<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubrics</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A Rubric-less Assignment

“Some people think schools do not encourage students to be creative. Why do you suppose the critics of schools take that position? Locate some sources arguing for or against that view and analyze what they say. (Be sure to cite your sources properly.) Finally, think about your own schooling and whether it was creative or not” (White, 77).
A Rubric to the Rescue!

- These papers will demonstrate an ability to construct and develop an argument in response to several articles from a professional journal. Specifically, they will
  - Clearly and fairly **summarize** the articles on a controversial topic.
  - **Analyze** the argument of the articles to demonstrate their strengths and weaknesses.
  - **Respond** to the articles by showing how and why the writer of the paper differs from the views expressed in the article.
  - **Develop** the views of the writer of the paper in an organized way, using personal experience and other sources, to demonstrate a conclusion. (White, 79-80)
What is a rubric?

- A scoring or evaluation tool
- A means of describing student performances at various levels
But what is it really?

“Ultimately, our rubric is the very best of our collective professional and intellectual selves at this little point in time, in our small spot on the planet. It is the finest description of what we think is important for our students, right now, in the service of their learning.

Most importantly, it is a statement of our mutual commitment to be guided by the highest and most carefully considered values in our professional practice. It is what we promise to teach.” (Griffin 10).
Types of Rubrics

- **Analytic**
  - Categorizes levels of performance by traits/parts

- **Generic**
  - Describes a general performance
    - Reading Responses
    - Critical Thinking
    - Class Participation

- **Holistic**
  - Categorizes levels of performance as a whole

- **Task-specific**
  - Describes a performance specific to a single task
    - Essay on a specific topic, such as a book or film
    - Genre such as a proposal
    - Portfolio
Holistic, Generic Rubric

Generic Rubric for Summary Writing Using Holistic Method

Explanation: A summary should be directed toward imagined readers who have not read the article being summarized. The purpose of the summary is to give these persons a clear overview of the article's main points. The criteria for a summary are (1) accuracy of content, (2) comprehensiveness and balance, and (3) clarity, readability, and grammatical correctness.

Rubric

6 A 6 summary meets all the criteria. The writer understands the article thoroughly. The main points in the article appear in the summary with all main points proportionately developed (that is, the writer does not spend excessive time on one main point while neglecting other main points). The summary should be as comprehensive as possible and should read smoothly, with appropriate transitions between ideas. Sentences should be clear, without vagueness or ambiguity and without grammatical or mechanical errors.

5 A 5 summary should still be very good, but it can be weaker than a 6 summary in one area. It may have excellent accuracy and balance but show occasional problems in sentence structure or correctness. Or it may be clearly written but be somewhat unbalanced or less comprehensive than a 6 summary or show a minor misunderstanding of the article.

4 A score of 4 means good but not excellent. Typically, a 4 summary will reveal a generally accurate reading of the article, but it will be noticeably weaker in the quality of writing. Or it may be well written but cover only part of the essay.

3 A 3 summary must have strength in at least one area of competence, and it should still be good enough to convince the grader that the writer has understood the article fairly well. However, a 3 summary typically is not written well enough to convey an understanding of the article to someone who has not already read it. Typically, the sentence structure of a 3 summary is not sophisticated enough to convey the sense of hierarchy and subordination found in the essay.
## Analytic, Task-Specific Rubric

### Scoring Guide Rubric for Film Presentations

**Task Description:** Each student will develop an hour-long presentation on a Japanese or American movie about World War II designed to acquaint the class more fully with the theoretical, historical, and interpretive issues surrounding the film. Clips or other audio-visual aids may be used, but guard against overusing these items; remember that we have all seen the movie once.

**Film:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td>The introduction tells the audience exactly what to expect in terms of how the speaker feels about the movie, what theories and theoretical framework(s) she or he will introduce and what conclusions she or he will draw.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td>The presentation is organized to create a logical argument and so that topics that need to be discussed together are presented together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
<td>The presenter discusses the main historical issues raised by the film and how other film scholars and historians have dealt with these issues both with regard to this film and in general. The presenter explains where he or she stands on these issues, which theories he or she finds most useful, and why.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence</strong></td>
<td>The presenter includes sufficient, detailed examples from the film and other sources to support her or his analyses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis</strong></td>
<td>The presenter uses her or his evidence to support a consistent, coherent analysis of how the film does or does not contribute to our understanding of World War II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentation</strong></td>
<td>The presenter spoke clearly, slowly, loudly enough to be heard, but not too loudly; used appropriate, effective gestures and body language; and maintained eye contact with the class. Audio-visual aids, if used, are technically sound (to prevent fumbling with equipment), appropriate, and referenced in the presentation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rubric for Conducting an Experiment in the Lab
Task Description: Conduct the assigned lab using the procedures and methods described below. Turn in your laboratory report at the beginning of the next class period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Needs Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>All materials needed are present and entered on the lab report. The materials are appropriate for the procedure. The student is not wasteful of the materials.</td>
<td>All materials needed are present, but not all are entered on the lab report, or some materials are absent and must be obtained during the procedure. The materials are appropriate for the procedure.</td>
<td>All materials needed are not present and are not entered on the lab report. The materials are not all appropriate for the procedure or there are some major omissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>The procedure is well designed and allows control of all variables selected. All stages of the procedure are entered on the lab report.</td>
<td>The procedure could be more efficiently designed, but it allows control of all variables selected. Most stages of the procedure are entered on the lab report.</td>
<td>The procedure does not allow control of all variables selected. Many stages of the procedure are not entered on the lab report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy and safety</td>
<td>While conducting the procedure, the student is tidy, respectful of others, mindful of safety, and leaves the area clean.</td>
<td>While conducting the procedure, the student is mostly tidy, sometimes respectful of others, sometimes mindful of safety, and leaves the area clean only after being reminded.</td>
<td>While conducting the procedure, the student is untidy, not respectful of others, not mindful of safety, and leaves the area messy even after being reminded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Research question and hypothesis are stated clearly, and the relationship between the two is clear. The variables are selected.</td>
<td>Research question and hypothesis are stated, but one or both are not as clear as they might be, or the relationship between the two is unclear. The variables are selected</td>
<td>Research question and hypothesis are not stated clearly, and the relationship between the two is unclear or absent. The variables are not selected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reasons to Use Rubrics

For Instructors

- Focus on student learning (as opposed to focusing on tasks students complete)
- Can be used for formative and summative evaluation as well as program assessment
- Help ensure consistency in evaluating student work
- Save time
Reasons to Use Rubrics

For Students

- Help students understand what they are being asked to perform
- Help students to self-assess their work
- Can be used in peer-review
- Engage students in their own learning
Criticism of Rubrics

- Send the message to students that
  - there are universally agreed-on standards for good writing projects
  - expectations for writing are the same regardless of context or genre
  - grading is a precise, objective activity (Bean 277-279)

- Can make it difficult to recognize or point out students’ strengths

- Can make value judgments appear neutral
How to Make a Rubric

- **Describe the task or performance** that you want students to undertake

- **Reflect on the learning outcomes** that have led you to ask students to complete the task

- **Decide which of those learning outcomes are most important** and if they are best expressed as a group (holistic) or individually (analytic)

- **Describe different levels of performance** for those outcomes (consider starting with 3 levels)
"A rubric is a series of choices. Unfortunately, like a phone booth, it can be stuffed with only so many bodies. Some things have to be left out, because if we included everything it would have to be printed in eight-point type on a bed sheet. So we choose the things we think are most important, at least for our particular students, at this point in their lives" (Griffin 9).
A few more details

- Types of rating scales
  - Points
  - Letter grades
  - Criteria defined for each level of achievement
  - Criteria defined for excellence paired with “step down” language

- Language for describing performance levels
  - Always/usually/some of the time/rarely
  - Fully/adequately/partially/minimally
  - High/adequate/limited/very limited
  - Meets most criteria/meets some criteria/meets few criteria

- Consider asking students to help you create the rubric
Pitfalls

- **Confusing outcomes with tasks.** The assignment describes the task; the rubric focuses on the learning outcome(s) the task asks the student to demonstrate.

- **Using only an evaluative scale** (grades, points, ratings) without a descriptive scale—at least for the highest level of performance.
Put your rubric to the test

- Ask colleagues for input
- Ask students for input
- Ask a writing center director for input
- Use the rubric to evaluate a project (But make sure to give it to students when you assign the project!)
- Revise the rubric until you feel confident you are focused on key learning outcomes and you have a good sense that you are assessing those outcomes when you use the rubric
Use a rubric for your rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric part</th>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The dimensions</td>
<td>Does each dimension cover important parts of the final student performance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the dimension capture some key themes in your teaching?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are the dimensions clear?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are the dimensions distinctly different from each other?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do the dimensions represent skills that the student knows something about already (e.g., organization, analysis, using conventions)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The descriptions</td>
<td>Do the descriptions match the dimensions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are the descriptions clear and different from each other?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If you used points, is there a clear basis for assigning points for each dimension?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If using a three-to-five level rubric, are the descriptions appropriately and equally weighted across the three-to-five levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The scale</td>
<td>Do the descriptors under each level truly represent that level of performance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are the scale labels (e.g., exemplary, competent, beginning) encouraging and still quite informative without being negative and discouraging?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Consultations

- Contact me at kvalentine@mail.sdsu.edu for a consultation on developing rubrics for writing assignments.

- Depending on the writing center schedule, we can also ask tutors for input on your assignment and rubric. Early in the semester or during the summer are the times we have the most availability.
Works Cited and Consulted


- Note: The rubric examples are taken from Bean and Stevens & Levi.
Michael Rapp
School of Communication
Contact: mrapp@mail.sdsu.edu
Assessing General Education within the College of Arts and Letters

Eniko Csomay, Beth Pollard, and Suzanne Bordelon
In 2007, the SDSU General Education Task Force developed clearer goals and outcomes for the GE program. Building on these efforts, in Spring 2013 a team from the College of Arts and Letters initiated a collaborative project to develop and pilot rubrics to assess student performance levels in relation to the different GE goals.
Why Assess GE?

- To increase awareness of the significance of the GE program, which comprises more than one-third of the baccalaureate degree.
- To provide feedback to determine how the program can be improved.
- To demonstrate to students, faculty, staff, and those outside of SDSU what the program is accomplishing.
Why Use a Rubric-Based Assessment and Authentic Student Work?

- To offer insight into more local, contextual learning (as compared to commercial standard exams).
- To provide a direct measure of student learning in the GE program.
- To encourage faculty engagement in the assessment process.
- To provide faculty with information for course and program improvement.
Goals and Outcomes: Spring 2013

- **Goals:**
  1) Develop and test assessment rubrics for CAL GE courses at the lower and upper levels.

- **Outcomes:**
  1) A piloted tool [rubrics] available to anyone in CAL to assess GE goals;
  2) A pilot of an evidence-based assessment of GE.
General Education profoundly influences undergraduates by providing the breadth of knowledge necessary for meaningful work, life-long learning, socially responsible citizenship, and intellectual development. The 49-unit program . . . places specialized disciplines into a wider world, enabling students to integrate knowledge and to make connections among fields of inquiry. (2014-2015 General Catalog, p. 90)
Span all Areas of Study

1. Construct, analyze, and communicate arguments;
2. Apply theoretical models to the real world;
3. Contextualize phenomena;
4. Negotiate difference;
5. Integrate global and local perspectives;
6. Illustrate relevance of concepts across boundaries;
7. Evaluate consequences of actions.
Humanities & Fine Arts
GE Goals/Objectives

1. Analyze written, visual, or performed texts in the humanities and fine arts with sensitivity to their diverse cultural contexts and historical moments;

2. Describe various aesthetic and other value systems and the ways they are communicated across time and cultures;

3. Argue from multiple perspectives about issues in the humanities that have personal and global relevance;

4. Approach complex problems and ask complex questions drawing upon knowledge of the humanities.
Communication and Critical Thinking
GE Goals/Objectives

• Craft well-reasoned arguments for specific audiences;
• Analyze a variety of texts commonly encountered in the academic setting;
• Situate discourse within social, generic, cultural, and historical contexts;
• Assess the relative strengths of arguments and supporting evidence.
Social and Behavioral Sciences
GE Goals/Objectives

1. Explore and recognize basic terms, concepts, and domains of the social and behavioral sciences;

2. Comprehend diverse theories and methods of the social and behavioral sciences;

3. Identify human behavioral patterns across space and time, and discuss their interrelatedness and distinctiveness;

4. Apply conceptual frameworks from the social and behavioral sciences to contemporary issues.
Spring 2013: Developing and Piloting Rubrics

- Held faculty meetings during Spring Semester 2013 to create, test, and finalize rubrics assessing GE for Humanities and Fine Arts, Communication and Critical Thinking, and Social and Behavioral Sciences.
- Used the rubrics refined over the course of the semester to evaluate student work.
## Humanities and Fine Arts Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>GOAL 1</th>
<th>GOAL 2</th>
<th>GOAL 3</th>
<th>GOAL 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td><strong>Recognizes</strong> key terms and cultural contexts at a basic level.</td>
<td><strong>Identifies</strong> varying aesthetic/value systems and recognizes that they change over time.</td>
<td><strong>Articulates</strong> his/her own argument from a limited perspective (e.g., his/her own subjective experience).</td>
<td><strong>Recognizes</strong> the diversity and complexity of human problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
<td><strong>Articulates</strong> key terms and cultural contexts with some errors and limited details.</td>
<td><strong>Explores</strong> the basis for different aesthetic/value systems and how they change over time.</td>
<td><strong>Identifies</strong> the impact of subjective experience on arguments relevant to the humanities.</td>
<td><strong>Describes</strong> and questions patterns in complex human problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td><strong>Analyzes</strong> key terms in diverse contexts through presentation of sufficient details and concepts.</td>
<td><strong>Evaluates</strong> the reasons for, and impacts of, diverse aesthetic/value systems and why they change over time.</td>
<td><strong>Differentiates</strong> among various perspectives, articulating connections and differences, in order to <strong>construct an argument</strong> with sensitivity to multiple points of view.</td>
<td><strong>Articulates</strong> the complexity of a problem, begins to question and to formulate interpretations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td><strong>Synthesizes</strong> key terms in diverse contexts incorporating a complex array of details and concepts.</td>
<td><strong>Negotiates</strong> a diverse range of aesthetic/value systems in order to <strong>construct an argument</strong> about the culture- and time-bound situatedness of these systems.</td>
<td><strong>Effectively deploys</strong> various perspectives to <strong>synthesize an argument</strong> that has both personal and global relevance.</td>
<td><strong>Synthesizes and develops</strong> original insights into complex problems and <strong>formulates</strong> meaningful interpretations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL 1</td>
<td>GOAL 2</td>
<td>GOAL 3</td>
<td>GOAL 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft well-reasoned arguments for specific audiences. (Although arguments may contain characteristics of content, structure, evidence, audience awareness, and language representing more than one level of proficiency, classification should be based on the preponderance of the characteristics.)</td>
<td>Analyze a variety of texts commonly encountered in the academic setting.</td>
<td>Situate discourse within social, generic, cultural, and historical contexts.</td>
<td>Assess the relative strengths and weaknesses of arguments and supporting evidence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning</strong> (1)</td>
<td>Content: Provides a basic or largely incoherent case, focused on a single issue or no discernible issues. Structure: Organizes argument in a rudimentary or confusing fashion. Evidence: Marshals minimal support, with few quotations and specific examples from appropriate texts. Audience: Demonstrates a lack of awareness of audience. Language: Communicates in an inappropriate register or with frequent errors or distractions that obscure meaning.</td>
<td>Attempts rudimentary analysis and mentions rhetorical concepts, but primarily summarizes and paraphrases.</td>
<td>Begins to explore the relationship between texts (and the arguments they make) and contexts (whether social, generic, cultural, historical, or issue- or controversy-based).</td>
<td>Mentions arguments and evidence, but not to a clear or useful purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developing</strong> (2)</td>
<td>Content: Provides an elementary or minimal case, perhaps with significant inconsistencies, that is narrowly or over generally focused. Structure: Organizes argument in a mechanical and/or occasionally unclear fashion. Evidence: Marshals incomplete support, providing insufficient and/or mismanaged quotations and examples. Audience: Addresses a general audience or misconstrues the specific audience. Language: Communicates with frequent errors and distractions.</td>
<td>Applies concepts and models in order to support analytic passages, but relies more heavily on summary, paraphrase, and perhaps repetition.</td>
<td>Locates texts (and the arguments they make) within specific contexts, minimally addressing ways texts are shaped by and shape other variables.</td>
<td>Marshals relevant evidence, but without careful assessment or consideration of multiple positions. Careful attention to audience is absent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proficient</strong> (3)</td>
<td>Content: Presents a coherent case addressing multiple issues. Structure: Organizes argument clearly and appropriately. Evidence: Marshals sufficient support, integrating specific quotations and examples from appropriate texts into analysis of their own making. Audience: Demonstrates an awareness of the audience’s specific expectations and values. Language: Communicates competently, with minimal significant errors or distractions.</td>
<td>Competently analyzes arguments, applying concepts and models to answer relevant “how” and “why” questions.</td>
<td>Locates texts (and the arguments they make) within a variety of specific contexts, demonstrating significant ways texts are shaped by and shape other variables.</td>
<td>Assesses the relationships among multiple positions (including strengths and weakness) with respect to audience, but may weigh some evidence incompletely or unpersuasively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advanced</strong> (4)</td>
<td>Content: Presents a solid case addressing a range of relevant issues and considerations. Structure: Organizes argument to meet the specific needs of the content. Evidence: Marshals ample support, successfully integrating specific quotations and examples from appropriate texts into analysis of their own making. Audience: Accommodates multiple expectations and premises of the audience. Language: Communicates effectively, with relatively few errors or distractions.</td>
<td>Successfully analyzes arguments, applying specific concepts and models in order to produce significant insights.</td>
<td>Successfully locates texts (and the arguments they make) within a variety of contexts, demonstrating complex ways texts are shaped by and shape other variables.</td>
<td>Successfully assesses the relationships among multiple positions (including strengths and weakness), with respect to audience, avoiding simplistic judgments and demonstrating, where appropriate, how the preponderance of the evidence supports specific positions over others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Social and Behavioral Sciences

## Social and Behavioral Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL 1</th>
<th>GOAL 2</th>
<th>GOAL 3</th>
<th>GOAL 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explore and recognize basic terms, concepts, and domains of the social and behavioral sciences.</td>
<td>Comprehend diverse theories and methods of the social and behavioral sciences.</td>
<td>Identify human behavioral patterns across space and time and discuss their interrelatedness and distinctiveness.</td>
<td>Enhance understanding of the social world through the application of conceptual frameworks from the social and behavioral sciences to the first-hand engagement with contemporary issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Beginning (1)
- **Recognizes** basic terms, concepts, or domains.
- **Identifies** basic theories and methods.
- **Recognizes and describes** basic human behavioral patterns.
- **Recognizes** contemporary issues.

### Developing (2)
- **Defines** basic terms, concepts, or domains.
- **Explains** the core assumptions of theories and methods or differentiates among theories and methods.
- **Explains and gives examples** of patterns in human behavior.
- **Explains and provides evidence** for the contemporary social world using a conceptual framework.

### Proficient (3)
- **Analyzes, compares, and integrates** basic terms, concepts, and/or domains.
- **Applies** theories and methods to phenomena.
- **Analyzes and compares** human behavioral patterns to each other.
- **Applies** a distinct conceptual framework to contemporary issues.

### Advanced (4)
- **Applies** basic terms, concepts, or domains.
- **Critiques** theories and methods or evaluates alternatives.
- **Draws** complex connections and evaluates discrepancies in human behavioral patterns.
- **Constructs** a valid argument about contemporary issues using a conceptual framework.
262 papers were read by two readers.

Student work was gathered from GE courses in Humanities (166 papers), Communication and Critical Thinking (23 papers), and Social and Behavioral Sciences (108 papers) for both the GE lower (120 papers) and upper (177 papers) levels.
Key Findings

- Overall, 26% scored Proficient or Advanced (score 3 to 4) on the lower level and 43% scored Proficient or Advanced on the upper level.

- (Humanities: 22% lower and 44% upper; Communication and Critical Thinking: 21% lower and 50% upper; Social and Behavioral Sciences: 35% lower and 35% upper).
Key Findings

- Scores varied in each GE area between the lower and upper levels for each of the Goals. However, the scores were consistently higher on the upper levels.
- These differences suggest a refinement of GE-related skills in the upper-level courses.
Assessment Plan AY 2013-14

- Featured a rubric-based evaluation of roughly 2,000 student papers collected during Fall and Spring semesters of AY 2013-14.
- Included a four-day reading of student work held in May 2014.

**The Goal:**
- To assesses the effectiveness of GE) courses (two levels) through an analysis of samples of student work randomly selected from existing GE courses in CAL.
Preliminary Outcomes

- The meetings and readings helped to reintroduce the GE goals to the faculty, which will encourage better alignment of student learning outcomes with these goals.
- The GE project also is having an impact at the department level.
  - RWS has revised its assignment types for RWS 100 and 200 so they are more fully aligned with GE goals, particularly Goal 4.
  - Other departments have reworked syllabi to include GE goals.
- Faculty also have noted the need for further workshops to enhance alignment of the goals with assignments.
Helpful Resources

Next Steps…

Please briefly describe a specific way that you might use the information provided today. For example, is there a class, assignment or degree-level learning outcome for which you would like to develop a rubric (or improve an existing one)?

All cards with contact information will be entered in a drawing for a teaching book of your choice...

Name ____________________________
Email ____________________________