

Chronology for the development of UMD General Education Rubrics.

This work was supported through a collaboration between the Office of Undergraduate Studies, Institutional Research Planning and Assessment, and the General Education Faculty Boards

The criterion based UMD General Education Assessment Approach involves faculty review of student work using criteria in the General Education rubrics followed by faculty reflection on how the assessment data may be used to improve student learning.

The general approach to rubric development was developed with Oral Communication faculty board and then followed for subsequent course categories. The approach involved review of category learning outcomes, selection of learning outcome(s) to assess, determination of review criteria with references to applicable AACU Value Rubrics, articulation of student performance levels, validity testing with faculty instructors, followed by revision.

<p>Criteria for Review of Rubric to establish Face Validity*</p> <p>Developed with Oral Communication Faculty Board and used to establish validity for all General Education Rubrics</p> <p>Criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are these the appropriate criteria for assessing the learning outcomes? Do these reflect important elements related to the learning outcome? 2. Is this the appropriate number of criteria for assessing the learning outcomes? 3. Is the meaning of each criterion evident? 4. Are the criteria observable in student work? <p>Descriptive information for performance levels</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overall, is the language clear? Is there appropriate detail? Have we included all of the necessary elements for defining levels of performance? Is there parallel language between levels? Are descriptions of student work positive and presented in objective language? 2. Does the “advanced” category define the appropriate high level of standard that we would expect of our students? 3. Do the levels of achievement described as “Advanced” “Proficient” “Beginning” and “Unacceptable” articulate the appropriate gradations of quality such that <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. you (the instructor/assessor) can unambiguously assign a performance level? b. a student can distinguish between the levels and understand the expectations of moving to the next level? <p>Overall usefulness of the rubric</p> <p>Does the rubric give clarity to the expectations for student performance?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will the rubric be useful as an assessment rubric? Will use of this tool reveal students’ performance with respect to the learning outcomes? 2. Will the rubric be useful to communicate expectations to students?

Chronology, Oral Communication General Education Rubric Development

August 2012 – May 2013

Faculty Board membership: Donna Hamilton (UGST/ English), James Drake (Physics), Charles Gelso (Psychology), Jeffrey Hermann (Mechanical Engineering), Michael Kimbrough (Accounting), Glori Hyman (Institute of Applied Agriculture) Robin Sawyer (Public & Community Health), Linda Valli (Curriculum & Instruction), Andrew Wolvin (Communication) with Ann Smith (UGST) and Sharon La Voy (IRPA) of Assessment Planning Team.

Steps	Dates	Activity
Review & select learning outcomes (including rationale)	August 5. 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of criterion based assessment, review of AAC&U Value rubrics, review of Blooms Taxonomy, • Determined that the student activity for assessment would be a speech. Selected learning outcomes to assess. These outcomes were most important for all Oral Comm courses and most relevant to the activity of giving a speech. • Determined that a subcommittee of members who were teaching Oral Comm courses and were using rubrics in their teaching would draft rubric. Subgroup: Hyman, Glori AGNR Institute of Applied Agriculture, Sawyer, Robin SPHL Public & Community Health, Wolvin, Andrew ARHU Communication worked with Ann Smith to draft v1.
Determine criteria for assessment and descriptions for levels of performance related to criteria	September – October 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On 9-2-2012 the rubric subcommittee presented draft rubric to Board. The board determined that there will be four performance criteria: Advanced, Proficient, Developing, Unacceptable (Developing was later revise to Beginning) • On 10-31-2012 the Draft rubric was reviewed by the Board using <u>Rubric Review Criteria</u> established by the GenEd Assessment Planning Team. The review involved the Board watching six recorded student speeches while using the rubric to assess student performance. The Board revised the language of the rubric. • Rubric was reviewed by Assessment Planning Team who provided feedback on language.
Review by faculty teaching courses Revise rubric	November 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fourteen course instructors met with faculty board (over two meetings 11-6 and 11-7). Assessed rubric by using it to review taped student speeches. Comments included: Too many criteria in each box – what if students don't meet all? How does assessment relate the grading of a speech? How do we account for effort or context (e.g., students where English is second language?) At this point we decided that if students do not meet all criteria in description they should have the lower rating (this idea was later revised to choose the description that best fits the performance) • Board determined to launch an online survey to capture more feedback from course instructors. See <u>Survey of Course Instructors for Rubric Review</u>

Steps	Dates	Activity
Establish logistics for rubrics	December 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12-13-12 The Faculty Board met with instructors to discuss pilot, online survey responses, confirmation of rubric face validity • Faculty Board from course instructors' feedback and in consultation with Assessment Planning Team determined the following for all General Education Rubrics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Rubric will articulate standards for student performance in the General Education course ○ Rubric will be distributed on CANVAS and scoring will occur in SpeedGrader ○ Rubric will define expectations to be met in a one semester course ○ When rating students select the level that <i>best</i> describes the student performance ○ General Education rubrics are designed for course assessment not for student grading ○ For scoring reliability instructors will meet for norming meetings ○ Office of Undergraduate Studies will supply information for instructors on use of rubrics including a video ○ Office of Undergraduate Studies will establish ELMS site for instructors re assessment
Final review & board approval	Feb 2013	<p>The Oral Comm Faculty Board determined that the Oral Comm rubric will be used across courses in a manner that scores collected are reliable. The Board held sessions with instructors to establish reliability and a process for norming sessions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2-21-13 and 2-27-13 scoring reliability sessions were held with Board members and instructors • Instructors used rubric in Spring courses for assessment • 5-17-13 and 5-22-13 Faculty Board members met with instructors to discuss use of rubric for assessment. Instructors had positive feedback about the rubric. There were challenges in communicating grading vs assessing student work for course evaluation to the students. Some instructors used the rubric for peer evaluation • Instructors also provided feedback in an online survey <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fourteen instructors: 8 - Comm107, 2 –HLTH420, 3-INAG110, 1- THET285 • 92.9% used rubric for one speech at end of class • 57% indicated that they discussed assessment project with students • 30% used text we provided to discuss assessment project with students • NINE distributed rubric via Speedgrader only FOUR distributed by hand in class • 28.6% used rubric to articulate expectations to students • ONE instructor used the rubric for peer grading • 35.7% instructors encouraged use of rubric for self-assessment • 28.6% altered approach to teaching oral comm as a result of discussions this year • 21.4% altered teaching due standards in rubric • 50% indicated that the rubric was valuable in articulating feedback to students • 78% indicated that expectations in rubric were similar to or aligned with grading • 85% agreed or strongly agreed that time invested was reasonable • 76% indicated that the use of the Speedgrader was straight forward

Steps	Dates	Activity
		The diversity board met to discuss survey and focus group results and possible revisions. The board approved the final versions of both the CC and UPS rubrics.
UGST dean approval	May 23, 2013	Dean Donna Hamilton approved the Oral Communication Rubric. The rubric prior to approval was vetted by the Faculty Board and instructors from COMM107, ENES143, HLTH 420, INAG110, JOUR130 and THET 285.

Chronology, Scholarship in Practice General Education Rubric Development

February 2013 – January 2014, additional rubric development 2016

Faculty Board membership: Douglas Roberts, Chair, (UGST) , Sarah A. Balcom (Animal and Avian Sciences), Sheryl Ehrman (Chem and Biomolecular Engineering), Paula Maccini (Special Education), Rebecca Ratner (Marketing), Madlen Simon (Architecture), Ann Smith (UGST), Allen Stairs (Philosophy), Richard Stewart (Cell Biology and Molecular Genetics), Leslie Walker (Journalism), Ronald Yaros (Journalism).

Steps	Dates	Activity
Review & select learning outcomes (including rationale)	February – April 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2-19-2013 Donna Hamilton and Ann Smith presented rubric development approach established by Oral Communication Faculty Board • 3-26-13 Faculty Board discussed DSSP learning outcomes, reviewed AAC&U rubrics, Blooms Taxonomy and established an ELMS site to share rubric development resources. Board determined that the rubric would be developed by the full board and not a subcommittee • 4-16-13 Faculty board met to establish criteria for rubric, determined to re-write Scholarship in Practice outcomes to better express the intentions of the category. Determined that all learning outcomes except the collaboration outcome would be included in rubric. All were considered as heart and soul of student learning in the category and were set a mandatory for all courses. Not all courses address collaboration rubric.
Determine criteria for assessment and descriptions for levels of performance related to criteria	May 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5-13-13 and 5- 31- 13 Faculty Board met for drafting and refining of rubric text. Finalized a draft rubric. Rubric was reviewed by Rubric Review Criteria
Review by faculty teaching courses Revise rubric	September - December 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9-11-13 course instructors (Patrick Craig (Art) Madlen Simon (Arch) Ben Bederson (CMSC) Sheryl Ehrman (ENGR) Joshua Weiner (ENGL), Ron Yaros (Jour) Sheri Parks (AMST) Scott Roberts (PSYCH)) attended board meeting to discuss draft rubric. Instructors volunteered to use rubric for course assessment and complete online questionnaire • 12-18-13 course instructors met with Faculty Board to provide feedback. Comments: how to apply rubric across disciplines? And how to use for team work? It was determined that instructors should be encouraged to interpret the rubric for their discipline and that the rubric could be applied to team projects.
Final review & board approval	December 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12-18-13 Faculty Board finalizes rubric

UGST dean approval	January 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1-21-14 DSSP revised Learning Outcomes and rubric approved. New Learning Outcomes were added to General Education application approval system in July 2014. • The Board determined that two meetings per semester would be held for instructors: semester start meeting to introduce rubric and assessment, semester end meeting to discuss the findings of assessment and how to input in to ELMS.
--------------------	--------------	--

April 2016 Addendum: Collaboration Rubric

An ad hoc group with members from the Office of Undergraduate Studies and including those with experience in teaching with team projects met to develop the General Education rubric for Collaboration. This group also developed a rubric for faculty readiness in teaching team projects and collected a series of artifacts to support team teaching.

<http://www.gened.umd.edu/for-faculty/TeamProjects.html>

Collaboration Rubric team: Erica Estrada-Liou (Academy of Innovation and Entrepreneurship), Melissa Hayes-Gehrke (Astronomy), Madlen Simon (Architecture), Kristan Cilente Skendall (Gemstone), Melissa Del Rios (Office of Undergraduate Studies) Ann C. Smith (Office of Undergraduate Studies) Cynthia K. Stevens (Office of Undergraduate Studies)

Chronology, Professional Writing General Education Rubric Development

Summer 2013 – November 2014, additional development in 2018

Faculty Board membership: Douglas Roberts, chair (UGST/Physics), Christopher Davis (Electrical and Computer Engineering), Jessica Enoch (English), Isabelle Gournay (Architecture), Leslie Rowland (History), Joseph Sullivan (Plant Sciences), Scott Wible (English).

Steps	Dates	Activity
Review & select learning outcomes (including rationale)	Summer 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7-11-13 Faculty Board meeting to learn about the General Education Assessment process. Faculty Board determined that Professional Writing Rubric development will be led by Scott Wible. He will work with Professional Writing instructors to develop and vet the rubric. The rubric will be presented to the faculty Board for review.
Determine criteria for assessment and descriptions for levels of performance related to criteria	Fall 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scott Wible determined two learning outcomes for rubric that best aligned with curriculum development goals of the Professional writing program. Scott Wible met with group of Professional Writing faculty to select criteria and draft descriptions. Scott Wible determined that the Instructors will participate in norming sessions to establish reliability in scoring of student work across course instructors.
Review by faculty teaching courses Revise rubric	Spring 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1-23-14 Ann Smith and Doug Roberts attended workshop with Scott Wible and all Professional Writing instructors. The instructors participate in a review of the rubric. The instructors reviewed student work and assessed the work with the rubric. Comments were collected. Revisions to rubric were completed. 8-28-14 First norming session held for preparation of use of rubric for assessment Rubric added to all sections of professional writing ELMS
Final review & board approval	September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9-5-14 Faculty Board met at All Faculty Board, Rubric presented to Faculty Board and approved
UGST dean approval	November 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 11-14-14 Dean Donna Hamilton approved Professional Writing Rubric Implemented in courses for assessment Spring 2015

2018 Addendum: The Professional Writing team led by Scott Wible developed an additional rubric PROFESSIONAL WRITING-PLANNING following a similar approach for the learning outcome: *Understand the stages required to produce competent, professional writing through planning, drafting, revising, and editing.* Rubric approved by the Faculty Board in January 2018.

Chronology, Academic Writing General Education Rubric Development

Summer 2013 – May 2015, Additional development 2018

Faculty Board membership: Douglas Roberts, chair (UGST/Physics), Christopher Davis (Electrical and Computer Engineering), Jessica Enoch (English), Isabelle Gourney (Architecture), Leslie Rowland (History), Joseph Sullivan (Plant Sciences), Scott Wible (English).

Steps	Dates	Activity
Review & select learning outcomes (including rationale)	Summer 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9-5-14 Faculty Board determined that Academic Writing Rubric development will be led by Jessica Enoch. She will work with Academic Writing instructors to develop and vet the rubric. The rubric will be presented to the faculty Board for review. 9-21-14 Faculty Board met at All Faculty Board meeting to learn about the Rubric development process. 9-22-14 Faculty Board met. Approach for rubric development by Jessica Enoch was approved.
Determine criteria for assessment and descriptions for levels of performance related to criteria	Fall 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jessica Enoch determined learning outcomes for rubric that best aligned with curriculum development goals of the Academic Writing program. Jessica Enoch met with Administrative team for Academic Writing to select criteria and draft descriptions. Jessica Enoch determined that the instructors will participate in norming sessions to establish reliability in scoring of student work across course instructors. 12-10-14 Faculty Board met to review progress of rubric development.
Review by faculty teaching courses Revise rubric	Spring 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1-21-15 Ann Smith and Doug Roberts attended workshop with Jessica Enoch and all Academic Writing instructors to discuss the value of General Education and General Education assessment.. Jessica Enoch and administrative team had two meetings with course instructors to review rubric. Revisions to rubric were completed.
Final review & board approval	April 21, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rubric presented to Faculty Board at All Faculty Board Meeting. The Rubric was approved.
UGST dean approval	May 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 11-14-14 Dean Donna Hamilton approved Professional Writing Rubric Implemented in courses for assessment Spring 2015

2018 Addendum: The Academic Writing team led by Jessica Enoch developed an additional rubric: ACADEMIC WRITING-INQUIRY for the learning outcome: *Demonstrate an understanding of the connection between writing and thinking and use writing and reading for inquiry, learning, thinking, and communicating in an academic setting.* Rubric approved by the Faculty Board in January 2018.

Chronology, I-Series General Education Rubric Development

Spring 2013 – May 2015

Faculty Board membership: Donna Hamilton, Chair (UGST/English), Robert Briber (Materials Science and Engineering), William Dorland (Honors/Physics), Saverio Giovacchini (History), A. Jay Kaufman (Geology), Peter Leone (Special Education), Lars Olson (Agriculture and Natural Resources), Margaret Pearson (Government and Politics), Aravind Scrinivasan (Computer Science), Douglas Roberts (UGST/Physics), Steve Roth (Kinesiology), Gerald Suarez (Management and Organization). Ann Smith joined the team for assessment development.

Steps	Dates	Activity
Review & select learning outcomes (including rationale)	Spring 2013-September 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spring 2013 Faculty Board met and selected one outcome for rubric development. The outcome was determined to be the defining characteristic of an I-Series course. A subgroup for assessment development met several times and developed a rubric draft. This process stalled and was revived in 2014 9-5-14 Faculty Board met at All Faculty Board meeting to learn more about the Rubric development process.
Determine criteria for assessment and descriptions for levels of performance related to criteria	October – March 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10-3-14 Faculty Board met to review AAC&U Value Rubrics and Blooms Taxonomy and developed a rubric draft that was further developed in a meeting on 10-24-14. The board selected one outcome to assess as this represented the character of an I-Series course. 2-12 -15 and 1-29-15 Faculty Board reviewed and revised rubric criteria of the draft rubric. Established google doc for further editing 2-12-15 Board reviewed rubric and decided that three criteria will be used to assess student work in an I-Series course, the criteria and descriptions of student performance will reveal the unique learning that occurs in an I-Series course. Editing of rubric continued through google docs. Final draft established by March 2
Review by faculty teaching courses Revise rubric	March –April 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3-10-15 Online survey was sent to all faculty teaching I-Series. Those who had volunteered at I-Series faculty meeting were the only to respond. Responses from seven faculty representing HIST, ENME, PHIL, CPSS, AOSC and BSCI. 3-12-15 Faculty Board review feedback 4-21-15 Faculty Board attended All Faculty Board meeting for review and discussion of rubrics 4-8-15 Discussion of Rubric with I-Series Faculty attending I-Series Faculty Seminar
Final review & board approval	April 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4-17-15 Board reviewed comments from instructors and made adjustments to the rubric. Board approved rubric after final review.
UGST dean approval	May 26, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dean Donna Hamilton approved the HSS rubrics.

Chronology, Humanities General Education Rubric Development

September 2014 – May 2015

Faculty Board membership: Douglas Roberts, Chair (UGST), Cathy W. Barks, Honors, Matthew J. Bell (Architecture), Joan B. Burton (UGST), William C. Richardson (Art), Philip M Soergel (History), Denis F. Sullivan (Curriculum and Instruction). Ann Smith joined the team for assessment development

Steps	Dates	Activity
Review & select learning outcomes (including rationale)	September 5 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9-5-14 Faculty Board met at All Faculty Board meeting to learn about the Rubric development process. The Board selected one learning outcome to assess as the learning outcome is most fundamental to student learning in Humanities.
Determine criteria for assessment and descriptions for levels of performance related to criteria	September – March 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9-18-14 Faculty Board met, reviewed AAC&U Value Rubrics and Blooms Taxonomy, developed first draft of rubric. The rubric draft was further revised on 11-19-14. 3 -3 15 and 3-11-15 Board reviewed and revised rubric criteria, some criteria were collapsed 3-31-15 Board revised performance descriptions and developed a survey for course instructors according to Rubric Review Criteria
Review by faculty teaching courses Revise rubric	March –April 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Online survey was sent to all faculty teaching Humanities courses. Instructors from PHIL, JWST, RUSS, GERM, ENGL, CLAS provided feedback via the online survey 4-21-15 Faculty Board attended All Faculty Board meeting for review and discussion of rubrics
Final review & board approval	April 17,2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4-17-15 Board reviewed comments from instructors and made adjustments to the rubric. Board approved rubric after final review.
UGST dean approval	May 26, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dean Donna Hamilton approved the HSS rubrics.

Chronology, Diversity General Education Board Rubric Development

September 2014 – May 2015

Faculty Board membership: Cynthia Kay Stevens (chair), Marilee Lindemann (English/Scholars), Janelle Wong (Asian American Studies), Francine Hultgren (Education-Teaching, Learning Policy & Leadership), Jason Rudy (English), Susan De La Paz (Education-Special Education), Roberta Lavine (Languages, Literature & Cultures), and Odis Johnson (African American Studies—on committee only through fall semester).

Steps	Dates	Activity
Review & select learning outcomes (including rationale) Determine criteria for assessment	September 2014 to October 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At its 9-30-2014 meeting, the board discussed which learning outcomes were important for cultural competence, and focused on #3 (i.e., <i>analyze own cultural beliefs with respect to attitudes or behavior</i>) and #5 (<i>effectively use skills to negotiate cross-cultural situations or conflicts</i>). At its 10-28-2014 meeting, the board decided to refine the diversity learning outcomes to facilitate a choice of which to use for rubric development. It set another short meeting for 11-18-2014 to refine the CC and UPS learning outcomes. The 11-25-2014 meeting was used to sketch out levels of student learning for the UPS category, with the notion that these should parallel Bloom's taxonomy. The board built on a rubric developed for History & Social Sciences (focused on fundamental concepts, knowledge creation, and critical analysis) and adapted it to the new UPS criteria. It agreed that the CC rubric should be developed around criteria of awareness and negotiation/conflict management skills. Chair Cindy Stevens drafted both rubrics and circulated them for comment.
Determine descriptions for levels of performance related to criteria	November 2014 to December 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the 12-16-2014 meeting, the board reviewed the draft rubrics for both the CC and UPS categories and planned to collect faculty input on them.
Review by faculty teaching courses Revise rubric	March 2015 – April 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Janelle Wong arranged for a focus group of 3 Asian American Studies faculty on 3-12-2015. These faculty members had numerous suggestions for modification to the rubrics but overall found them to be useful. On 3-23-2015, a cultural competence course instructor offered individual feedback on the cultural competence rubric; these suggestions were integrated with those from the prior focus group. On 3-25-2015, all Understanding Plural Societies (n = 61) and Cultural Competence (n = 26) faculty who are currently teaching UPS or CC courses were emailed an online survey link along with the rubric and invited to offer comments and suggestions. The survey closed on 4-14-2015. A total of 6 cultural competence (23% of those surveyed) and 2 (3%) understanding plural societies' faculty responded, despite three reminder emails. On 4-17-2015, Cindy Stevens met with the Cultural Competence Course Development group and shared the rubric. They offered additional feedback and advice on wording and implementation.

Steps	Dates	Activity
Final review & board approval	April 20, 2015	The diversity board met to discuss survey and focus group results and possible revisions. The board approved the final versions of both the CC and UPS rubrics.
UGST dean approval	May 26, 2015	Dean Donna Hamilton approved revised learning outcomes and rubrics.

Chronology, History & Social Sciences General Education Board Rubric Development

September 2014 – May 2015

Faculty Board membership: Cynthia Kay Stevens (chair), Robyn Leigh Muncy (History), Howard Leathers (Agricultural Economics), Dylan Selterman (Psychology), Vladimir Tismaneanu (Government & Politics), Robert Feldman (School of Public Health).

Steps	Dates	Activity
Review & select learning outcomes (including rationale) Determine criteria for assessment	September 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the all-faculty board meeting, Cindy, Dylan and Robyn discussed focusing on the first three learning outcomes and agreed that this would be a good focus, as the first learning outcome (fundamental concepts) is required for all HSS courses, and methods and critical thinking (the 2nd and 3rd) are important for solid disciplinary understanding. At the 9-23-2014 board meeting, the board agreed to focus on those learning outcomes and thought they would work well as criteria. Several board members questioned the value of developing a learning assessment rubric and whether these would be too broad for use in both history and social science courses.
Determine descriptions for levels of performance related to criteria	October 2014 to December 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At our 10-14-2014 board meeting, it was agreed that the type of assignment should be kept open so that instructors can choose what form of student work to evaluate. Several rubrics were shared: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> History: http://www.historians.org/publications-and-directories/perspectives-on-history/october-2010/rubrics-for-history-courses-lessons-from-one-campus Sociology outcome assessment: http://www.cod.edu/Dept/outcomes/ProgDis/SOCInstr.htm; from Utah State Univ. sociology department: http://dev.sswa.usu.edu/page1161442.aspx Anthropology & content areas important for assessment: http://www.livinganthropologically.com/2012/05/28/anthropology-student-learning-outcomes-assessment/; from Utah State Univ. anthropology department: http://dev.sswa.usu.edu/anthroassessmentplan.aspx Cindy Stevens generated a complete rubric, which was refined and simplified by Howard Leathers. Robyn Muncy also developed a set of descriptors more specific to history. At the 11-18-2014 meeting, the board voted to adopt the simplified version and offer the more detailed one as an option for faculty. On 11-24-2014, the General Education Assessment team met and reviewed both versions. They asked the HSS board to consider revising the simplified version to offer more specifics. The GenEd assessment team was concerned that the short form would not offer enough guidance in how to assess students, explain to students what is expected of them, or clarify the HSS category. At the 12-9-2014 board meeting, members refused to revise the simplified version.

Steps	Dates	Activity
<p>Review by faculty teaching courses</p> <p>Revise rubric</p>	<p>February 2015 – April 2015</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the 2-13-2015 meeting, the board agreed to collect focus group data and do a survey. • Robyn Muncy arranged a focus group of 5 history faculty members on 2-25-2015, which recommended splitting out historical methodologies from social science methodologies. • On 3-9-2015, 2 economics faculty members agreed to meet with Cindy Stevens to do a small focus group. They thought the social science rubric would be workable for their 200+ student courses although they did not cover more than 1 methodology explicitly. They discussed how they might modify the course to emphasize methodology more explicitly. • On 3-13-2015, the board met to discuss the focus group results. It agreed to split the methodology criterion into two versions (one for social science, one for history). It also agreed to survey all instructors teaching spring 2015 HSS courses regarding the rubric. • On 3-25-2015, all History (n = 21) and Social Science (n = 131) faculty who were teaching Spring semester HSS courses were emailed an online survey link along with the rubric and invited to offer comments and suggestions. • On 4-14-2015, the online survey closed. A total of 6 history (28% of those surveyed) and 10 (8%) social science faculty responded, despite three reminder emails. • Using notes from focus group meetings and a summary of survey feedback, Cindy Stevens modified the rubrics. The two versions are identical except for the methodology criterion.
<p>Final review & board approval</p>	<p>April 24, 2015</p>	<p>The HSS board met to discuss survey and focus group results and possible revisions. The board approved the final versions.</p>
<p>UGST dean approval</p>	<p>May 26, 2015</p>	<p>Dean Donna Hamilton approved the HSS rubrics.</p>

Chronology, Natural Science General Education Rubric Development

September 2014 – May 2015

Faculty Board Membership: Douglas Roberts, chair, (UGST/Physics), Ibrahim Ades (Biology), Norma Allewell (Cell Biology and Molecular Genetics), Mikhail Anisimov (Chem & Biochem Engineering), Paulo Bedaque (Physics), A. Jay Kaufman (Geology), Marc Rogers (Kinesiology), Ray Weil (Environmental Sciences & Technology), Ann Smith (UGST/Cell Biology and Molecular Genetics) joined the team for assessment development.

Steps	Dates	Activity
Review & select learning outcomes (including rationale)	September 5 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9-5-14 Faculty Board met at All Faculty Board meeting to learn about the Rubric development process. 9-22-14 Faculty Board met to select a learning outcome that was central to the category. One outcome on problem solving was selected for the rubric. Discussion centered on the challenge for establishing criteria and descriptions that would cross disciplines. There was also discussion about meeting this learning outcome in large lecture courses.
Determine criteria for assessment and descriptions for levels of performance related to criteria	November – March 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 11-21-14 Faculty Board met to review AAC&U Value Rubrics and Blooms Taxonomy, a rubric draft was developed 3-11-15 Faculty Board reviewed and revised rubric criteria and descriptions of the draft rubric. Rubric was edited after the meeting and discussion occurred via email. 4-2-15 Faculty Board met and reviewed student assignments that would be relevant to the rubric. Rubric was reviewed in respect to Rubric Review criteria.
Review by faculty teaching courses Revise rubric	March 2015 – April 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4-3-15 Online survey was sent to all faculty teaching Natural Science courses. 4-15-15 Doug Roberts and Ann Smith met with Cole Miller to discuss comments from Faculty in ASTR 4-21-15 Faculty Board attended All Faculty Board meeting for review instructor comments and discussion of rubrics. 5-1-15 Faculty Board reviewed rubrics making additional edits. The Board determined additional feedback from instructors on the latest draft will be useful Small group meetings to refine language and address comments from instructors
Final review & board approval	May 2016	
UGST dean approval	May 6, 2016	

Chronology, Math/Analytical Reasoning General Education Rubric Development

September 2014 -

Faculty Board membership: Douglas Roberts, chair, (UGST/Physics), Cindy Clement (Economics), Howard Lasnick (Linguistics), Naranjan Ramachandran (Math), Doron Levy (Math), Allen Stairs (Philosophy), Scott Wolpert (Math).

Steps	Dates	Activity
Review & select learning outcomes (including rationale)	September 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9-5-14 Faculty Board met at All Faculty Board meeting to learn about the Rubric development process. • 9-23-14 Faculty Board met to select a learning outcome that was central to the category.
Determine criteria for assessment and descriptions for levels of performance related to criteria	November 2014 – April 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11-24-14 Faculty Board met to discuss the assessment approach for Math vs Analytical Reasoning. It was decided that math will not develop a rubric at this time. Will consider developing a set of questions to assess student performance. • 4-9-15 Faculty Board meeting
Review by faculty teaching courses Revise rubric	April 2015 -	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4-21-15 Faculty Board attended All Faculty Board meeting to review instructor comments and discussion of rubrics. • Small group meetings to revise language and attend to instructors comments.
Final review & board approval	May 2015	
UGST dean approval	May 18, 2015	

Criteria for Review of Rubric to establish Face Validity

Criteria:

5. Are these the appropriate criteria for assessing the learning outcomes? Do these reflect important elements related to the learning outcome?
6. Is this the appropriate number of criteria for assessing the learning outcomes?
7. Is the meaning of each criterion evident?
8. Are the criteria observable in student work?

Descriptive information for performance levels

4. Overall, is the language clear? Is there appropriate detail? Have we included all of the necessary elements for defining levels of performance? Is there parallel language between levels? Are descriptions of student work positive and presented in objective language?
5. Does the “advanced” category define the appropriate high level of standard that we would expect of our students?
6. Do the levels of achievement described as “Advanced” “Proficient” “Beginning” and “Unacceptable” articulate the appropriate gradations of quality such that
 - a. you (the instructor/assessor) can unambiguously assign a performance level?
 - b. a student can distinguish between the levels and understand the expectations of moving to the next level?

Overall usefulness of the rubric

Does the rubric give clarity to the expectations for student performance?

3. Will the rubric be useful as an assessment rubric? Will use of this tool reveal students’ performance with respect to the learning outcomes?
4. Will the rubric be useful to communicate expectations to students?