with general descriptors of success and failure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**For more information, please contact value@aaacu.org**
Assignment Worksheet for Integrative Learning

Name: ___________________________ Department: ___________________________

1. Please describe the assignment you plan to use with the General Education assessment.

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

2. Please review the assignment and verify the assignment addresses the performance criteria by checking the box on the right.

1. Connections to Experience

2. Connections to Discipline

3. Transfer

4. Integrated Communication

5. Reflection and Self-Assessment
Content Validity of Integrative Learning

Reviewer Name: ___________________  Reviewer Department: _______________________

Department Assignment Sample: _______________________________________________________

Instructions: Please read over your assignment carefully and familiarize yourself with the City Tech Integrative Learning Rubric. Please document how the assignment (and instructions) will cover each of the following Performance Criteria:

Connections to Experience

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

Connections to Discipline

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

Transfer

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

Integrated Communication

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

Reflection and Self-Assessment

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________
Detailed Timeline: Integrative Learning

Assessment Planning 2016-17 to 2019-20

**Fall 2016**

- **September**
  - Gen Ed Assignment and Content Validity worksheets and corresponding AAC&U VALUE rubric sent to participating faculty, assessment faculty co-chairs and assessment department liaisons.

- **October 28th**
  - Working meeting to discuss selected assignment, content validity and TK20
    
  - 1:30 – 3:30 p.m. N 119.

- **Nov/Dec**
  - Final Assignment loaded to S drive.

    - Full-scale data collection begins.
    
    - Assignments given to students in participating courses.
    
    - Student assignments are scored using revised rubric.

- **Dec 23rd**
  - **Due Date:** Student work scored using TK20
    
  - 3 copies of student work uploaded to TK20
    
    - 1 copy each of “Excellent,” “Average,” and “Poor” student work

**Spring 2017 – Fall 2017**

- **February**
  - AIR Gen Ed Assessment analyses distributed to chairs, faculty and administrators.

- **To be scheduled**
  - Inter-rater reliability meeting with participating faculty

    - Revise rubrics and course assignments.

- **Nov/Dec**
  - Final Assignment loaded to S drive.

    - Full-scale data collection begins.
    
    - Assignments given to students in participating courses.
    
    - Student assignments are scored using revised rubric.
Dec 23rd  
Due Date: Student work scored using TK20

3 copies of student work uploaded to TK20
- 1 copy each of “Excellent,” “Average,” and “Poor” student work

**SPRING 2018**

Jan 30th  
Gen. Ed. Assessment results received from AIR.

February  
Report results to General Education Committee and department chairs.

April  
Departments discuss Fall 2017 results and consult with Faculty Commons for support to formulate action items to improve and/or sustain Gen Ed competencies.

May  
Action items finalized with plans for implementation in Fall 2018 and additional consulting with Faculty Commons for Best Practices/Pedagogical Support (if requested by departments).

Chairs notify all departmental faculty of action items for Fall 2018 implementation.

Chairs select courses for Gen Ed assessment for Fall 2018 and notify AIR.

**FALL 2018 – SPRING 2020**

Implementation of improvement plan.

**FALL 2020**

Full-scale data collection to re-assess Gen Ed competency.
Intercultural Knowledge & Competence
Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric

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

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.” (Bennett, J. M. 2008. Transformative training: Designing programs for culture learning. In Contemporary leadership and intercultural competence: Understanding and utilizing cultural diversity to build successful organizations, ed. M. A. Moodian, 95-110. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.)

Framing Language

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

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

Glossary

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**
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.” (Bennett, J. M. 2008. Transformative training: Designing programs for culture learning. In Contemporary leadership and intercultural competence: Understanding and utilizing cultural diversity to build successful organizations, ed. M. A. Moodian, 95-130. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.)

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</th>
<th><strong>Capstone</strong> 4</th>
<th><strong>Milestones</strong> 2</th>
<th><strong>Benchmark</strong> 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural self-awareness</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 seeks the same in others). Shows minimal awareness of own cultural rules and biases (even those shared with own cultural group) (e.g., uncomfortable with identifying possible cultural differences with others).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks</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. Demonstrates surface 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>Skills: Empathy</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. Views the experience of others but does so through own cultural worldview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills: Verbal and nonverbal communication</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. Has a minimal level of understanding of cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication; is unable to negotiate a shared understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes: Cautiousness</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. States minimal interest in learning more about other cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes: Openness</td>
<td>Initiates and develops interactions with culturally different others.</td>
<td>Initiates and develops interactions with culturally different others. Begins to suspend judgment in valuing her/his interactions with culturally different others. Begins to initiate and develop 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. Receptive to interacting with culturally different others. Has difficulty suspending any judgment in her/his interactions with culturally different others, but is unaware of own judgment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assignment Worksheet for Intercultural Knowledge & Competence

Name: __________________________  Department: ______________________________

1. Please describe the assignment you plan to use with the General Education assessment.

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

2. Please review the assignment and verify the assignment addresses the performance criteria by checking the box on the right.

   1. Knowledge—Cultural self-awareness
   2. Knowledge—Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks
   3. Skills—Empathy
   4. Skills—Verbal and nonverbal communication
   5. Attitudes—Curiosity
   6. Attitudes—Openness
Content Validity of Intercultural Knowledge & Competence

Reviewer Name: ______________________ Reviewer Department: __________________________

Department Assignment Sample: ______________________ _______________________

Instructions: Please read over your assignment carefully and familiarize yourself with the City Tech Intercultural Knowledge and Competency Rubric. Please document how the assignment (and instructions) will cover each of the following Performance Criteria:

Knowledge—Cultural self-awareness

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

Knowledge—Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

Skills—Empathy

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

Skills—Verbal and nonverbal communication

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

Attitudes—Curiosity

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

Attitudes—Openness

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________
**Detailed Timeline: Intercultural Knowledge & Competence**

**Assessment Planning 2016-17 to 2019-20**

**FALL 2016**

**September**
Gen Ed Assignment and Content Validity worksheets and corresponding AAC&U VALUE rubric sent to participating faculty, assessment faculty co-chairs and assessment department liaisons.

**October 28th**
Working meeting to discuss selected assignment, content validity and TK20

1:30 – 3:30 p.m. N 119.

**Nov/Dec**
Final Assignment loaded to S drive.

Full-scale data collection begins.

Assignments given to students in participating courses.

Student assignments are scored using revised rubric.

**Dec 23rd**
Due Date: Student work scored using TK20

3 copies of student work uploaded to TK20
- 1 copy each of “Excellent,” “Average,” and “Poor” student work

**SPRING 2017 – FALL 2017**

**February**
AIR Gen Ed Assessment analyses distributed to chairs, faculty and administrators.

**To be scheduled**
Inter-rater reliability meeting with participating faculty

Revise rubrics and course assignments.

**Nov/Dec**
Final Assignment loaded to S drive.

Full-scale data collection begins.

Assignments given to students in participating courses.

Student assignments are scored using revised rubric.

**Dec 23rd**
Due Date: Student work scored using TK20

3 copies of student work uploaded to TK20
- 1 copy each of “Excellent,” “Average,” and “Poor” student work
**SPRING 2018**

Jan 30th  Gen. Ed. Assessment results received from AIR.

February  Report results to General Education Committee and department chairs.

April  Departments discuss Fall 2017 results and consult with Faculty Commons for support to formulate action items to improve and/or sustain Gen Ed competencies.

May  Action items finalized with plans for implementation in Fall 2018 and additional consulting with Faculty Commons for Best Practices/Pedagogical Support (if requested by departments).

Chairs notify all departmental faculty of action items for Fall 2018 implementation.

Chairs select courses for Gen Ed assessment for Fall 2018 and notify AIR.

**FALL 2018 – SPRING 2020**

Implementation of improvement plan.

**FALL 2020**

Full-scale data collection to re-assess Gen Ed competency.
Oral Communication
Oral Communication VALUE Rubric

for more information, please contact value@aaau.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.
**ORAL COMMUNICATION VALUE RUBRIC**

for more information, please contact value@aaacu.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>Organization</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capstone</strong></td>
<td><strong>Milestones</strong></td>
<td><strong>Benchmark</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td><strong>Organizational pattern</strong> (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><strong>Organizational pattern</strong> (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable within the presentation.</td>
<td><strong>Organizational pattern</strong> (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is intermittently observable within the presentation.</td>
<td><strong>Organizational pattern</strong> (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is not observable within the presentation.</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliver</strong>y</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>
</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>
</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assignment Worksheet for Oral Communication

Name: ___________________________ Department: ___________________________

1. Please describe the assignment you plan to use with the General Education assessment.
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________

2. Please review the assignment and verify the assignment addresses the performance criteria by checking the box on the right.

   1. Organization [ ]
   2. Language [ ]
   3. Delivery [ ]
   4. Supporting Material [ ]
   5. Central Message [ ]
Content Validity for Oral Communication

Reviewer Name: ______________________ Reviewer Department: ______________________________

Department Assignment Sample: ________________________________________________________________

Instructions: Please read over your assignment carefully and familiarize yourself with the City Tech Oral Communication Rubric. Please document how the assignment (and instructions) will cover each of the following Performance Criteria:

**Organization**
____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________

**Language**
____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________

**Delivery**
____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________

**Supporting Material**
____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________

**Central Message**
____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REFER TO INSTRUCTIONS FOR DEFINITIONS OF TERMS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central idea</td>
<td>Facile or of little value to audience.</td>
<td>Mentioned in introduction and somewhat appropriate to audience.</td>
<td>Stated in introduction and useful and appropriate to audience.</td>
<td>Clearly stated, memorable, and compelling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational structure</td>
<td>Not apparent. The progression of ideas is difficult to follow.</td>
<td>Somewhat coherent, but contains a number of digressions or ambiguities.</td>
<td>Clearly present, with some digressions or ambiguities.</td>
<td>Effective and logical. The progression of ideas is easy to follow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Not appropriate to the audience.</td>
<td>Generally appropriate to the audience.</td>
<td>Appropriate and effective to the audience.</td>
<td>Appropriate, effective, and compelling to the audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Materials</td>
<td>Not incorporated and/or cited.</td>
<td>Only occasionally used and/or cited, may not be credible.</td>
<td>Sufficient and credible. Citations are generally provided.</td>
<td>Highly effective. Sources are consistently credible and compelling.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructions for City Tech Oral Communication

Please adhere to the following guidelines carefully.

1. Central idea. In the best case (deserving a “4” on the rubric), the central idea of a presentation should be
   a. clearly articulated in the introduction and conclusion of the speech;
   b. appropriate for the specific audience and speech setting; and
   c. engaging, compelling, valuable, interesting, and/or informative to the audience.

2. Organization. Student should score a “4” if they include
   a. clearly articulated and delineated introduction, main points, and conclusion; and
   b. main points that are arranged logically and coherently, following a single principle of organization (time, space, theme, development, etc.)

3. Language. The styles and grammars of oral communication are different than those used in formal writing. With this in mind, a student should score a “4” on the rubric if the language of the presentation is
   a. easily understood;
   b. engaging (interesting, compelling, descriptive);
   c. appropriate for the specific audience (no unfamiliar terms, fillers, or slang); and
   d. ethical (not culturally insensitive, slanderous, inflammatory or offensive language).

4. Verbal communication. Students should not be evaluated on the basis of the presence of a dialect or accent, but only if a dialect or accent interferes with comprehension. In the best cases, students should exhibit
   a. clear articulation (not mumbling);
   b. strong volume (audible to the entire audience); and
   c. correct pronunciation of words.

5. Non-verbal communication. In the best cases, students should
   a. maintain eye contact with the audience approximately 75% of the time;
   b. use hand and facial gestures that are meaningful and clear; and
   c. walk and move with purpose (avoid fidgeting and distracting movements).

6. Appearance. In the best cases, students should
   a. wear clothing that does not distract the listener from the topic of the speech (loud colors/patterns, distracting logos, etc.);
   b. wear clothing that is clean, neat, and would gain the respect of an audience from a diverse demographic;
   c. avoid hats, coats, and other accouterments that encumber movement or hide expressivity of the eyes and face.1

7. Supporting material. In the best cases, students should provide explanations, evidence (statistics, quotes and examples) and descriptions that
   a. strongly support the central idea and main points of the presentation;
   b. include attribution in the form of citations (source information); and
   c. help the audience understand concepts and information in their complexity and fullness.

8. Visual aids. The most effective use of visual aids should
   a. be impactful (use fonts, colors, and other design elements that are simple and uncluttered); and
   b. strongly connect to, and support, the speaker’s points without distracting from the main points of the speech.

---

1 These are not “rules” of behavior, only guiding principles. Speakers who wear articles of clothing that conform to religious tenets should not be penalized for their choices.
Assignment Worksheet for Oral Communication V2

Name: ______________________________ Department: ______________________________

1. Please describe the assignment you plan to use with the General Education assessment.
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________

2. Please review the assignment and verify the assignment addresses the performance criteria by checking the box on the right.

   1. Central Idea
      [ ]
   2. Organizational Structure
      [ ]
   3. Language
      [ ]
   4. Verbal Delivery
      [ ]
   5. Non-verbal Delivery
      [ ]
   6. Appearance
      [ ]
   7. Supporting Materials
      [ ]
   8. Visual Aids (if applicable)
      [ ]
Content Validity for Oral Communication V2

Reviewer Name: ______________________ Reviewer Department: ___________________________

Department Assignment Sample: _______________________________________________________

Instructions: Please read over your assignment carefully and familiarize yourself with the City Tech Oral Communication Rubric. Please document how the assignment (and instructions) will cover each of the following Performance Criteria:

Central Idea
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

Organizational Structure
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

Language
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

Verbal Delivery
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

Non-verbal Delivery
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

Appearance
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

Supporting Materials
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

Visual Aids (if applicable)
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
Detailed Timeline: Oral Communication

Assessment Planning 2016-17 to 2018-19

**Spring 2016**

April  
Meeting with AIR to discuss assessment.

May  
Department chairs select courses to be assessed.

**Fall 2016**

Nov/Dec  
Final Assignment loaded to S drive.

Full-scale data collection begins.

Assignments given to students in participating courses.

Student assignments are scored using revised rubric.

Dec 23rd  
Due Date: Student work scored using TK20

3 copies of student work uploaded to TK20

- 1 copy each of “Excellent,” “Average,” and “Poor” student work

**Spring 2017**

Jan 30th  
Gen. Ed. Assessment results received from AIR.

February  
Report results to General Education Committee and department chairs.

April  
Departments discuss Fall 2016 results and consult with Faculty Commons for support to formulate action items to improve and/or sustain Gen Ed competencies.

May  
Action items finalized with plans for implementation in Fall 2017 and additional consulting with Faculty Commons for Best Practices/Pedagogical Support (if requested by departments).

Chairs notify all departmental faculty of action items for Fall 2017 implementation.

Chairs select courses for Gen Ed assessment for Fall 2017 and notify AIR.

**Fall 2017 – Spring 2019**

Implementation of improvement plan.

**Fall 2019**

Full scale data collection to re-assess Gen Ed competency.
Quantitative Literacy
Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric

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

Definition

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

Quantitative Literacy Across the Disciplines

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

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

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

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

Framing Language

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretation</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to explain information presented in mathematical forms (e.g., equations, graphs, diagrams, tables, words)</td>
<td>Provides accurate explanations of information presented in mathematical forms. Makes appropriate inferences based on that information. 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>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 misinterpret the slope of the trend line.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to convert relevant information into various mathematical forms (e.g., equations, graphs, diagrams, tables, words)</td>
<td>Skillfully converts relevant information into an insightful mathematical portrayal in a way that contributes to a further or deeper understanding.</td>
<td>Competently converts relevant information into an appropriate and desired mathematical portrayal.</td>
<td>Completes conversion of information but resulting mathematical portrayal is inappropriate or inaccurate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculations attempted are essentially all successful and sufficiently comprehensive to solve the problem. Calculations are also presented elegantly (clearly, concisely, etc.)</td>
<td>Calculations attempted are essentially all successful and sufficiently comprehensive to solve the problem.</td>
<td>Calculations attempted are either unsuccessful or represent only a portion of the calculations required to comprehensively solve the problem.</td>
<td>Calculations are attempted but are both unsuccessful and are not comprehensive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application/Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to make judgments and draw appropriate conclusions based on the quantitative analysis of data, while recognizing the limits of this analysis</td>
<td>Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for deep and thoughtful judgments, drawing insightful, carefully qualified conclusions from this work.</td>
<td>Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for competent judgments, drawing reasonable and appropriately qualified conclusions from this work.</td>
<td>Uses the quantitative analysis of data as the basis for tentative, basic judgments, although is hesitant or uncertain about drawing conclusions from this work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to make and evaluate important assumptions in estimation, modeling, and data analysis</td>
<td>Explicitly describes assumptions and provides compelling rationale for why each assumption is appropriate. Shows awareness that confidence in final conclusions is limited by the accuracy of the assumptions.</td>
<td>Explicitly describes assumptions and provides compelling rationale for why assumptions are appropriate.</td>
<td>Attempts to describe assumptions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Presents an argument for which quantitative evidence is pertinent, but does not provide adequate explicit numerical support. (May use quasi-quantitative words such as &quot;many,&quot; &quot;few,&quot; &quot;increasing,&quot; &quot;small,&quot; and the like in place of actual quantities.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assignment Worksheet for Quantitative Literacy

Name: ___________________________  Department: ______________________________

1. Please describe the assignment you plan to use with the General Education assessment.

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

2. Please review the assignment and verify the assignment addresses the performance criteria by checking the box on the right.

   1. Interpretation  □
   2. Representation □
   3. Calculation □
   4. Application/Analysis □
   5. Assumptions □
   6. Communication □
### Content Validity for Quantitative Literacy

Reviewer Name: ________________________  Reviewer Department: ____________________________

Department Assignment Sample: __________________________________________________________

Instructions: Please read over your assignment carefully and familiarize yourself with the City Tech Quantitative Literacy Rubric. Please document how the assignment (and instructions) will cover each of the following Performance Criteria:

**Interpretation:** Ability to explain information presented in mathematical forms

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

**Representation:** Ability to convert relevant information into various mathematical forms

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

**Calculation:** Algebraic manipulation and solving equations, units conversions, scientific notation, accuracy vs. precision, rounding

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

**Application/Analysis:** Ability to connect quantitative information to subject matter (as appropriate) and ability to draw appropriate conclusions based on the quantitative analysis of data, while recognizing the limits of this analysis

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

**Assumptions:** Ability to make and evaluate important assumptions in estimation, modeling, and data analysis

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

**Communication:** Expressing quantitative evidence in support of the argument or purpose of the work

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________
Detailed Timeline: Quantitative Literacy

Assessment Planning 2016-17 to 2018-19

Spring 2016

April  Meeting with AIR to discuss assessment.

May   Pilot data collection.

Fall 2016

September 9th  Inter-rater reliability meeting with participating faculty in N119, 1:30 p.m. –

            3:30 p.m.

            Revise rubrics and course assignments.

September 23rd  Rubric and assignment revision completed.

            Distribute final rubric to faculty.

            Full-scale data collection planning meeting for participating faculty in N119,

            1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

November/December  Final Assignment loaded to S drive.

            Full-scale data collection begins.

            Assignments given to students in participating courses.

            Student assignments are scored using revised rubric.

December 23rd  Due Date:  Student work scored using TK20

            3 copies of student work uploaded to TK20

            -  1 copy each of “Excellent,” “Average,” and “Poor” student work

Spring 2017

January 30th  Gen. Ed. Assessment results received from AIR.

February  Report results to General Education Committee and department chairs.

April    Departments discuss Fall 2016 results and consult with Faculty Commons for
support to formulate action items to improve and/or sustain Gen Ed competencies.

**May**

Action items finalized with plans for implementation in Fall 2017 and additional consulting with Faculty Commons for Best Practices/Pedagogical Support (if requested by departments).

Chairs notify all departmental faculty of action items for Fall 2017 implementation.

Chairs select courses for Gen Ed assessment for Fall 2017 and notify AIR.

**Fall 2017 – Spring 2019**

Implementation of improvement plan.

**Fall 2019**

September  Full scale data collection to re-assess Gen Ed competency.
Reading
# Reading Rubric
(Modified from AAC&U VALUE Rubric)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Does not Meet Criterion</th>
<th>Approaching Criterion</th>
<th>Meets Criterion</th>
<th>Surpasses Criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>Unable to comprehend technical information.</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>Uses the text and background knowledge from within the discipline in order to draw inferences from the material.</td>
<td>Uses the text, background knowledge from within and out of the discipline to draw sophisticated inferences from the material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Unable to apply information from the reading to broader context either within or outside of discipline.</td>
<td>Struggles to apply information towards a broader context, but aware that it is useful and important.</td>
<td>Able to apply information from the reading within the discipline.</td>
<td>Able to proficiently apply information to broader contexts, both within and outside of discipline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Fails to identify the incremental steps of an argument. Unable to evaluate or compare facts, positions and procedures amongst various texts.</td>
<td>Identify at least one idea or argument but cannot evaluate it. Struggles at comparing or contrast information between different sources.</td>
<td>Identifies ideas or arguments but may not always be able to evaluate them. Shows increasing ability to compare or contrast information between different sources.</td>
<td>Correctly identifies and evaluates idea or arguments. Able to compare or contrast information competently between different sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>Makes little or no interpretation of the text.</td>
<td>Uses information from the text to make simplistic interpretations of the text without using significant concepts or by making only limited connections to other situations or contexts.</td>
<td>Uses information from the text to interpret significant concepts or make connections to other situations or contexts logically through analysis, evaluation, inference, or comparison/contrast.</td>
<td>Uses information from the text to make sophisticated interpretations of the text while making connections to other situations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assignment Worksheet for Reading

Name: ___________________________  Department: _____________________________

1. Please describe the assignment you plan to use with the General Education assessment.

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

2. Please review the assignment and verify the assignment addresses the performance criteria by checking the box on the right.

1. Comprehension  
2. Context  
3. Analysis  
4. Interpretation
Content Validity for Reading

Reviewer Name: ___________________ Reviewer Department: ___________________________

Department Assignment Sample: ______________________________________________________

Instructions: Please read over your assignment carefully and familiarize yourself with the City Tech Reading Rubric. Please document how the assignment (and instructions) will cover each of the following Performance Criteria:

Comprehension

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

Context

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

Analysis

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

Interpretation

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________
Detailed Timeline: Reading

Assessment Planning 2016-17 to 2018-19

Spring 2016

April  Meeting with AIR to discuss assessment.

May  Department chairs select courses to be assessed.

Fall 2016

Nov/Dec  Final Assignment loaded to S drive.

  Full-scale data collection begins.

  Assignments given to students in participating courses.

  Student assignments are scored using revised rubric.

Dec 23rd  Due Date: Student work scored using TK20

  3 copies of student work uploaded to TK20
    - 1 copy each of “Excellent,” “Average,” and “Poor” student work

Spring 2017

Jan 30th  Gen. Ed. Assessment results received from AIR.

February  Report results to General Education Committee and department chairs.

April  Departments discuss Fall 2016 results and consult with Faculty Commons for

  support to formulate action items to improve and/or sustain Gen Ed competencies.

May  Action items finalized with plans for implementation in Fall 2017 and additional

  consulting with Faculty Commons for Best Practices/Pedagogical Support (if
  requested by departments).

  Chairs notify all departmental faculty of action items for Fall 2017
  implementation.

  Chairs select courses for Gen Ed assessment for Fall 2017 and notify AIR.
**Fall 2017 – Spring 2019**

Implementation of improvement plan.

**Fall 2019**

Full scale data collection to re-assess Gen Ed competency.
Teamwork
Teamwork 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 by 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**

**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>Capstone</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Benchmark</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>
</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>
</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.</td>
<td>Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished is thorough, comprehensive, and advances the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fosters Constructive Team Climate</strong></td>
<td>Supports a constructive team climate by doing all of the following: • Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication. • Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work. • Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it. • Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members.</td>
<td>Supports a constructive team climate by doing any three of the following: • Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication. • Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work. • Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it. • Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members.</td>
</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assignment Worksheet for Teamwork

Name: ___________________________ Department: _____________________________

1. Please describe the assignment you plan to use with the General Education assessment.

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

2. Please review the assignment and verify the assignment addresses the performance criteria by checking the box on the right.

   1. Contributes to Team Meetings
      ☐

   2. Facilitates the Contributions of Team Members
      ☐

   3. Individual Contributions Outside of Team Meetings
      ☐

   4. Fosters Constructive Team Climate
      ☐

   5. Responds to Conflict
      ☐
Content for Validity for Teamwork

Reviewer Name: ________________________ Reviewer Department: ________________________________

Department Assignment Sample: ____________________________________________________________________________________________

Instructions: Please read over your assignment carefully and familiarize yourself with the City Tech Teamwork Rubric. Please document how the assignment (and instructions) will cover each of the following Performance Criteria:

Contributes to Team Meetings
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________

Facilitates the Contributions of Team Members
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________

Individual Contributions Outside of Team Meetings
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________

Fosters Constructive Team Climate
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________

Responds to Conflict
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________
**Detailed Timeline: Teamwork**

**Assessment Planning 2016-17 to 2018-19**

**Spring 2016**

February  
Gen Ed Assignment and Content Validity worksheets and corresponding AAC&U VALUE rubric sent to participating faculty, assessment faculty co-chairs and assessment department liaisons.

March 11th  
Working meeting to discuss selected assignment, content validity and online rubrics  
1:30 – 3:30 p.m. N 119.

April 15th  
Final assignments submitted to AIR.

April 25th  
Online rubrics will be available to faculty.

May 6th  
Chairs notify all departmental faculty of participation for Fall 2016 full-scale data collection in Gen Ed assessment.

May 31st  
Due Date: Student work scored using online rubrics  
3 copies of student work submitted to AIR office  
- 1 copy each of “Excellent,” “Average,” and “Poor” student work

**Fall 2016**

September 23rd  
Rubric and assignment revision completed.  
Distribute final rubric to faculty.

Nov/Dec  
Full-scale data collection planning meeting for participating faculty in N119,  
1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

Assignments given to students in participating courses.

Student assignments are scored using revised rubric.

Dec 23rd  
Due Date: Student work scored using TK20  
3 copies of student work uploaded to TK20
- 1 copy each of “Excellent,” “Average,” and “Poor” student work

**SPRING 2017**

Jan 30th Gen. Ed. Assessment results received from AIR.

February Report results to Gen Ed Committee and department chairs.

April Departments discuss Fall 2016 results and consult with Faculty Commons for support to formulate action items to improve and/or sustain Gen Ed competencies.

May Action items finalized with plans for implementation in Fall 2017 and additional consulting with Faculty Commons for Best Practices/Pedagogical Support (if requested by departments).

Chairs notify all departmental faculty of action items for Fall 2017 implementation.

**FALL 2017–SPRING 2018**

Implementation of improvement plan.

**FALL 2018**

Full-scale data collection to re-assess Gen Ed competency.
Writing
## Writing Rubric
(Modified from AAC&U VALUE Rubric)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>No Proficiency</th>
<th>Some Proficiency</th>
<th>Proficiency</th>
<th>High Proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context and Purpose for Writing</strong> (includes consideration of audience &amp; circumstances surrounding the task)</td>
<td>Minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned task(s).</td>
<td>Some evidence of awareness of context, audience, purpose, and the assigned task(s); begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions.</td>
<td>Adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose with a focus on the assigned task(s).</td>
<td>Thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Format</strong></td>
<td>Does not adhere to standardized format (APA, MLA, etc.) or given instructions; no sense of introduction, body, conclusion; does not contain all sections required; handwritten/sloppy in appearance.</td>
<td>Minimally follows the standardized format or given instructions; some sense of organization and structure; contains all sections, but the content within each section is not appropriate.</td>
<td>Mostly follows the standardized format or given instructions; contains all sections, whose content is generally correct with only occasional lapses; minor edits are required.</td>
<td>Accurately follows the standardized format or given instructions; all sections are present and clearly labeled; each section contains all of the appropriate information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language</strong></td>
<td>Numerous errors in spelling, grammar, verb tense and punctuation; no paragraphs, numerous fragmented sentences; extremely limited vocabulary; use of language impedes meaning because of errors in usage.</td>
<td>Several instances of grammatical errors and demonstrates a lack of editing; sentence structure is simplistic, little variety; although there are errors, uses language that conveys meaning to readers.</td>
<td>Few errors in spelling, grammar, verb tense and punctuation; sentence structure (subject and predicate) is generally correct although still simplistic and occasionally repetitive; generally straightforward language that conveys meaning to the readers.</td>
<td>Very few errors in sentence structure and mechanics; exhibits good to excellent command of language and professional terminology; sentences are complex and vocabulary is sophisticated; skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td>Does not articulate thoughts or ideas; organization of the document is not clear enough for reader to follow arguments; lacks focus and fluency in writing.</td>
<td>Thoughts are expressed using vague language; attempts to convey main ideas of the paper but lacks focus and fluency; overall document is somewhat confusing.</td>
<td>Thoughts are organized and the main ideas are exposed, but some connections are not clearly supported by the written text; topic presented (or proof if applicable) is clear, with very minor lapses.</td>
<td>Thoughts are carefully organized and allows reader to easily follow all of the arguments; no lapses in logic or clarity; thoughts are clearly expressed with focus and fluency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis/Synthesis</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates little understanding of what the important data/content that should be presented; comments, if present, are superficial or not related to the main topic discussed, does not identify significant professional standard findings; analysis of important points (or data) is lacking.</td>
<td>Statement of important results/content is incomplete; some personal comments are present but not particularly relevant for the discussion; identifies the critical elements but does not demonstrate an accurate comprehension of the concept; analysis of important points (or data) is incomplete and incomprehensible.</td>
<td>Statement of the important results are clear and complete but may include too much information or information that is not relevant; analysis of important points (or data) is well thought out but lacks a few important points; relevant comments or real world connections are included.</td>
<td>Successfully performed a thorough analysis; all important results/arguments are clearly identified and motivated; presence of significant personal comments and observations prove a real understanding of the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting Evidence</strong></td>
<td>Does not attempt to use sources to support ideas in the writing, or provides inappropriate sources.</td>
<td>Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing.</td>
<td>Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are situated within the discipline and genre of the writing.</td>
<td>Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assignment Worksheet for Writing

Name: __________________________  Department: ______________________________

1. Please describe the assignment you plan to use with the General Education assessment.

____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

2. Please review the assignment and verify the assignment addresses the performance criteria by checking the box on the right.

   1. Context and Purpose of Writing  
   2. Format  
   3. Language  
   4. Communication  
   5. Analysis/Synthesis  
   6. Supporting Evidence
Content Validity for Writing

Reviewer Name: ________________________ Reviewer Department: __________________________

Department Assignment Sample: ____________________________________________________________

Instructions: Please read over your assignment carefully and familiarize yourself with the City Tech Writing Rubric. Please document how the assignment (and instructions) will cover each of the following Performance Criteria:

Context and Purpose of Writing

____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________

Format

____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________

Language

____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________

Communication

____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________

Analysis/Synthesis

____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________

Supporting Evidence

____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
Detailed Timeline: Writing

Assessment Planning 2016-17 to 2018-19

**Spring 2016**

April  Meeting with AIR to discuss assessment.

May  Department chairs select courses to be assessed.

**Fall 2016**

Nov/Dec  Final Assignment loaded to S drive.

  - Full-scale data collection begins.
  - Assignments given to students in participating courses.
  - Student assignments are scored using revised rubric.

Dec 23rd  Due Date: Student work scored using TK20

  - 3 copies of student work uploaded to TK20

**Spring 2017**

Jan 30th  Gen. Ed. Assessment results received from AIR.

February  Report results to General Education Committee and department chairs.

April  Departments discuss Fall 2016 results and consult with Faculty Commons for support to formulate action items to improve and/or sustain Gen Ed competencies.

May  Action items finalized with plans for implementation in Fall 2017 and additional consulting with Faculty Commons for Best Practices/Pedagogical Support (if requested by departments).

  - Chairs notify all departmental faculty of action items for Fall 2017 implementation.

  - Chairs select courses for Gen Ed assessment for Fall 2017 and notify AIR.
**Fall 2017 – Spring 2019**

Implementation of improvement plan.

**Fall 2019**

Full scale data collection to re-assess Gen Ed competency.