

## Core Course Review Documentation

### Foundational Component Area: CREATIVE ARTS

**Component Area Option?** No  
Yes – Cultural & Global Understanding  
Yes – Undergraduate Inquiry & Creativity

**Proposed Course:** Appreciation of Film  
**Credit Hours:** 3  
**Proposed by:** Jim Gorham, Assistant Professor of Mass Communication  
**Date:** 4 SEPT 2012

Please document how the proposed course meets each of the following requirements. (You may provide a written explanation or copy and paste the appropriate information from the syllabus.)

**Content:** *Courses in this category focus on the appreciation and analysis of creative artifacts and works of the human imagination.*

**Students in this course view, discuss and critically review films across various genres and cultures. Emphasis is on film aesthetics, e.g., cinematography, editing, staging, narrative and structure. Students are asked to assume the role of the *auteur*, i.e., the director in their analysis since it is the director who is the visionary behind the film. This class also uses the foundation of staging as a means of analysis as we analyze scenes through character, the setting and ultimately the composition.**

**SKILLS:** *Courses involve the synthesis and interpretation of artistic expression and enable critical, creative, and innovative communication about works of art.*

**Each week students are given a writing assignment they do at home and bring to class the following week. Each weekly writing assignment requires between 400 and 750 words depending on the questions asked. There are two other viewing assignments during the semester. Critical thinking and critical review are the basis for these assignments. For instance, the first writing assignment asks how the setting of a film or scene in a film dictates the characters' moods, costumes, etc. Consequently, how do the settings and characters then contribute to the composition of the frame? In the second assignment students are asked to go to any film at any theater they would like. They are asked to write a critical review of this film but also to analyze the work in terms of context. For instance, with whom one sees a film can dictate their impressions of the film. Also, what time of day they saw the movie and the number of other film goers can also influence their thoughts about the film.**

**ASSESSMENT OF CORE OBJECTIVES:** *Assessments should be authentic, intentional and direct. The following four Core Objectives must be addressed in each course approved to fulfill this category requirement:*

**Critical Thinking Skills** - *to include creative thinking, innovation, inquiry, and analysis, evaluation and synthesis of information*

Weekly writing assignments and two viewing assignments form the basis for critical thinking. However, I also ask them to occasionally write the third act of a movie or an idea for a movie, which I hope challenges their imagination and innovation. Questions posed in class such as “Are there any original story ideas anymore?”, or “What is the responsibility of the filmmaker to his/her audience?” generate discussion and active learning and participation. These assignments will be used to assess the students’ critical thinking skills, and the AAC&U’s value rubric covering critical thinking (attached) will be used as the assessment tool.

**Communication Skills** - *to include effective development, interpretation and expression of ideas through written, oral, and visual communication*

The evaluation of film as narrative is evaluated in their writing assignments and two exams. Both exams have essay components that challenge them to write intuitively. I show them a scene from a film and they are asked to write based on what they have viewed. One of these essays will be used to assess the students’ communication skills, and the AAC&U’s value rubric covering communication (attached) will be used as the assessment tool.

**Teamwork** - *to include the ability to consider different points of view and to work effectively with others to support a shared purpose or goal*

Open discussion about the positive and negatives about particular movies is an essential component of the course. Each class period I ask the students which films they have seen either in the theater or at home. Usually I have not yet seen these films, so a dialogue takes place between students who may or may not agree on the effectiveness of the film. One of the better discussions is usually about different genres and how certain genres attract one gender over another. The students challenge one another over these clichéd stereotypes such as a “Chick Film” or a “Guy Movie.” Each student will work in a group to present such a discussion. Their performance on this assignment will be used to assess the students’ teamwork skills, and the AAC&U’s value rubric covering teamwork (attached) will be used as the assessment tool.

**Social Responsibility** - *to include intercultural competence, knowledge of civic responsibility, and the ability to engage effectively in regional, national, and global communities*

The students and I discuss movies and their role in our culture and the social responsibilities filmmakers and movie studios have within a democratic society. We also talk about the current film rating system and film in context, i.e., how it has evolved or devolved within American society. Finally, we discuss the economics of the film industry. As noted above,

**students have weekly writing assignments. One of these assignments requires students to assess the topics noted, specifically in an ethical context. One of these assignments will be used to assess the students' social responsibility skills, and the AAC&U's value rubric covering ethical reasoning (attached) will be used as the assessment tool.**

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:** Provide any additional information supporting course inclusion in the core (optional).

**PLEASE ATTACH THE FOLLOWING**

1. Syllabus
2. Assessment for Critical Thinking Skills
3. Assessment for Communication Skills
4. Assessment for Teamwork
5. Assessment for Social Responsibility

**Appreciation of Film  
MCOM 2213  
Fall 2012  
5:30-8:20 p.m. (C111)**

**Course Identification:** In this course we will view, discuss and write about a wide variety of films; we will also read about characteristics of the film medium and see how they apply to films studied in the course. Emphasis will be on film aesthetics, film genres, history of the cinema and viewer responses to film.

**Professor Identification:**

Jim Gorham  
Fain Fine Arts Bldg. B-125  
397-4849  
jim.gorham@mwsu.edu

**Office Hours:**

Monday	8:30-10:00	11:00-11:30
Tuesday	8:30-9:30	12:30-2:30
Wednesday	8:30-10:00	11:00-11:30
Thursday	8:30-9:30	
Friday	8:30-10:00	11:00-11:30

**Grade Breakdown**

2 Tests	40%
Viewing Assignments	20%
Weekly Writing Assignments	40%

**\*Viewing Assignments and/or writing assignments may be used to fulfill senior portfolio requirements.**

**Class Conduct Requirements:** Students are expected to be in attendance and on time for all class sessions. It is completely unacceptable to walk into this class late when a film is running. *Cell phones should be turned off and put away. If any phone goes off during class or during a film you will be asked to leave. If this occurs a second time you may be dropped from the class.* Do not infringe on the learning of others. You will make entries into a journal after each film or film clip that we watch. If you miss a class, it is your responsibility to procure the film(s) and view them on your own time. I will not loan out any movies from my video library. ***All homework assignments need to be turned in at the beginning of class! At 5:35 p.m. they are late and the appropriate points will be deducted.*** Also, classroom behavior which interferes with either the professor's ability to conduct the class or the ability of other students to profit from the instruction will result in the professor removing the disruptive student(s) from the class.

**Attendance Policy:** This class meets once a week so any absence will affect the final grade. After the second absence, the professor may drop you from the class. In short, be in class and be on-time.

### **Senior Portfolio Requirement**

Please note that all mass communication majors are required to submit a portfolio as part of their Internship course (Internship is a prerequisite to Senior Production). This requirement is a part of MSU's reaccreditation with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and is non-negotiable. Through the portfolio, students are required to demonstrate communication competence through the written word and visual communication; two examples of each competency are required.

As you go through this and other classes, you are responsible for saving course work that could be included in your senior portfolio.

Please see me, your adviser, the department chair or any mass communication faculty member for handouts with more information ("Mass Communication Portfolio Competencies" and "Mass Communication Portfolio FAQ"). These handouts are also available on our department web page: <http://finearts.mwsu.edu/masscomm/>.

### **Plagiarism:**

Plagiarism comes from the Latin word plagiarus, which means kidnapper. Webster's defines plagiarize as to take (ideas, writings, etc.) from (another) and pass them off as one's own.

Plagiarism includes deliberate as well as inadvertent failure to properly attribute: 1) material taken directly from a source (including work done by other students); 2) paraphrasing of a source; 3) use of the same or similar organizations of source material; 4) any submission that contains the thoughts or work of others. Copying of a substantial portion of material without acknowledgment is plagiarism and a violation of copyright law. Plagiarism applies to print sources, electronic/digital sources, and materials obtained through the internet.

**Ignorance is no excuse. Do your own work. Violation of this policy will result in the student receiving a failing grade for the course. All students should refer to the MSU Student Handbook for university policies, student responsibilities, rights and activities. Students in this course are expected to follow the MSU Student Honor Code. Journals are NOT a group activity. Three students last semester failed this course because they worked together on their journals—that is plagiarism and it will not be tolerated.**

**Privacy:** Federal Privacy law prohibits me from releasing information about students to certain parties outside the university. Thus, in almost all cases I will not discuss your academic progress, academic matters, or grades with anyone including your parents. Do not have them call me! You are college students and adults and therefore will be treated as such. Also, I will only correspond with you via email if your name is in the email address.

**Final Caveat:** The professor reserves the right to change any part of this syllabus for any reason. Sufficient notice will be given if changes to the syllabus are deemed necessary.

# CRITICAL THINKING VALUE RUBRIC

*for more information, please contact [value@aacu.org](mailto:value@aacu.org)*



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

## Definition

Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.

## Framing Language

This rubric is designed to be transdisciplinary, reflecting the recognition that success in all disciplines requires habits of inquiry and analysis that share common attributes. Further, research suggests that successful critical thinkers from all disciplines increasingly need to be able to apply those habits in various and changing situations encountered in all walks of life.

This rubric is designed for use with many different types of assignments and the suggestions here are not an exhaustive list of possibilities. Critical thinking can be demonstrated in assignments that require students to complete analyses of text, data, or issues. Assignments that cut across presentation mode might be especially useful in some fields. If insight into the process components of critical thinking (e.g., how information sources were evaluated regardless of whether they were included in the product) is important, assignments focused on student reflection might be especially illuminating.

## Glossary

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

- **Ambiguity:** Information that may be interpreted in more than one way.
- **Assumptions:** Ideas, conditions, or beliefs (often implicit or unstated) that are "taken for granted or accepted as true without proof." (quoted from [www.dictionary.reference.com/browse/assumptions](http://www.dictionary.reference.com/browse/assumptions))
- **Context:** The historical, ethical, political, cultural, environmental, or circumstantial settings or conditions that influence and complicate the consideration of any issues, ideas, artifacts, and events.
- **Literal meaning:** Interpretation of information exactly as stated. For example, "she was green with envy" would be interpreted to mean that her skin was green.
- **Metaphor:** Information that is (intended to be) interpreted in a non-literal way. For example, "she was green with envy" is intended to convey an intensity of emotion, not a skin color.

# CRITICAL THINKING VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact [value@aacu.org](mailto:value@aacu.org)



## Definition

Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.

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

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

# WRITTEN COMMUNICATION VALUE RUBRIC

*for more information, please contact [value@aacu.org](mailto:value@aacu.org)*



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

## Definition

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

## Framing Language

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

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

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

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

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

## Glossary

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

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

# WRITTEN COMMUNICATION VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact [value@aacu.org](mailto:value@aacu.org)



## Definition

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

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

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

# TEAMWORK VALUE RUBRIC

*for more information, please contact [value@aacu.org](mailto:value@aacu.org)*



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

## Definition

Teamwork is behaviors under the control of individual team members (effort they put into team tasks, their manner of interacting with others on team, and the quantity and quality of contributions they make to team discussions.)

## Framing Language

Students participate on many different teams, in many different settings. For example, a given student may work on separate teams to complete a lab assignment, give an oral presentation, or complete a community service project. Furthermore, the people the student works with are likely to be different in each of these different teams. As a result, it is assumed that a work sample or collection of work that demonstrates a student's teamwork skills could include a diverse range of inputs. This rubric is designed to function across all of these different settings.

Two characteristics define the ways in which this rubric is to be used. First, the rubric is meant to assess the teamwork of an individual student, not the team as a whole. Therefore, it is possible for a student to receive high ratings, even if the team as a whole is rather flawed. Similarly, a student could receive low ratings, even if the team as a whole works fairly well. Second, this rubric is designed to measure the quality of a **process**, rather than the quality of an **end product**. As a result, work samples or collections of work will need to include some evidence of the individual's interactions within the team. The final product of the team's work (e.g., a written lab report) is insufficient, as it does not provide insight into the functioning of the team.

It is recommended that work samples or collections of work for this outcome come from one (or more) of the following three sources: (1) students' own reflections about their contribution to a team's functioning; (2) evaluation or feedback from fellow team members about students' contribution to the team's functioning; or (3) the evaluation of an outside observer regarding students' contributions to a team's functioning. These three sources differ considerably in the resource demands they place on an institution. It is recommended that institutions using this rubric consider carefully the resources they are able to allocate to the assessment of teamwork and choose a means of compiling work samples or collections of work that best suits their priorities, needs, and abilities.

# TEAMWORK VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact [value@aacu.org](mailto:value@aacu.org)



## Definition

Teamwork is behaviors under the control of individual team members (effort they put into team tasks, their manner of interacting with others on team, and the quantity and quality of contributions they make to team discussions.)

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

	<b>Capstone</b> 4	<b>Milestones</b>		<b>Benchmark</b> 1
		3	2	
<b>Contributes to Team Meetings</b>	Helps the team move forward by articulating the merits of alternative ideas or proposals.	Offers alternative solutions or courses of action that build on the ideas of others.	Offers new suggestions to advance the work of the group.	Shares ideas but does not advance the work of the group.
<b>Facilitates the Contributions of Team Members</b>	Engages team members in ways that facilitate their contributions to meetings by both constructively building upon or synthesizing the contributions of others as well as noticing when someone is not participating and inviting them to engage.	Engages team members in ways that facilitate their contributions to meetings by constructively building upon or synthesizing the contributions of others.	Engages team members in ways that facilitate their contributions to meetings by restating the views of other team members and/or asking questions for clarification.	Engages team members by taking turns and listening to others without interrupting.
<b>Individual Contributions Outside of Team Meetings</b>	Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished is thorough, comprehensive, and advances the project. Proactively helps other team members complete their assigned tasks to a similar level of excellence.	Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished is thorough, comprehensive, and advances the project.	Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished advances the project.	Completes all assigned tasks by deadline.
<b>Fosters Constructive Team Climate</b>	Supports a constructive team climate by doing all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication.</li> <li>• Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work.</li> <li>• Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it.</li> <li>• Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members.</li> </ul>	Supports a constructive team climate by doing any three of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication.</li> <li>• Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work.</li> <li>• Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it.</li> <li>• Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members.</li> </ul>	Supports a constructive team climate by doing any two of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication.</li> <li>• Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work.</li> <li>• Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it.</li> <li>• Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members.</li> </ul>	Supports a constructive team climate by doing any one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication.</li> <li>• Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work.</li> <li>• Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it.</li> <li>• Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members.</li> </ul>
<b>Responds to Conflict</b>	Addresses destructive conflict directly and constructively, helping to manage/resolve it in a way that strengthens overall team cohesiveness and future effectiveness.	Identifies and acknowledges conflict and stays engaged with it.	Redirecting focus toward common ground, toward task at hand (away from conflict).	Passively accepts alternate viewpoints/ideas/opinions.

# ETHICAL REASONING VALUE RUBRIC

*for more information, please contact [value@aacu.org](mailto:value@aacu.org)*



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

## Definition

Ethical Reasoning is reasoning about right and wrong human conduct. It requires students to be able to assess their own ethical values and the social context of problems, recognize ethical issues in a variety of settings, think about how different ethical perspectives might be applied to ethical dilemmas and consider the ramifications of alternative actions. Students' ethical self identity evolves as they practice ethical decision-making skills and learn how to describe and analyze positions on ethical issues.

## Framing Language

This rubric is intended to help faculty evaluate work samples and collections of work that demonstrate student learning about ethics. Although the goal of a liberal education should be to help students turn what they've learned in the classroom into action, pragmatically it would be difficult, if not impossible, to judge whether or not students would act ethically when faced with real ethical situations. What can be evaluated using a rubric is whether students have the intellectual tools to make ethical choices.

The rubric focuses on five elements: Ethical Self Awareness, Ethical Issue Recognition, Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts, Application of Ethical Principles, and Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts. Students' Ethical Self Identity evolves as they practice ethical decision-making skills and learn how to describe and analyze positions on ethical issues. Presumably, they will choose ethical actions when faced with ethical issues.

## Glossary

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

- **Core Beliefs:** Those fundamental principles that consciously or unconsciously influence one's ethical conduct and ethical thinking. Even when unacknowledged, core beliefs shape one's responses. Core beliefs can reflect one's environment, religion, culture or training. A person may or may not choose to act on their core beliefs.
- **Ethical Perspectives/concepts:** The different theoretical means through which ethical issues are analyzed, such as ethical theories (e.g., utilitarian, natural law, virtue) or ethical concepts (e.g., rights, justice, duty).
- **Complex, multi-layered (gray) context:** The sub-parts or situational conditions of a scenario that bring two or more ethical dilemmas (issues) into the mix/problem/context/for student's identification.
- **Cross-relationships among the issues:** Obvious or subtle connections between/among the sub-parts or situational conditions of the issues present in a scenario (e.g., relationship of production of corn as part of climate change issue).

# ETHICAL REASONING VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact [value@aacu.org](mailto:value@aacu.org)



## Definition

Ethical Reasoning is reasoning about right and wrong human conduct. It requires students to be able to assess their own ethical values and the social context of problems, recognize ethical issues in a variety of settings, think about how different ethical perspectives might be applied to ethical dilemmas, and consider the ramifications of alternative actions. Students' ethical self-identity evolves as they practice ethical decision-making skills and learn how to describe and analyze positions on ethical issues.

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

	<b>Capstone</b> 4	<b>Milestones</b>		<b>Benchmark</b> 1
		3	2	
<b>Ethical Self-Awareness</b>	Student discusses in detail/analyzes both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs and discussion has greater depth and clarity.	Student discusses in detail/analyzes both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs.	Student states both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs.	Student states either their core beliefs or articulates the origins of the core beliefs but not both.
<b>Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts</b>	Student names the theory or theories, can present the gist of said theory or theories, and accurately explains the details of the theory or theories used.	Student can name the major theory or theories she/he uses, can present the gist of said theory or theories, and attempts to explain the details of the theory or theories used, but has some inaccuracies.	Student can name the major theory she/he uses, and is only able to present the gist of the named theory.	Student only names the major theory she/he uses.
<b>Ethical Issue Recognition</b>	Student can recognize ethical issues when presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context AND can recognize cross-relationships among the issues.	Student can recognize ethical issues when issues are presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context OR can grasp cross-relationships among the issues.	Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues and grasp (incompletely) the complexities or interrelationships among the issues.	Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues but fails to grasp complexity or interrelationships.
<b>Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts</b>	Student can independently apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, accurately, and is able to consider full implications of the application.	Student can independently apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, accurately, but does not consider the specific implications of the application.	Student can apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, independently (to a new example) and the application is inaccurate.	Student can apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question with support (using examples, in a class, in a group, or a fixed-choice setting) but is unable to apply ethical perspectives/concepts independently (to a new example).
<b>Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts</b>	Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of and can reasonably defend against the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/concepts, and the student's defense is adequate and effective.	Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of, and respond to the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/concepts, but the student's response is inadequate.	Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/concepts but does not respond to them (and ultimately objections, assumptions, and implications are compartmentalized by student and do not affect student's position.)	Student states a position but cannot state the objections to and assumptions and limitations of the different perspectives/concepts.

