



Guide for Assessment of General Education Courses and Assessment Review Process

Expectations and Instructions



General Education Course Recertification

BACKGROUND: Since its inception in 2010, the General Education Committee has been charged with: (1) establishing the definition, criteria, and learning outcomes for the general education curriculum, (2) approving courses that can satisfy general education requirements, and (3) facilitating on-going review and assessment of student learning outcomes and their relevance, and modification of the general education curriculum. ***To fulfill this founding charge, the General Education Committee requires that all existing General Education courses are regularly assessed, and remain aligned with expectations/criteria as articulated by the General Education committee.*** This assessment and review process has several goals:

- To ensure General Education courses remain broadly focused and serve students from a wide variety of backgrounds and interests
- To encourage and promote promising teaching and learning practices that might be scaled to other General Education courses
- To ensure courses are regularly offered
- To ensure evidence that General Education student learning outcomes are continuously assessed
- To identify ongoing needs for professional development

Expectations/Criteria for General Education Courses

- The course must be in the Course Inventory Management (CIM) system and approved by the General Education Committee according to the process outlined [here](#)
- General Education courses should provide exposure to issues, ideas, and methods across broad areas of inquiry
 - Courses are not appropriate for General Education if the primary purpose is to predominately serve academic majors in the offering discipline or college.
- Course are regularly offered
- Evidence must be provided of continuous assessment of the appropriate General Education student learning outcomes
- Courses must remain aligned with General Education student learning outcomes

Assessment Options for Units : Units must provide evidence of continuous assessment of General Education program outcomes. Continuous is defined for this purpose as assessment of appropriate outcomes during every semester in which the course is offered. Evidence of continuous assessment can be accomplished in one of two ways:

- Method 1: Assessing Outcomes in Canvas using a standard rubric developed by the General Education Committee
 - ***This is the easiest approach, and requires completion of a more limited General Education assessment reflection, rather than a complete assessment report*** ([see appendix A](#))

- Send this to unogenerated@unomaha.edu or mtracy@unomaah.edu by **May 10th** of the academic year for which the course is on the assessment cycle
 - Units electing to use this option must ensure the majority of sections assess students utilizing Canvas and embedded common rubrics ([See appendix C](#) for example rubrics)
 - Note: to use this option, courses must be assessed in Canvas using common rubrics)
- Method 2: Traditional method that requires completion of a full General Education assessment report.
 - Submit the following information to the General Education Committee at unogenerated@unomaha.edu or mtracy@unomaha.edu. by **May 10th** of the academic year for which the course is on the assessment cycle
 - A completed General Education Assessment Reporting Form ([see appendix B](#))
 - Examples, if used, of any rubrics used to assess General Education student learning outcomes

OUTCOMES OF ASSESSMENT REVIEW: The General Education Committee will review the status of course level assessment for existing General Education courses, and also review alignment of courses with the criteria previously outlined. There are four potential outcomes of this review that will be communicated with units by Oct 31st of the fall semester following submission of their assessment materials:

- Re-approval for 3 years, or until the next assessment cycle
- Provisional approval pending satisfactory revisions of minor issues or details
- One year probation for courses that do not meet stated criteria
 - Courses still not meeting expectations after a one-year probation may be removed from the General Education curriculum

Steps to Gen Ed Assessment

- 1. Review the General Education Assessment Guide**
- 2. Review the course syllabus in [CIM](#)**
 - This can have important information on assessment that was included when the course was proposed for inclusion in the Gen Ed curriculum.
- 3. Understand which [student learning outcomes](#) you need to assess.**
 - Units must assess all outcomes for their General Education courses
- 4. Determine which course sections you need to assess**
 - While not every section of each course will necessarily be involved in the sampling, the data gathered should be a reasonable representation of all sections, students, and faculty. Data should be collected each time a course is offered. Data do not need to be collected on every student, but should be collected on enough students that analyses yield useful results.
- 5. Determine which approach the course/unit will use to meet General Education assessment requirements**
 - Method 1: Assessing Outcomes in Canvas using a standard rubric developed by the General Education Committee. At least half of the students in a given course will need to be assessed in Canvas to use this approach. This approach will only require submission of a more limited assessment reflection to the General Education committee.
 - Method 2: Traditional approach where data is collected in various ways across all sections and then consolidated manually by a unit coordinator. This approach will require the completion of a full assessment report to be submitted to the General Education committee.
- 6. Identify which course concepts are related to the relevant general education SLOs**
 - Again, it might be helpful to review the course syllabus in CIM which likely includes some of this information.
- 7. Determine how you are already measuring student performance / achievement related to these concepts and whether this is sufficient for assessment of student learning outcomes**
 - Existing measures might include specific test questions, components of lab exercises, presentations, etc which can be used to collect assessment data for each of the relevant student learning outcomes.
- 8. If not using rubrics provided by the General Education committee and assessing students in Canvas, units will need to determine proficiency definitions and scoring criteria for each of your assessment measures**
 - These should be clearly articulated and consistently applied. This is particularly important for courses that have multiple sections with different instructors.
- 9. Administer the assessment tool(s) (eg. exam questions, lab, etc) as appropriate for each SLO and record results**
 - Instructors should administer the assessment tool, and data should be compiled and reported using the format specified in the Gen Ed Assessment Guide and existing report template:
<http://www.unomaha.edu/general-education/assessment/index.php>
- 10. Review and discuss the data as a unit to determine what action can be taken to improve student learning**
 - Consider exploring differences in the abilities of students to meet the various general education student learning outcomes (eg. 90% of students sampled met/exceeded proficiency score for SLO #1, but only 25% of students met/exceeded proficiency score for SLO #4). Consider evaluating student performance relative to SLOs across different delivery methods (eg. inclass, online, day/night, etc.). Also consider including information on the process within the unit for reviewing and sharing assessment results with faculty.

Frequently Asked Questions about General Education Assessment

Why is there a requirement to do General Education assessment?

There are many valuable reasons to undertake assessment efforts that help our students and our institution. First, assessment can provide important feedback to faculty that can inform teaching practices and drive improvements to the broader General Education curriculum. Second, assessment supports, highlights, and celebrates ongoing and creative efforts of our faculty which can be shared across the campus to improve student learning and outcomes. Third, assessment can bring together faculty from a variety of disciplines using a common language to discuss the General Education program. Fourth, assessment will address demands for accountability and transparency from a variety of groups including parents, legislators, and accrediting bodies.

What is the difference between grades and assessment?

Assessment should evaluate student proficiency in meeting well-defined student learning outcomes, while grades often include other behaviors and/or activities such as participation, improvement, etc. and are not focused exclusively on specific learning outcomes. Assessment can relate to course grades in that multiple assessments can be assembled to assign a grade.

How is General Education assessment in my unit different than “End of Program SLO Assessment”?

End of program SLO assessment is an ongoing process in units to measure student learning at the degree level (eg. how well graduates are meeting program outcomes in a particular academic major). Course level assessment measures incremental skills that are aligned with, but typically more narrow than program outcomes. General Education assessment in your units takes place at the course level and should address how well students in your specific course, or courses, perform in meeting the existing General Education student learning outcomes.

What happens to the information we provide the Gen Ed Committee?

The Gen Ed Committee will review your reports and provide feedback to your unit in the fall. The committee will also aggregate data from different units, review alignment of courses with student learning outcomes, and evaluate the overall effectiveness of the General Education program in meeting its stated goals and provide this feedback to the University Assessment Committee. It's important to remember that assessment does not need to be perfect...in fact it will probably be a little (or a lot) ugly the first few times. Focus on small manageable steps to improve your Gen Ed courses and your assessment process, and begin dialogue with your units about your Gen Ed courses and their contribution to the broader program

Which SLO's should be measured and assessed in each General Education Area?

The SLO's for each general education area have been determined by the UNO General Education Committee and all are examined as part of the regular assessment cycle. A particular course should measure all general education SLOs for the general education area (eg. Fundamental Academic Skills, Distribution, or Diversity) it is associated with (eg. all SLOs for the social science distribution requirement).

How is student performance on the SLOs measured?

Measures should be aligned with the General Education SLOs, and direct measures should be used. Examples of *direct* measures include samples of student work (e.g., exam, essay, portfolio, paper) and observations of skills or creative activity (e.g., speech, presentation, theatre performance). Examples of *indirect* measures include student self-assessments (e.g., student surveys about what or how much they have learned, course evaluations) or feedback from community partners on the preparedness of

graduates for the work force. Both types of measures can provide useful data. Academic units have flexibility in determining assessment mechanisms that best capture the content of the SLOs. In many cases, it may be possible to employ an assessment mechanism that is already in use. Additional examples of direct measures include evaluations in any/all of the following domains:

- **Examination:** includes standardized tests or qualifying exams, content exams, pre- and post- test comparisons, oral defenses, comprehensive exams, exit exams, etc.
- **Product:** includes refereed student portfolios, theses, publications, capstone projects, original creative works, software, apps or programs, etc.
- **Performance:** includes presentations, recitals, exhibits, speeches, demonstrations, field experiences, internships, etc.

What/how, much data should be collected and reported?

Results (data) should be sufficient for meaningful analysis and collected for each course. While not every section of each course will necessarily be involved in the sampling, the data gathered should be a reasonable representation of all sections, students and faculty. Data should be collected every time a course is offered, regardless of when assessment reports are due to the General Education committee. Data does not need to be collected on every student, but should be collected on enough students that analyses yield useful results.

How should the unit/program use the results to inform decisions and actions?

The unit/program should review the results and develop action steps as needed based on the review. Data-informed decisions and actions taken should be documented. Consider exploring differences in the abilities of students to meet the various general education student-learning outcomes (e.g. 90% of students sampled met/exceeded proficiency score for SLO #1, but only 25% of students met/exceeded proficiency score for SLO #4). Consider evaluating student performance relative to SLOs across different delivery methods (e.g. in- class, online, etc.).

**APPENDIX A: GENERAL EDUCATION ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE IF USING THE GENERAL EDUCATION COMMON RUBRIC
IN CANVAS**

(This template can only be used if general education outcomes are assessed for the majority of students in a course using Canvas and the embedded General Education common assessment rubric)

1. Course prefix and number:

2. Summarize how assignments evaluated for purposes of general education assessment are aligned to each relevant general education student learning outcome.

3. Provide a short reflection of what the assessment data collected in Canvas tell you about student achievement of outcomes and performance in the course, and explain any specific decisions and actions your unit has taken, or will take, related to these findings.
 - a. Possible considerations include: Is student performance significantly different based on demographic characteristics such as race, gender, or ethnicity? Is student performance different in online vs. on-campus sections? Does performance vary significantly based on the class year of the student? Does student performance in meeting the general education outcome correlate with final class grades?

APPENDIX B: GENERAL EDUCATION ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE IF NOT COMPLETING ASSESSMENT IN CANVAS WITH COMMON RUBRIC

EXAMPLE GENERAL EDUCATION ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Course (Please Identify the course): e.g. PHYSICS 1000

I. Assessment Methods (Examples only provided for SLO 1)

Complete a table for each general education SLO. If SLOs are assessed by more than one measure, complete tables for each measure used to assess the SLO.

| GEN ED SLO #1: Indicate which Gen Ed SLO will be assessed | |
|--|---|
| A. Title of Measure | <i>e.g. Term Paper</i> |
| B. Alignment of Measure <i>Describe how measure aligns to the SLO</i> | <i>e.g. This paper requires students to explain how socio-cultural, psycho-social, and philosophical perspectives account for the formation and development of their character and personality.</i> |
| C. Domain of Measure <i>Check all that apply</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Exam <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Product <input type="checkbox"/> Performance |
| D. Type of Measure <i>Check all that apply</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Direct (e.g. exam, presentation) <input type="checkbox"/> Indirect (e.g. self-assessment, course evaluation) |
| E. Measurement Tool <i>Check all that apply and attach rubrics where appropriate</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Subset of questions on exam <input type="checkbox"/> Exam <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Product evaluated w/rubric <input type="checkbox"/> Product evaluated w/o rubric <input type="checkbox"/> Performance evaluated w/rubric <input type="checkbox"/> Performance evaluated w/o rubric <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe): |
| F. Population of Students Assessed | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All students in a course <input type="checkbox"/> Sample of students – Describe below |
| G. Frequency of Data Collection | <input type="checkbox"/> Every semester <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Every academic year <input type="checkbox"/> Other – Describe below |
| H. Proficiency threshold <i>(e.g. the score which determines if an individual student has met the outcome)</i> | <i>Describe: e.g. Student must achieve a 2 or a 3 on the assignment based on a faculty developed rubric</i> |
| I. SLO Proficiency Target <i>(e.g. percentage of students who must meet/exceed proficiency target for the course to meet the SLO)</i> | <i>Describe: e.g. at least 80% of all students assessed will meet or exceed the proficiency threshold noted above.</i> |

GEN ED SLO #2:

| | |
|---|--|
| GEN ED SLO #2: | |
| A. Title of Measure | |
| B. Alignment of Measure <i>Describe how measure aligns to the SLO</i> | |
| C. Domain of Measure <i>Check all that apply</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Exam <input type="checkbox"/> Product <input type="checkbox"/> Performance |
| D. Type of Measure <i>Check all that apply</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Direct <input type="checkbox"/> Indirect |
| E. Measurement Tool <i>Check all that apply and attach rubrics where appropriate</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Subset of questions on exam <input type="checkbox"/> Exam <input type="checkbox"/> Product evaluated w/rubric <input type="checkbox"/> Product evaluated w/o rubric <input type="checkbox"/> Performance evaluated w/rubric <input type="checkbox"/> Performance evaluated w/o rubric <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe): |
| F. Population of Students Assessed | <input type="checkbox"/> All students in a course <input type="checkbox"/> Sample of students – Describe below |
| G. Frequency of Data Collection | <input type="checkbox"/> Every semester <input type="checkbox"/> Every academic year <input type="checkbox"/> Other – Describe below: |
| H. Proficiency Threshold (e.g. the score which determines if an individual student has met the outcome) | Describe: |
| I. SLO Proficiency Target (e.g. percentage of students who must meet/exceed proficiency target for the course to meet the SLO) | Describe: |

GEN ED SLO #3 (if necessary):

| | |
|---|--|
| GEN ED SLO #3 (if necessary): | |
| A. Title of Measure | |
| B. Alignment of Measure <i>Describe how measure aligns to the SLO</i> | |
| C. Domain of Measure <i>Check all that apply</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Exam <input type="checkbox"/> Product <input type="checkbox"/> Performance |
| D. Type of Measure <i>Check all that apply</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Direct <input type="checkbox"/> Indirect |
| E. Measurement Tool <i>Check all that apply and attach rubrics where appropriate</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Subset of questions on exam <input type="checkbox"/> Exam <input type="checkbox"/> Product evaluated w/rubric <input type="checkbox"/> Product evaluated w/o rubric <input type="checkbox"/> Performance evaluated w/rubric <input type="checkbox"/> Performance evaluated w/o rubric <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe): |
| F. Population of Students Assessed | <input type="checkbox"/> All students in a course <input type="checkbox"/> Sample of students – Describe below |
| G. Frequency of Data Collection | <input type="checkbox"/> Every semester <input type="checkbox"/> Every academic year <input type="checkbox"/> Other – Describe below: |
| H. Proficiency Threshold (e.g. the score which determines if an individual student has met the outcome) | Describe: |
| I. SLO Proficiency Target (e.g. percentage of students who must meet/exceed proficiency target for the course to meet the SLO) | Describe: |

GEN ED SLO #4 (if necessary):

| | |
|---|--|
| GEN ED SLO #4 (if necessary): | |
| A. Title of Measure | |
| B. Alignment of Measure <i>Describe how measure aligns to the SLO</i> | |
| C. Domain of Measure <i>Check all that apply</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Exam <input type="checkbox"/> Product <input type="checkbox"/> Performance |
| D. Type of Measure <i>Check all that apply</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Direct <input type="checkbox"/> Indirect |
| E. Measurement Tool <i>Check all that apply and attach rubrics where appropriate</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> Subset of questions on exam <input type="checkbox"/> Exam <input type="checkbox"/> Product evaluated w/rubric <input type="checkbox"/> Product evaluated w/o rubric <input type="checkbox"/> Performance evaluated w/rubric <input type="checkbox"/> Performance evaluated w/o rubric <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe): |
| F. Population of Students Assessed | <input type="checkbox"/> All students in a course <input type="checkbox"/> Sample of students – Describe below |
| G. Frequency of Data Collection | <input type="checkbox"/> Every semester <input type="checkbox"/> Every academic year <input type="checkbox"/> Other – Describe below: |
| H. Proficiency Threshold (e.g. the score which determines if an individual student has met the outcome) | Describe: |
| I. SLO Proficiency Target (e.g. percentage of students who must meet/exceed proficiency target for the course to meet the SLO) | Describe: |

II. Data Collection and Analysis (Samples only provided for SLO 1)

A: Results Table – Report results for each SLO. If an SLO was assessed by multiple measures, report data for each measure. Add rows as needed to accommodate the number of SLOs and measures.

| | Data Collection Date Range | Number of Students Assessed | Percentage of Students who Met/Exceeded Threshold Proficiency |
|---|----------------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| SLO 1 – Measure one | Fall 2018 – Fall 2020 | 120 | 86% |
| SLO 1 – Measure two <i>(if applicable)</i> | | | |
| SLO 2 – Measure one | | | |
| SLO 2 – Measure two <i>(if applicable)</i> | | | |
| SLO 3 – Measure one | | | |
| SLO 3 – Measure two <i>(if applicable)</i> | | | |
| SLO 4 – Measure one | | | |
| SLO 4 – Measure two <i>(if applicable)</i> | | | |

B: SLO Status Table

Based on the results reported in the above table, indicate the status of Gen Ed SLOs as Met, Partially Met, Not Met, or Unknown for your course.

| | | | | |
|-------|---|--|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| SLO 1 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Met | <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Met | <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met | <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown |
| SLO 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> Met | <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Met | <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met | <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown |
| SLO 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> Met | <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Met | <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met | <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown |
| SLO 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> Met | <input type="checkbox"/> Partially Met | <input type="checkbox"/> Not Met | <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown |

C: Describe how results are communicated within the unit.

SLO 1: Research paper grades (rubric scores) are routinely shared between faculty members who teach the course. These faculty members meet at the end of each academic year to review the data and summarize their discussion at a committee meeting.

III. Decisions and Actions

Briefly describe decisions and actions related to these SLOs. Include the decision making process to include who made the decision, when was the decision made, what data informed the decision, and a timeline for actions taken or to be taken.

SLO 1: At the May 2019 department retreat, faculty discussed the results of the term paper. Based on overall results, the SLO was met by the majority of students. However, faculty indicated that students failed to fully incorporate appropriate philosophical perspectives in their papers. A small committee was subsequently formed to develop strategies to address this shortfall. The team's recommendations will be presented at the 2020 department retreat.

Humanities/Fine Arts Assessment Rubric

Outcome(s): Show a broad understanding of the theories, perspectives and methods of the Humanities and Fine Arts by:

- *Demonstrating knowledge of the human condition using discipline appropriate criteria;*
- *Respond to the human condition using discipline specific criteria;*
- *Explaining how context (historical, cultural, etc.) influences the creation or interpretation of the topic of study*

| | Rating – 3 (Mastery) | Rating – 2 (Satisfactory) | Rating – 1 (Emerging) | Rating – 0 (Not demonstrated) |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| Demonstrate knowledge of the human condition using discipline appropriate criteria | Demonstrates thorough knowledge of the major figure(s)/artist(s)/writer(s)/ concepts/ideas in the area of study. Articulates insightful, specific reasons for their importance. | Demonstrates sufficient knowledge of figure(s)/artist(s)/ writer(s)/concepts/ideas in the area of study. Usually makes direct reference to and provides clear information, though occasionally lacking in detail or accuracy | Demonstrates superficial knowledge of the figure(s)/artist(s)/ writer(s)/concepts/ideas in the area of study. Information is more general in nature, often lacking in detail or accuracy | Demonstrates little or no knowledge of the figure(s)/artist(s)/ writer(s)/concepts/ideas in the area of study. Provides information that is not relevant or accurate. |
| Evaluate the human condition using discipline specific criteria | Demonstrates thorough ability to critique or evaluate key figure(s)/artist(s)/ writer(s)/concepts in an area of study using appropriate methods | Demonstrates sufficient ability to critique or evaluate key figure(s)/artist(s)/ writer(s)/concepts in an area of study using appropriate methods | Demonstrates superficial ability to critique or evaluate key figure(s)/artist(s)/ writer(s)/concepts in an area of study using appropriate methods | Demonstrates little or no ability to critique or evaluate key figure(s)/artist(s)/ writer(s)/concepts in an area of study using appropriate methods |
| Explain how context influences the creation or interpretation of the topic of study | Clearly and completely explains how context influences the issue being studied. Provides well-detailed, accurate, and relevant information. | Clearly and completely explains how context influences the issue being studied, though information occasionally lacks detail or accuracy. | Demonstrated superficial ability to explain how context influences the issue being studied. Information provided is general in nature, and often lacks detail or accuracy. | Demonstrates little to no ability to explain how context influences the issue being studied. Information provided is not relevant or accurate. |

Social Sciences Assessment Rubric

Outcome(s): Demonstrate broad understanding of the theories, perspectives, and/or issues of the social sciences by:

- *Describing signature ideas, concepts, theories, or perspectives using the language of the discipline;*
- *Analyzing Implications, conclusions, or consequences of a particular issue relevant to the discipline*
- *Evaluating evidence of truth-claims;*

| | Rating – 3 (Mastery) | Rating – 2 (Satisfactory) | Rating – 1 (Emerging) | Rating – 0 (Not Demonstrated) |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| Describes signature theories, perspectives, or issues | Thoroughly describes relevant signature theories, perspectives, or issues in the discipline | Sufficiently describes relevant signature theories, perspectives, or issues in the discipline | Superficially describes relevant signature theories, perspectives, or issues in the discipline | Does not describe relevant signature theories, perspectives, or issues in the discipline |
| Analyzes implications | Thoroughly analyzes implications, conclusions, or consequences of the theory, perspective, or issue by providing exacting detail and depth | Sufficiently analyzes the implications, conclusions, or consequences of the theory, perspective, or issue providing adequate detail and depth | Superficially analyzes the implications, conclusions, or consequences of the theory, perspective, or issue with few details or depth. | Fails to analyze implications, conclusions, or consequences of the theory, perspective, or issue |
| Evaluates evidence of truth claims | Identifies all important evidence and rigorously evaluates it, but also provides new information for consideration | Identifies all important evidence for truth-claims and rigorously evaluates its credibility. | Successfully identifies data and information that counts as evidence for truth-claims but fails to thoroughly evaluate its credibility | Fails to identify data and information that counts as evidence for truth-claims. |

Natural & Physical Sciences Assessment Rubric

Outcome(s): Demonstrate a broad understanding of scientific inquiry by:

- *Identifying key elements of scientific inquiry relative to a problem in the natural world*
- *Solving problems based on scientific data, information, or models*
- *Evaluating conclusions*

| | Rating – 3 (Mastery) | Rating – 2 (Satisfactory) | Rating – 1 (Emerging) | Rating – 0 (Not Demonstrated) |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| Identifies key elements of scientific inquiry relative to problem | 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 sub disciplines. | Critical elements of the methodology or theoretical framework are appropriately developed, however, more subtle elements are ignored or unaccounted for. | Critical elements of the methodology or theoretical framework are included, but are incorrectly developed, or unfocused. | Inquiry demonstrates a misunderstanding of the methodology or theoretical framework. |
| Solves problems based on data, information, or models | Organizes and synthesizes evidence to reveal insightful patterns, differences, or similarities related to the problem under investigation. Demonstrates elegant ability to reason by deduction, induction, or analogy. | Organizes evidence to reveal important patterns, differences, or similarities related to the problem under investigation. Demonstrates appropriate ability to reason by deduction, induction, or analogy | Organizes evidence, but the organization is not effective in revealing important patterns, differences, or similarities. Demonstrates limited ability to reason by deduction, induction, or analogy | Lists evidence, but it is not organized and/or is unrelated to the problem under investigation. Demonstrates no ability to reason by deduction, induction, or analogy |
| Evaluate conclusions, limitations, and/or implications | States a conclusion that is a logical extrapolation from the inquiry findings, limitations and implications. Demonstrates advanced ability to distinguish between causal and correlational relationships. | States a conclusion focused solely on the inquiry findings. The conclusion arises specifically from and responds specifically to the inquiry findings limitations and implications. Demonstrates appropriate ability to distinguish between causal and correlational relationships. | States a general conclusion that, because it is so general, also applies beyond the scope of the inquiry findings limitations and implications. Demonstrates limited ability to distinguish between causal and correlational relationships. | States an ambiguous, illogical, or unsupportable conclusion from inquiry findings limitations and implications. Demonstrates no ability to distinguish between causal and correlational relationships. |

U.S. Diversity Assessment Rubric

Outcome(s): Demonstrate an informed and attentive knowledge of global diversity across the spectrum of differences by:

- *Demonstrating specific knowledge of the cultural, historical, social, economic, and/or political aspects of one or more diverse/underrepresented groups in the United States;*
- *Explaining/describing the implications or consequences of these characteristics upon the development of the United States*

| | Rating – 3 (Mastery) | Rating – 2 (Satisfactory) | Rating – 1 (Emerging) | Rating – 0 (Not Demonstrated) |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| Demonstrate specific knowledge | Demonstrates exemplary knowledge of significant socio-economic, historical, cultural, or political aspects of one or more diverse/underrepresented groups in the United States | Demonstrates adequate knowledge of significant socio-economic, historical, cultural, or political aspects of one or more diverse/underrepresented groups in the United States | Demonstrates superficial knowledge of significant socio-economic, historical, cultural, or political aspects of one or more diverse/underrepresented groups in the United States | Demonstrates little to no knowledge of significant social, economic, historical, cultural, or political aspects of one or more diverse/underrepresented groups in the United States |
| Implications to human endeavors | Demonstrates exemplary ability to articulate the implications/impact of diverse groups in the United States | Demonstrates adequate ability to articulate the implications/impact of diverse groups in the United States | Demonstrates superficial ability to articulate the implications/impact of diverse groups in the United States | Demonstrates little to no ability to articulate the implications/impact of diverse groups in the United States |

Global Diversity Assessment Rubric

Outcome(s): Demonstrate an informed and attentive knowledge of global diversity across the spectrum of differences by:

- *Demonstrating specific knowledge of the cultural, historical, social, economic, and/or political aspects of one or more countries or nations other than the United States;*
- *Explaining/describing the implications or consequences of these characteristics to human endeavors*

| | Rating – 3 (Mastery) | Rating – 2 (Satisfactory) | Rating – 1 (Emerging) | Rating – 0 (Not Demonstrated) |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| Demonstrate specific knowledge | Demonstrates exemplary knowledge of significant socio-economic, historical, cultural, or political aspects of countries or nations outside the United States | Demonstrates adequate knowledge of significant socio-economic, historical, cultural, or political aspects of countries or nations outside the United States | Demonstrates superficial knowledge of significant socio-economic, historical, cultural, or political aspects of countries or nations outside the United States | Demonstrates little to no knowledge of significant social, economic, historical, cultural, or political aspects of countries or nations outside the United States |
| Implications to human endeavors | Demonstrates exemplary ability to articulate the implications/impact of diverse groups in one or more countries other than the United States | Demonstrates adequate ability to articulate the implications/impact of diverse groups in one or more countries other than the United States | Demonstrates superficial ability to articulate the implications/impact of diverse groups in one or more countries other than the United States | Demonstrates little to no ability to articulate the implications/impact of diverse groups in one or more countries other than the United States |

