

**IN 140/IN 183: University Seminar
2008-2009 Assessment Report
Dr. Robert Money, Coordinator of University Seminar**

(1) Context: The Need for a New Assessment Plan

In the recent past, our curriculum suffered from a lack of clarity regarding the role of IN140, University Seminar; it has been unclear exactly what we wanted IN140 to do. Sometimes, we used it as a “dumping ground.” For example, if we thought a skill set important but did not know where to put it (e.g., oral communication), we put it in IN140, without giving serious attention to the implications that this might have for the internal coherence of the course. In addition, we paid little attention to how IN140 might connect to the larger curriculum. We tended to treat IN140 as less of an academic course and more of a stand alone “orientation to college” course. Our inability to see IN140 as an academic course connected to the larger curriculum was, in part, a function of a lack of full coherence within our University Studies program and a lack of clarity regarding how our University Studies program was connected to the University’s educational mission, values, and goals.

During 2006-2007, a consensus emerged that our University Studies program needed to undergo re-examination and revision. A Nyberg seminar was convened during the summer of 2007 to focus on this project. The Seminar, comprised of six faculty members representing all colleges across the University, was charged with “refreshing the MPSL in ways that better meet our stated University Studies learning objectives.” Accordingly, the Seminar was asked to “produce a definitive set of suggested revisions to the University Studies portion of the MPSL.” The product of the Seminar’s summer work was a formal report, “Refreshing the Millikin Program of Student Learning.” This report proposed numerous revisions to our University Studies program, including several that impacted directly on IN140, University Seminar. The Nyberg report served as the basis for the eventual recommendations for reform of the University Studies program brought to the full faculty by the Council on Curriculum during the fall 2007 semester. Those recommendations were voted on and accepted by the full faculty during the fall 2007 semester.

As a result of these revisions, IN140 was reconceptualized, reformed, and refocused, especially in relation to its function vis-à-vis the larger University

Studies curriculum. Among the more important revisions to IN140 were the following:

- IN140 was formally understood as an **academic** course first and foremost, charged with providing students an “*introduction* to academic inquiry at the college level.”
- IN140 was formally understood as the place in our curriculum where students would be *introduced* to the skill set of “**critical and ethical reasoning**.” This skill set thread would run vertically through the sequential elements of the University Studies curriculum (i.e., IN250, IN251, and IN350).
- IN140 was formally understood as one of two places in our first-semester first-year curriculum where students would engage in **reflection** (the other location is IN150, Critical Writing, Reading, and Research – the other half of the first-year learning community). This skill set thread would also run vertically through the sequential elements of the University Studies curriculum (i.e., IN250, IN251, and IN350).
- IN140’s focus on student reflection would be intentionally connected to its use of **service learning**. Connecting student reflection to service learning allows IN140 to introduce students to one hallmark of a Millikin education – the commitment to “theory and practice.”
- IN140 would continue to engage students in specific **orientation topics**, with the help of a First Year Experience Mentor. This allows IN140 to serve as a targeted location within our curriculum where we take seriously our obligation to help students transition to college life, both academically and socially. This embodies our commitment to the education of the whole person.
- IN140 was formally relieved of its obligation to deliver oral communication. A new element within the University Studies program, “Oral Communication Studies,” would target the delivery of that skill set.

This reconceptualization of IN140 links it in very clear and very intentional ways to larger University values and to the larger curriculum, particularly the sequential elements of the University Studies program. As a result of these changes, our assessment of this component of the University Studies curriculum had to be revised and refocused. Last year’s report, responding to the larger institution-wide curricular changes that have occurred over the previous year, sought to establish a clear framework within which the assessment of IN140 can take place. Where possible and appropriate, it suggested that we continue to use methods of assessment used in the past. However, the fundamental reconceptualization of IN140 demanded that new methods of assessment be

utilized going forward. Of equal importance, it required that faculty teaching the course be informed of these methods *in advance of teaching the course*.

This year's report is the first report with the opportunity to implement the assessment framework envisioned in the previous year's report.

(2) Description and Learning Goals

The formal course description and the formal course learning goals for University Seminar are as follows:

IN140. University Seminar (3) Fall semester freshman year. This course is an introduction to academic inquiry at the college level. Seminar topics vary across sections. Each section engages students in critical and ethical reasoning, includes a service learning component, and addresses specific orientation topics. The learning outcome goals for students taking IN140 are that students will be able to:

1. use ethical reasoning to analyze and reflect on issues that impact their personal lives as well as their local, national, and/or global communities;
2. reflect on the significance of contributions to community through service learning; and
3. work collaboratively and creatively with diverse others.

As indicated by the course learning goals, the course asks teachers and students to do several different things. Regardless of the particular substantive content of the course (content is chosen by the particular faculty member teaching the course), each course is expected to do the following: engage students in **ethical reasoning**, engage students in **service learning with reflection**, and discuss **orientation topics** pertaining to the first-year student.

The University Seminar experience is intended to be a *unique* learning opportunity for first-year students entering the university. University Seminar is an *introduction* to academic inquiry; it is not an introduction to any particular major. This distinction is crucial for understanding the learning goals of the course. University Seminar is an academic course designed to facilitate the development of certain specific skill sets while engaging students in a particular substantive content. While allowing for great diversity of substantive content among sections, this introduction to academic inquiry is anchored by two key skills: (1) critical and ethical reasoning, and (2) reflection. By engaging students

in critical and ethical reasoning and reflection, the course introduces students to skill sets that will be further developed by the sequential elements of the University Studies program as well as courses in the students' chosen majors. Moreover, by engaging students in critical and ethical reasoning and reflection, the course facilitates the development of skill sets that are indispensable to professional success, democratic citizenship in a global environment, and the discovery and creation of a personal life of meaning and value. By having student engage in reflection about their service learning experiences, the course takes academic skills out of the formal classroom setting and connects them with our larger community. The course, thus, serves as an initial introduction to Millikin's commitment to "theory-practice" education, a pedagogical commitment that will be reinforced in the students' chosen majors.

In addition to its academic focus, the course also provides students with an opportunity to build community on campus. All students enrolled in a fall section of University Seminar participate in First Week orientation. First Week provides students opportunities to acclimate to campus life and to meet and bond with their University Seminar classmates and instructors. This community building function is reinforced over the course of the semester by the "learning community" comprised of IN140 and IN150, Critical Writing, Reading and Research. The students move as a group between these two academic courses. This experience builds community among the students, and allows for the possibility of cross-disciplinary collaboration by the faculty involved.

Finally, the course provides students with an opportunity to engage with specific orientation topics that address a variety of "life skills" issues important for student success during the transition to college. In this regard, the course employs an upper classman as a mentor, again grounding the students on campus and providing them with a "student" resource to consult on numerous topics.

In sum, then, University Seminar is intended to be a place of intellectual growth, shared learning, and community building. In addition, it is the specific location within our curriculum where we take seriously our obligation to help students transition to college life, both academically and socially. We are, after all, interested in the education of the whole person. No other course on campus aims to function in this unique way.

(3) Snapshot

The seminar topics for University Seminar are varied and are selected by individual instructors. However, all sections are required to deliver the learning goals that are definitive of the course and address orientation topics pertaining to the first-year student.

During fall 2008 semester, 27 sections of University Seminar were offered. This included four honors sections and two “enhanced” sections for students who were co-enrolled in an enhanced section of IN150, Critical Writing, Reading and Research. Regular and honors sections averaged 18 students. The two enhanced sections averaged 16 students.

During the fall 2008 semester, 16 sections of University Seminar were taught by full-time faculty members, 4 by adjunct faculty members, and 7 by full-time administrators. Although most instructors taught only one section, 6 instructors taught two sections, with one of those six faculty members teaching three sections.

One section of University Seminar was offered during the spring 2009 semester. Of the 16 students enrolled in this section, 12 did not pass during the fall semester and 4 were new students. A full-time faculty member taught this section of University Seminar.

Given its multiple functions (as described above), University Seminar is best delivered by a diverse and multitalented set of faculty. One of – if not *the* – most important factors in a successful educational experience is high quality teaching. As an institution, Millikin University is committed to providing our students with excellent teachers. This commitment is not confined to the delivery of the major; it extends to the delivery of our University Studies program. Accordingly, faculty quality must be monitored throughout the curriculum. However, judgments about quality must go beyond easy to make judgments such as the number/percentage of full-time faculty instructors delivering the curricular component, or the number/percentage of faculty with terminal degrees delivering the curricular component. These judgments are easy to make because they are easy to quantify. Teaching excellence, however, cannot be reductively captured in this way. While these sorts of easily quantifiable data may be relevant to whether you are likely to get high quality instruction, they certainly do not guarantee it. Of at least equal importance are faculty passion and

commitment to the course, as well as faculty experience relative to the unique nature of the course.

Appendix One provides a brief educational-experiential sketch of some of the faculty scheduled to teach University Seminar during the fall 2008 semester. This “lineup” of University Seminar faculty is typical. As can be seen, our use of adjuncts and select administrators to help deliver University Seminar is done in such a way so as to allow those with proper qualifications (both educational and experiential) to help deliver the course. We have a diverse and multitalented set of instructors committed to the delivery of this course. Each of these instructors brings her own distinctive skills and areas of expertise to the course – skills and expertise that fit well with the diverse aims of this unique course.

(4) Assessment Methods

As noted in the 2007-2008 Assessment Report, given the reforms made to University Seminar in the past few years, new methods for assessing the course are required. The following methods will be employed going forward:

- Administration of a newly reformed University Seminar Survey (see below)
- Tracking SIR data for University Seminar and comparing that data against similar SIR data for faculty across the University.
- Syllabi audits (using an audit form specifically designed for University Seminar).
- Review of a random sampling of “artifacts” (generally, written papers) collected for purposes of assessing the primary academic learning goal for which University Seminar has sole responsibility during the first year: critical and ethical reasoning.

***Comment on Newly Reformed Survey Instrument:

In the 2008 Assessment Report, learning outcomes goals for University Seminar were assessed, in part, through the *Your First College Year* student survey. That survey was administered during the spring semester to students enrolled in IN151, CWRRII. Thus, it was administered during the semester *after* IN140, University Seminar was completed. That survey instrument has been discontinued and was not administered during the 2008-09 academic year. Anticipating its discontinuation, Dr. Money, Faculty Coordinator for IN140, called for the construction and administration of a new survey instrument. This was proposed in the “Trends and Improvement Plans” section of the 2008

Assessment Report. The new survey instrument maintains some overlap with the prior instrument so that we can continue to track trends over time relative to specific elements of the course. However, it also includes revisions that allow it to better track student attitudes and, more importantly, *behaviors* that relate to the specific learning goals of University Seminar. This new survey instrument was constructed and administered by University Seminar instructors during the fall (2009), at the end of the semester. Here is the new survey instrument:

IN 140 University Seminar Survey
Fall 2008

Section _____

1. The academic content of my University Seminar course was challenging.
4 - strongly agree 3 - agree 2 - disagree 1 - strongly disagree
2. The course caused me to engage in a great deal of critical thinking.
4 - strongly agree 3 - agree 2 - disagree 1 - strongly disagree
3. I used ethical reasoning to analyze and reflect on an issue that impacts my personal life.
4 - strongly agree 3 - agree 2 - disagree 1 - strongly disagree
4. I used ethical reasoning to analyze and reflect on an issue that impacts my local, national, or global community.
4 - strongly agree 3 - agree 2 - disagree 1 - strongly disagree
5. Our section's service learning project was a purposeful experience.
4 - strongly agree 3 - agree 2 - disagree 1 - strongly disagree
6. I could see direct connection between our course content and our class service learning project.
4 - strongly agree 3 - agree 2 - disagree 1 - strongly disagree
7. I engaged in reflection on my service learning experience.
4 - strongly agree 3 - agree 2 - disagree 1 - strongly disagree
8. The orientation topics that were covered helped me to adapt to college life.

- 4 - strongly agree 3 - agree 2 - disagree 1 - strongly disagree
9. There was a strong connection between the instructors of my IN 140 and IN 150 courses.
- 4 - strongly agree 3 - agree 2 - disagree 1 - strongly disagree
10. The University Seminar course helped me feel more equipped to succeed in college.
- 4 - strongly agree 3 - agree 2 - disagree 1 - strongly disagree
11. I feel that the University Seminar course was worth taking.
- 4 - strongly agree 3 - agree 2 - disagree 1 - strongly disagree

(5) Assessment Data

The fall 2008 offerings of University Seminar were the first time instructors constructed their University Seminar offerings in light of knowledge of the revisions made to our University Studies program, including the revisions that impacted on the function and role of University Seminar. This report will include University Seminar Survey data, SIR data, syllabi audit data, and an examination of a random sampling of student work (“artifacts”) relevant to the major academic learning goal for which University Seminar has sole responsibility during the first year, ethical reasoning.

A. University Seminar Survey¹

At the close of the fall 2008 semester, all faculty teaching sections of University Seminar were asked to administer the University Seminar Survey. All sections but one complied with this request. As a result of the high percentage of sections participating, 397 of the 482 students enrolled in University Seminar completed at least part of the survey. This represents a response rate of **82.36%** (compared with a response rate of 66% for the previous year). This is a significant

¹ For guidance for future reports, all of the means and percentages in the tables below are calculated based off of the number of survey respondents, not the total number of students enrolled in IN140. Students taking IN140 but not responding to the survey are ignored. Thus, if one adds the percentage of “positive” responses to the percentage of “negative” responses, one will get 100%. This is not the case with the YFYC surveys of 2006-2008. The author of this report *suspects* that those percentage calculations were based off of total number of students taking CWRR, as opposed to total number of respondents.

improvement. Moreover, all respondents were first year students. For each survey item statement relating to University Seminar, respondents rated their agreement on a 4-point, likert-style scale (4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=disagree, 1=strongly disagree). If the survey item represents a continuation from items asked on previously administered YFYC surveys, those previous results will also be identified.

The following chart provides the statistical means for each item on the survey instrument (with comparisons to prior YFYC surveys, if available):

Question	Spring 2006 (358 Respondents)	Spring 2007 (228 Respondents)	Spring 2008 (301 Respondents)	Fall 2008 (397-385 Respondents)
Course Content Challenging	2.70	2.85	2.61	3.08
Engaged in Critical Thinking	2.78	2.86	2.61	3.14
Engaged in Ethical Reasoning on Personal Issue	n/a	n/a	n/a	2.96
Engaged in Ethical Reasoning on Local, National, Global, Community Issue	n/a	n/a	n/a	2.96
Service learning was a purposeful experience	2.99	2.93	2.54	2.88
Service Learning	2.70	2.82	2.50	2.77

Connected to Course				
Engaged in Reflection on Service Learning	n/a	n/a	n/a	2.87
Orientation topics helped me adapt to college life	2.83	2.97	2.68	2.70
Cohort between IN140 and IN150 was strong	2.47	2.60	2.29	2.21
Course Equips Me to Succeed in College	2.63	2.79	2.50	2.74
Course was worth taking	2.86	2.97	2.76	2.89
Overall Index Score on Eight Items from Original YFYC Survey	2.75	2.85	2.56	2.80
Overall Index Score on Survey as Revised (11 Items)	n/a	n/a	n/a	2.84

The following chart identifies the percentage of “**positive**” responses (“strongly agree” and “agree”) to the individual survey item statements:

Question	Spring 2006 (358 Respondents)	Spring 2007 (228 Respondents)	Spring 2008 (301 Respondents)	Fall 2008 (397-385 Respondents)
Course Content Challenging	49%	64%	56%	80%
Engaged in Critical Thinking	51%	65%	56%	79%
Engaged in Ethical Reasoning on Personal Issue	n/a	n/a	n/a	71%
Engaged in Ethical Reasoning on Local, National, Global, Community Issue	n/a	n/a	n/a	75%
Service learning was a purposeful experience	59%	66%	55%	74%
Service Learning Connected to Course	50%	62%	54%	65%
Engaged in Reflection on Service Learning	n/a	n/a	n/a	72%
Orientation topics helped me adapt to college life	57%	74%	62%	65%
Cohort	38%	50%	42%	37%

between IN140 and IN150 was strong				
Course Equips Me to Succeed in College	48%	60%	50%	68%
Course was worth taking	56%	69%	61%	68%

The following chart identifies the percentage of “**negative**” responses (“strongly disagree” and “disagree”) to the individual survey item statements.

Question	Spring 2006 (358 Respondents)	Spring 2007 (228 Respondents)	Spring 2008 (301 Respondents)	Fall 2008 (397-385 Respondents)
Course Content Challenging	31%	30%	31%	20%
Engaged in Critical Thinking	29%	28%	30%	21%
Engaged in Ethical Reasoning on Personal Issue	n/a	n/a	n/a	29%
Engaged in Ethical Reasoning on Local, National, Global, Community Issue	n/a	n/a	n/a	25%
Service learning was	19%	26%	28%	26%

a purposeful experience				
Service Learning Connected to Course	32%	31%	30%	35%
Engaged in Reflection on Service Learning	n/a	n/a	n/a	28%
Orientation topics helped me adapt to college life	22%	19%	24%	35%
Cohort between IN140 and IN150 was strong	40%	41%	42%	63%
Course Equips Me to Succeed in College	32%	33%	35%	32%
Course was worth taking	25%	25%	26%	32%

B. SIR Data Comparison

SIR data have been collected for the following four items: (1) scale summary data for course organization and planning, (2) scale summary data for communication, (3) overall evaluation of the instructor, and (4) overall evaluation of the course. The following SIR data compare the mean scores for faculty at the university (first number) with average mean scores for IN140 faculty (second number). The three different categories of IN140 faculty are then identified and average mean scores for each category are provided: full-time faculty (third number), adjunct faculty (fourth number), and administrators (fifth number). These data are for the fall 2008 semester. The data also indicates the percentage change compared to the previous year (fall 2007). This information is

in parentheses and placed immediately below the fall 2008 data. Data was not available for one section, taught by an adjunct instructor. Hence, data from a total of 26 sections are examined.

	Univ. Faculty	IN140 All(26)	IN140 FT(16)	IN140 Adj.(3)	IN140 Admin(7)
Course Organization and Planning:					
Scale Summary	4.320 (-.0078)	4.106 (-.0127)	3.910 (-.0369)	4.116 (-.0184)	4.550 +.0289
Communication:					
Scale Summary	4.370 +.0078	4.212 (-.0033)	4.039 (-.0258)	4.196 (-.0143)	4.612 +.0392
Overall Evaluation:					
Overall, the instructor for this course was excellent	4.367 +.0069	4.040 +.0375	3.737 (-.0158)	4.237 +.0503	4.647 +.1485
Overall, this course was excellent	4.151 +.0085	3.754 (-.0360)	3.460 (-.0888)	3.786 (-.0615)	4.411 +.0902

The following chart indicates the number of sections of University Seminar taught by instructors whose SIR means were at or above the average for the University as a whole:

CATEOGRY	ALL IN140 FACULTY	IN140 FT	IN140 ADJUNCT	IN140 ADMIN.
Org. & Planning	15 (57.6%)	7	2	6
Communication	16 (61.54%)	7	2	7
Overall, Instructor	15 (57.6%)	6	2	7
Overall, Course	12 (46.2%)	5	2	5

C. Syllabus Audit Data

For the fall 2008 semester, 19 total syllabi were collected. This represents syllabi for each section of IN140 except one. Each syllabus was audited to see if it contained specific items relevant to the delivery and assessment of University Seminar. The following data provides information regarding the number of syllabi containing the relevant items as specified on the audit form.

**IN140 University Seminar
Syllabus Audit Form**

	Syllabus is acceptable on item	Syllabus has item included but not in acceptable form	Syllabus does not have item
TOP of FIRST PAGE: Course Identification: course number, course name, faculty, semester	19 (100%)		
SOMEWHERE in SYLLABUS:			
Faculty contact info: name, office, office hours, office phone, email address	19 (100%)		
Course description: Standard description (see below) plus faculty written course description/overview	14 (74%)	5 (26%)	
Standard course learning goals (see below)	14 (74%)	4 (21%)	1 (5%)
Additional course learning goals (as specified by faculty member), if any	N/A	N/A	N/A
Instructor's grading policy - scale and weights for assignments & for the semester	17 (89%)	2 (11%)	
Instructor's attendance policy – penalties	18 (95%)	1 (5%)	
Academic honesty & integrity statement	16 (84%)	2 (11%)	1 (5%)

(standard)			
University disability statement (standard, see below)	17 (89%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)
Specification of a written assignment that will serve as ethical reasoning artifact for assessment purposes	15 (79%)	1 (5%)	3 (16%)
Specification of a written assignment that will serve as service learning with reflection artifact for assessment purposes	14 (74%)	5 (26%)	

D. Artifact Collection: Ethical Reasoning

For the first time, we used an electronic medium (Moodle) to allow students to upload their ethical reasoning artifacts directly to a central storage location. A central course “shell” was created. Within that shell, a folder was created for each section of University Seminar entitled, “Ethical Reasoning Essay.” Students were instructed to deposit the relevant assignments (identified by their instructors) into the appropriate folder. This method of collecting student work creates a central location for the deposit of student work and relieves faculty of the responsibility of making sure that the work is passed along to the IN140 Coordinator.

The process by which ethical reasoning is to be assessed in IN140, University Seminar is as follows. Two artifacts (papers) for examination are randomly selected from each section of University Seminar and assessed under the Ethical Reasoning Rubric (see appendix two). Assuming full participation by all sections and student enrollments of 20 students per section, this would represent a random review of artifacts from approximately 10% of our students.

Actual participation for fall 2008 fell short of full participation. A total of 38 ethical reasoning artifacts were examined. These artifacts were randomly selected from across 20 sections of University Seminar, with two artifacts coming from 18 sections and one artifact coming from two sections. This represents a

participation rate of 81% of Seminar sections and a random sampling of 7.88% of the total students enrolled in University Seminar during the fall 2008 semester (482). No artifacts were examined from seven sections (26%) of University Seminar sections.

There are two primary explanations for why full participation did not occur. First, several instructors either failed to cover ethical reasoning and/or failed to require students to submit an artifact documenting engagement in ethical reasoning. Those instructors who intentionally refuse to teach the course according to its stated learning goals (i.e., in short, who refuse to teach *this* specific course as defined by the criteria agreed to by the full faculty) will not be asked or permitted to continue teaching University Seminar. Second, there was a malfunction of the Moodle program. For some unknown reason, during the early summer months, the Moodle program reconfigured the IN140 seminar course that had been set up as a central location to house the artifacts electronically. As a result of this event, some artifacts were lost. Indeed, we were fortunate not to lose all artifacts.

Most of the artifacts examined were submitted in electronic format (34). The remaining artifacts examined were submitted in hard copy paper format (4). All artifacts represented written assignments in which students were asked to respond to various prompts designed by the instructor teaching the course and tailored to the particular course content as determined by the instructor.

On all artifacts, the assessor used yellow highlight to flag specific items relevant to ethical reasoning. Green highlight was used to indicate the assessor's comments.

The electronic copies of the artifacts are saved on a disk. Copies of both the electronic and paper artifacts are in the possession of the Dean of Teaching and Learning (Dr. Anne Matthews) and the faculty coordinator of University Seminar (Dr. Money).

The assessor on all ethical reasoning artifacts was Dr. Money. Assessment was done based on the ethical reasoning rubric (see appendix two). That rubric scores artifacts on four criteria across a three level range: 1 (nominal), 2 (adequate), or 3 (excellent). Thus, each artifact has a total rubric based score of between 4 and 12. On the basis of its total score, each artifact is tagged as falling into one of three categories:

Nominal (Red – Stop)	Adequate (Yellow – Caution)	Excellent (Green – Go)
4-6	7-9	10-12

Any partial scores are rounded up. So, an artifact with a total score of 6.5 is placed in the “adequate” category while an artifact with a total score of 9.5 is placed in the “excellent” category.

(6) Analysis of Assessment Results

A. University Seminar Survey

When viewed in general and in comparison to previous administrations of the YFCY survey, the survey data for 2009 indicate that we made significant progress in a number of important areas. For example, the mean responses for “course content was challenging” (3.08) and “engaged in critical thinking” (3.14) were both all-time highs, and the first time any mean response has crossed the 3.0 threshold. Likewise, the percentage of students with positive responses to those two items was 80% and 79%, respectively. More importantly, these responses are significant improvements over last year’s mean response of 2.61 and 2.61, and positive response percentages of 56% and 56%, respectively. A full 24% more students report experiencing a course with challenging content, and a full 23% more students report experiencing a course that engages them in critical thinking. These data suggest, therefore, that we did an excellent job of improving the (perceived) academic rigor of the course and delivering on the goal of having IN140 serve as an introduction to academic inquiry.

We also achieved strong initial results on the three survey items targeting the two primary learning goals of the course—ethical reasoning and reflection on service learning. The means on those items were 2.96, 2.96, and 2.87. The percentages of positive responses to those items were 71%, 75%, and 72%. Although these responses cannot be compared with comparable items on previous administration of the YFCY surveys (because that survey did not have these items), the fact that the mean responses are approaching 3.0, and the fact that the percentages of positive responses were all over 70% indicate comparative strength.

In addition, we achieved all-time high positive responses for the following items: service learning was a purposeful experience (74%, increase of 19% over prior

year), service learning connected to the course (65%, increase of 11% over prior year), and course equips me to succeed in college (68%, increase of 18% over prior year).

As a whole, University Seminar students felt that they benefited from the inclusion of first-year orientation topics within their course. Nearly two-thirds (65%) of survey respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that class orientation topics (citizenship, academic strategies, diversity, healthy relationships, and wellness) helped them adapt to college life.

Over two-third (68%) of freshmen responded positively to the item “course worth taking,” a 7% increase over the prior year and only 1% away from the all-time high.

The overall index score of **2.80** for the eight items that were continued from the original YFYC survey was a significant improvement over the prior year’s overall index score of 2.56. And the overall index score of **2.84** for the survey as a whole seems to indicate strength in the delivery of the course.

Survey respondents continue to perceive a weak connection between their IN 140 and IN 150 instructors. Only slightly more than one-third (37%) either agreed or strongly agreed that there was a strong connection between their University Seminar and CWRR I instructors. This was, in fact, the only item where the positive response was below 65% and the only item where the negative response was above 35%.

In sum, the data suggest substantial improvement over the results for last year and, in some cases, substantial improvement over *any* prior results.

B. SIR Data

This is the second time in our assessment of IN140 that the SIR data of University Seminar faculty have been collected for review and compared with the SIR data of faculty at the university. SIR data are included in this report as *part* of an effort to ensure faculty quality in University Seminar. The goal of our assessment, after all, is to help us self-monitor and work to ensure that our students receive a quality educational experience in IN140. SIR data seem relevant to the pursuit of that goal. While SIR data are not determinative of teaching effectiveness, they are an important piece of evidence. Faculty members wishing to present a case for tenure and/or promotion are required to include SIR data. Clearly, then, the

institution is committed to the value of SIR data, even if that data must be properly contextualized and understood in relation to other dimensions of teaching pedagogy and effectiveness.

During the fall 2008 semester, full-time faculty taught 16 (59%) of the 27 total sections. Adjunct faculty taught 4 sections (15%), while administrators taught 7 sections (26%).

The SIR data for the fall 2008 offerings of University Seminar show that on each of the four evaluated items, the average mean scores for IN140 faculty were *below* the mean scores for faculty at the university. In terms of the number of individual faculty above/below the university mean on each item, the data show that 15 faculty (56%) scored above the university mean on the scale summary for organization and planning, compared to 12 (48%) from the prior year. 16 faculty (59%) scored above the university mean on the scale summary for communication, compared to 13 (52%) from the prior year. 15 faculty (56%) scored above the university mean on overall evaluation of instructor, compared to 14 (56%) from the prior year. Finally, 12 faculty (44%) scored above the university mean for overall evaluation of course, compared to 11 (44%) from the prior year. On each item, more faculty scored above the university mean this year than last year.

SIR data further show that the average mean scores for our full-time faculty teaching sections of IN140 were *lower* when compared with the average mean scores for both our adjuncts and our administrators. This holds with respect to each of the four evaluated items. This was also true last year. In short, as a group, the full-time faculty teaching IN140 are judged by students to be less effective than faculty at the University as a whole.

SIR data show that on the four evaluated items, those instructors receiving the ten highest marks fell into the following categories:

Organization and Planning:

- Full Time: 50% (40% last year)
- Administrator: 40% (40% last year)
- Adjunct: 10% (30% last year)

Communication:

- Full Time: 60% (50% last year)
- Administrator: 30% (30% last year)

- Adjunct: 10% (20% last year)

Overall instructor:

- Full Time: 40% (40% last year)
- Administrator: 40% (40% last year)
- Adjunct: 20% (20% last year)

Overall course:

- FT: 50% (50% last year)
- Admin: 40% (30% last year)
- Adj: 10% (20% last year)

SIR data show that on the four evaluated items, those instructors receiving the ten lowest marks fell into the following categories:

Organization and Planning:

- Full Time: 80% (80% last year)
- Administrator: 10% (10% last year)
- Adjunct: 10% (10% last year)

Communication:

- Full Time: 90% (70% last year)
- Administrator: 0% (10% last year)
- Adjunct: 10% (20% last year)

Overall instructor:

- Full Time: 90% (70% last year)
- Administrator: 0% (10% last year)
- Adjunct: 10% (20% last year)

Overall course:

- FT: 90% (70% last year)
- Admin: 0% (10% last year)
- Adj: 10% (20% last year)

These findings help substantiate the earlier claim that teaching quality should not be identified with full-time status or terminal degree possession. In general, relative to the percentage of courses taught by each category of instructor, the data show:

- 1) Full time faculty consistently under-represented in the top ten and consistently over-represented in the bottom ten.
- 2) Administrators consistently over-represented in the top ten and consistently under-represented in the bottom ten.

Also, it is worth noting that the data support the proposition that student perception of the quality of the course is directly connected to their perception of the quality of the instructor. The ten *instructors* receiving the lowest SIR scores with respect to excellence were also the instructors for the ten *sections* receiving the lowest SIR scores with respect to excellence.

Again, while only based on SIR results, the data indicate that we need to continue to work to bring higher quality full-time faculty instructors to IN140.

C. Syllabi Audits

The syllabi were audited under a formal rubric that was distributed to faculty in advance of the fall semester. The data reveal that on most items, faculty members are constructing syllabi that are targeting the skills and responsibilities that are definitive of the course. Under the audit, only three items received less than a 75% rate of delivery. Those were the following:

- Course description (5 syllabi did not include the standard description or all parts of it in an acceptable form)
- Clear statement of course learning goals (4 syllabi did not include a statement of the learning goals in acceptable form; 1 did not include any statement of the learning goals)
- Clear identification of an artifact for reflection on service learning (5 syllabi did not include)

As indicated in section (1) “Context” above, the course has been substantially revised in the recent past. This may explain the failure of some syllabi to include clear statements of the course learning goals and the failure to “tag” specific assignments as artifacts relative to those learning goals. However, this should not be the case, particularly as we move forward. The learning goals are clearly stated in curricular documents and in the University Bulletin. Moreover, both the standard course description and the standard course learning goals are provided on the syllabus audit form that is distributed to all instructors teaching the course in advance of their construction of syllabi. Hence, we should expect to see near (if not actual) 100% marks in the future. Faculty teaching the course need

make sure that they revise their syllabi to meet the criteria identified in the audit form.

D. Artifact Collection

The following table identifies the number of artifacts falling into each of the three major categories:

Nominal (Red – Stop)	Adequate (Yellow – Caution)	Excellent (Green – Go)
9 (23.7%)	16 (42.1%)	13 (34.2%)

Given that this is essentially the first time that a sufficient number of artifacts have been examined to provide us with meaningful data, the results should be understood as providing a baseline by which to judge future progress in student learning relative to ethical reasoning.

The data show that just **over 76%** of student artifacts demonstrated at least adequate ethical reasoning skills. Intuitively, this is a solid percentage. Interestingly, this percentage is in line with the students' self-reports on the University Seminar survey instrument regarding engagement in ethical reasoning.

(7) Trends and Improvement Plans

A. Improvement in Assessment Methods

As a result of the Moodle malfunction, we lost some artifacts. Indeed, we were fortunate not to lose all artifacts. To ensure that something like this does not happen in the future, the faculty coordinator will collect the random sample before the start of the spring semester and save them to a disk, even if he does not write the official assessment report until summer.

The new University Seminar survey instrument provides us with a way to continue tracking trends in responses to items that used to appear on the YFCY survey while at the same time including items that ask students to report on their behaviors in seminar relative to ethical reasoning and reflection, the two primary academic skills. We will continue to employ this survey going forward. Indeed, we will continue with all four key assessment methods as we move forward: (1)

administration of the University Seminar Survey, (2) examination of SIR data, (3) audit of syllabi, and (4) review of artifacts.

B. Faculty Development

Immediately following the finalizing of this report, the faculty coordinator is going to put together a document focusing on the results of our ethical reasoning assessment as presented in this report. This document will contain: (1) a range of sample ethical reasoning prompts, (2) the ethical reasoning rubric, and (3) actual student artifacts that span the range of rubric-based scores (e.g., 12, 10, 8, 6, and 4). This document will then be sent to all instructors scheduled to teach University Seminar in the fall 2009 semester. This will be done by the middle of July. The goal is to put this data and information in front of the faculty teaching the course so that they can think intentionally (and well in advance of the start of the fall 2009 semester) about ways to engage our students in ethical reasoning. Moreover, they will have actual practical examples to reference.

The above document will then provide us with a base for faculty development workshops over the course of the upcoming year. Workshops were done last year focusing on the “learning threads” in the sequential program, including ethical reasoning. Power points covering the “nuts and bolts” of ethical reasoning were constructed, reviewed, and made available to all faculty (as well as students). Presentations were made at the fall and spring university-wide faculty workshops on ethical reasoning. Rather than continue to review what ethical reasoning is, the time is ripe to provide workshops that focus on the application of the ethical reasoning rubric to actual student artifacts. It is likely that instructors will gain more insight into how to target ethical reasoning in their assignments if the workshops are focused in this way.

As became apparent in the review of artifacts, some artifacts that scored “nominal” had potential. In some cases, it seemed that the way in which the assignment was constructed or “pitched” did not facilitate student engagement in ethical reasoning. For example, an assignment that asks students to list ethical qualities they admire is, standing alone, not going to engage students in ethical reasoning because the assignment does not call for or encourage the generation of argument. However, the same idea could be reworked so as to ask students to identify, say, two ethical qualities (virtues) that they find admirable and provide an argument for why these qualities are admirable, i.e., why they should be admired. This would intentionally direct students to engage in ethical reasoning.

Thus, the workshops will also include discussion of how to construct better prompts that facilitate student engagement in ethical reasoning.

C. First Week

Response to the First Week pilot program on Ethical Reasoning was generally quite positive. A survey was administered to first year students who participated in the pilot program last year. Approximately 138 responses were generated to the following question: "If your section of University Seminar participated in the Ethical Reasoning Pilot, how do you feel that Ethical Reasoning will prepare you for the future?" Of the 138 responses, 100 (72.5%) were positive, 23 (16.7%) were neutral, and 15 (10.9%) were negative.

Two main concerns were identified by students and faculty. First, the general consensus was that the program was too long. Second, the general consensus was that the program was too passive and that we would like to have more student engagement in ethical reasoning. As a result, we decided to make specific changes for the fall 2009 First Week Ethical Reasoning Program. Rather than spanning two days, the ethical reasoning program will now take place on a single day, over two hours. During the first hour, a general presentation on the "nuts and bolts" of critical and ethical reasoning will be made. The three members of the Philosophy Department will deliver the presentation, each leading one of three concurrently running presentations. A single reading will be distributed to students the day before the general presentation. Students will be asked to read the essay in advance of the presentation. The power points that are used for these presentations will be made available to all students after the presentation. This will enable students to refer to them over the course of the semester. Immediately following the general presentation, there will be smaller breakout sessions. These breakout sessions will also last one hour. Students will convene with their specific seminar class. The seminar instructor will guide students as they consider a short case study or essay (selected by the instructor, in light of her course content). The case study or essay will then be the backdrop for students to actively engage in critical and ethical reasoning during First Week, at the very outset of their university academic career.

Our goal with this program is two-fold. First, we want to provide students with general information about what critical and ethical reasoning is and, in doing so, increase their own expectations about what is involved in critical and ethical reasoning. They need to understand up front that critical and ethical reasoning is far more than the mere expression of opinion or belief. They need to understand

at the beginning of their academic career that critical and ethical reasoning demands reasons and/or evidence in support of belief. This is part and parcel of the intellectual training and development that institutions of higher learning should be about. Second, we want to provide our students with an opportunity to engage actively in ethical reasoning and, in the process, see the crucial elements of critical and ethical reasoning (as discussed in the general presentation) “in action.” In short, we want to encourage experiential learning in which theory is brought to bear on practice.

(8) Closing Remarks

In closing, it should be noted that a great deal of work has been and is being invested in IN140. First and foremost is the commitment and passion of those faculty members who step to the plate to deliver this important element in our University Studies program. As evidenced by the data above and appendix one, this group of faculty is multitalented and brings a wealth of competencies to the delivery of this unique course.

In addition to the actual delivery of the course, a number of substantial efforts continue to be made in an effort to improve the assessment mechanisms for IN140, all with the aim of helping us make University Seminar a quality educational experience for our students. Within the last year alone, we have done all of the following:

- Held multiple workshops on the “thread” of ethical reasoning, including presentations at both the fall and spring faculty workshops.
- Piloted and now revised an ethical reasoning program during First Week.
- Utilized a centralized electronic medium for the collection of ethical reasoning artifacts.
- Constructed and administered a new University Seminar Survey.
- Maintained a quality University Seminar experience for our students during this transitional time.

These are substantive and meaningful efforts to maintain and improve the quality of the educational experience provided by University Seminar. And in the end, providing a high quality educational experience for our students is the point of it all.

Appendix One: Sample IN140 Faculty Bios for Fall 2008

Sally M. Betscher received her B.A. in philosophy, Magna Cum Laude, from Lawrence University, 1978 and her M.A. in philosophy from the University of Michigan, 1980. Sally is a life-long resident of Decatur. After a bit of a hiatus from academics, taken to raise her six children (four of whom are attending university), Sally returns to academic life to teach in the University Seminar program. Her graduate studies were in philosophical ethics, primarily focusing on the British thinker, Philippa Foot, because of Foot's ability to draw on philosophy to make sense of practical ethical issues. Betscher's philosophy of education reflects Foot's belief that real philosophical thinking aims to integrate theory with practical action. She joins the program this year because she believes that thinking is a pleasure that can be cultivated by learning to be more attentive readers, clearer writers, and engaged conversationalists. Betscher's commitment to the integration of thinking and doing is also reflected in her work as a personal trainer at the Decatur Athletic Club, where her workouts are renowned for having brought at least one 18 year old to his knees. Please note that Betscher keeps her office hours at the Athletic Club and will answer any of your questions when you sign up for her 6:00 A.M. circuit class. ☺

Ann Borders teaches in the Department of Theatre and Dance and in the School of Music. She has degrees in Musical Theatre and Vocal Performance and maintains an active performance schedule. Favorite recent roles include Mrs. Potts in *Beauty and the Beast*, Golda in *Fiddler on the Roof* and Mother in *Ragtime*.

Originally from Ohio, **Aaron Copley** received his BA in Communication from Wittenberg University and his MA in College Student Personnel from Bowling Green State University. This will be his second year teaching a section of IN140: Of House and Home. Beginning his Millikin career as an Area Coordinator for Residence Life in 2006, Copley is currently helping students make a home here at Millikin as the Assistant Director of Residence Life.

Holly Dunsworth received her Bachelor of Arts in Interpersonal Communication from the University of Evansville and her Master of Science in Education from Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. She has been affiliated with Millikin University since 1995, serving in a variety of positions in student development, enrollment management, and business and finance. After taking some time away when her children were born, she returned to teaching University Seminar in 2007.

Josh Hayes, Director of Academic Development, came to Millikin in 2004 and has taught University Seminar every year since 2005. He holds a Bachelor of Arts degree in Psychology, a Master of Business Administration degree, and is currently pursuing a Ph.D. in Educational Administration & Foundations.

Jo Ellen Jacobs has two main research interests, Harriet Taylor Mill and aesthetics. Jacobs has written two books and several articles on Mill, including *The Voice of Harriet Taylor Mill*. She has also written articles on the aesthetics of kissing, snow, shadows, suntanning, and music, and edited dictionaries, journals, and a book series in aesthetics. She earned a Ph.D. at Washington University in St. Louis, an M.A. at Boston College, and a B.A. at Eastern Illinois University. She studied abroad at LaTrobe University in Australia. Jacobs has twice taught on Semester at Sea and has taken students to Thailand, Greece, Paris, and London.

Robert Money received his B.A. from Furman University, 1990, his J.D. from Emory University School of Law, 1993, and his Ph.D. from the University of Iowa, 1999. His teaching interests include ethics and ethical theory, political philosophy, the history of philosophy, philosophy of law, and the philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche. Dr. Money serves as Director of the Pre-Law Program, faculty advisor to Millikin's moot court teams, and faculty advisor to the TheoSocratic Club. Dr. Money is Chair of the Philosophy Department and faculty coordinator for University Seminar.

Roslyn O'Conner received her B.S. in Education from Southwest Missouri State University, 1985 and her MA with an emphasis in ecology from the University of Missouri-Columbia, 1990. She began teaching and working as a lab technician at Millikin in the fall of 2000. Before coming to Millikin, she was a high school science teacher, a laboratory coordinator at the University of Missouri-Columbia, and taught biology at Richland Community College. Her responsibilities at Millikin include teaching general biology and interdepartmental courses and preparing various laboratories for laboratory coursework.

Molly Pawsey is an Area Coordinator in the Office of Residence Life at Millikin University. She received her Bachelors Degree in Communication from Bluffton University in Bluffton, Ohio, and received her Masters Degree in College Student Personnel from Bowling Green State University in Bowling Green, Ohio. She taught a Leadership Theories and Leadership Development course at Heidelberg College as a part of her graduate assistantship as well as leading many diversity and leadership development workshops. Her academic interests include social

justice education, spiritual development in college students, and women's programming.

Carrie Pierson is the Learning Recourse Specialist at Millikin University. She obtained her Bachelors degree in Special Education and holds certifications to teach students with disabilities and also received her Masters degree in Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment. Carrie's job at Millikin University is to support students with documented disabilities, assist students who have not yet decided on major, assist students who are academically struggling, and set up the tutoring program for the university.

Amanda (Landacre) Podeschi graduated from Millikin University with a B.A. in Social Science Secondary Education (2002), and has a M.A. in History from the University of Illinois at Springfield (2005). As a social and cultural historian, she focuses on gender roles in history, oral history, as well as American history, pre-1900. She is going into her fourth year of teaching IN 140, and has focused on bringing oral history into the classroom, both academically and through service learning. She also works as the Associate Dir. of Development in Millikin's Alumni Office.

Eric Roark received his B.A. from Iowa State University, 2001, his M.S. (Sociology) from Iowa State University 2003, and his PhD (Philosophy) from the University of Missouri, 2008. His teaching and research interests include social and political philosophy (especially left-libertarianism), applied ethics, the history of philosophy, and epistemology.

Dr. Rene Verry earned her degrees in experimental psychology from Madison College (now James Madison University) – B. S. / Summa Cum Laude, Trinity University in San Antonio - M.A., and Purdue University – Ph.D. Rene's research interests lie in both the basic and applied areas of psychology: animal learning & motivation – animal training & environmental enrichment of captive animals, psychology applied to the workplace, and perception. An avid animal lover, Rene shares her life with 3 former shelter dogs and works with local shelters to train and re-home shelter dogs. Her motivation for teaching U.O. is to share the joy of animal companions with others, explore our relationships and obligations to other species, and reflect on what a life of meaning and value means. Intensely curious, sees learning as the never ending adventure and invites you to join her.

Since August 2007 **J. Mark Wrighton** has been Associate Professor and Chair of the Department of Political Science at Millikin University. He earned a Ph. D. in

Political Science from the University of Iowa in 1997, served as a lecturer at the University of Texas – Pan American from 1997 to 2000, and was a member of the faculty at the University of New Hampshire from 2000 to 2007. His primary research interests are American political institutions and congressional elections, and he has been a frequent national commentator on American elections. He has published research pieces in the *American Journal of Political Science*, *The Journal of Politics*, *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, *Political Behavior*, *Congress and the Presidency*, and *The American Review of Politics*. In 2004 – 2005, he served as an American Political Science Association congressional fellow on the staff of the House Republican Policy Committee.

Appendix Two: Ethical Reasoning Rubric

Discussion of a rubric must begin by clear identification of what we desire students to be able to do when they engage in “ethical reasoning.” The key to ethical reasoning is **the making of argument in support or criticism of an ethical judgment**. From that central idea, we can identify the following items that students should be doing as they engage in ethical reasoning:

- Students should **present an ethical (normative) judgment**.
 - The ethical judgment presented might be the student’s own judgment or the judgment of another (e.g., the view of an author the student read in class, the view of a fellow student, the view of the instructor, etc.).
 - The ethical judgment presented must be normative. That is, an ethical judgment does not simply describe what *is* the case or predict what *will be* (or *would be*) the case, but prescribes what should be the case. Typical linguistic markers for normative ethical judgments include terms such as “wrong,” “right,” “should,” “ought,” “good,” “immoral,” “desirable,” etc.

- Students should **use arguments** to support or criticize ethical judgments.
 - Regardless of whose point of view is represented by the ethical judgment, the student should use argument to support or criticize the judgment.
 - The arguments used will, of course, range in quality. Ideally, we want students to make sound arguments. However, in the introduction of the skill, the first step is to train students to make arguments.

- Students should **make good arguments** relative to validity, soundness, and the “three C’s.”
 - Student arguments should pay special attention to clarity, coherence, and completeness.
 - Students should show some awareness of the implications or consequences of the ethical judgments presented, or the reasons (premises) used in arguments.

- Students should **think about opposing or different viewpoints**.
 - Regardless of whether the student is defending or criticizing the ethical judgment presented, she should anticipate opposing or different viewpoints and seek to respond to them with arguments. This helps train students to think about the implications of a specific position.
 - Again, student arguments should pay special attention to clarity, coherence, and completeness.

So, if we summarize what we are looking for in ethical reasoning artifacts, we are looking to see:

- 1) That the student presents a normative ethical judgment (thesis).
- 2) That the student uses argument to support or criticize the ethical judgment (thesis).
- 3) That the student’s arguments are good arguments.
- 4) That the student thinks about opposing viewpoints and responds to them with argument.

The following (draft) rubric revolves around the above four desired outcomes.

RUBRIC FOR ASSESSMENT OF ETHICAL REASONING ARTIFACTS

1. Student clearly presents (normative) ethical judgment or thesis.

RED, 1 Point	YELLOW, 2 Points	GREEN, 3 Points
<p>Fails to present ethical judgment (thesis).</p> <p>Little integration of perspectives and little or no evidence of attending to others' views to qualify own view.</p>	<p>Presents ethical judgment (thesis), though some aspects are unclear or not explicitly stated.</p> <p>Qualifies position, though in a superficial way.</p>	<p>Presents well-formed and clear ethical judgment (thesis).</p> <p>Qualifies position by integrating contrary views or interpretations as appropriate.</p>

Comments:

2. Student supports or criticizes ethical judgment (thesis) with argument.

RED, 1 Point	YELLOW, 2 Points	GREEN, 3 Points
<p>No argument is made to support ethical judgment.</p> <p>Writing is purely emotive or purely descriptive.</p>	<p>Rudimentary argument structure is present.</p> <p>Identification of reasons to accept judgment or thesis, though some may be implied.</p>	<p>Argument structure is well organized.</p> <p>Clear identification of reasons to accept or reject the ethical judgment (thesis).</p>

Comments:

3. Student makes good arguments in support or criticism of ethical judgment or thesis.

RED, 1 Point	YELLOW, 2 Points	GREEN, 3 Points
<p>Argument, if present, is invalid and unsound.</p> <p>Argument fails to show any competence with the "three C's" (clarity, coherence, and completeness).</p>	<p>Effort to make a valid argument; some reasons given to believe argument is sound.</p> <p>Argument demonstrates partial competence with some of the "three C's"</p>	<p>Argument is valid; compelling reasons given to believe it is sound.</p> <p>Arguments made demonstrate competence with some of the "three C's" (clarity, coherence,</p>

Student fails to show awareness of consequences or implications of argument.	(clarity, coherence, completeness), though in a limited way. Student shows some awareness of consequences or implications of argument.	completeness). Student shows awareness of consequences or implications of argument.
--	---	--

Comments:

4. Student considers opposing viewpoints and engages in critical evaluation of opposing viewpoints.

RED, 1 Point	YELLOW, 2 Points	GREEN, 3 Points
Fails to acknowledge opposing viewpoints, or significantly misrepresents other positions. No effort to evaluate support given for other positions.	Student acknowledges opposing viewpoints. Some effort to use argument to critically evaluate the opposing viewpoint.	Student discusses opposing viewpoints. Analysis of other positions is accurate. Argument used to critically evaluate the opposing viewpoint.

Comments:

Overall Rating:

Criteria Score

__(1-3)__ 1. Presents own ethical (normative) judgment or thesis

__(1-3)__ 2. Supports ethical judgment with argument

__(1-3)__ 3. Makes good argument(s) in support of judgment

__(1-3)__ 4. Critically evaluates arguments of others

__(4-12)__ TOTAL SCORE

An artifact assessed with the above rubric will then be tagged as falling into one of three categories:

Nominal (Red – Stop)	Adequate (Yellow – Caution)	Excellent (Green – Go)
4-6	7-9	10-12

Any partial scores will be rounded up. So, an artifact with a total score of 6.5 will be placed in the “adequate” category while an artifact with a total score of 9.5 will be placed in the “excellent” category.