

**IN 140/IN 183: University Seminar
2009-2010 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 had 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 of “**critical and ethical reasoning**.” This skill 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 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” and experiential learning.
- 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.

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. The 2008 report, responding to the larger institution-wide curricular changes that occurred the previous year, sought to establish a clear framework within which the assessment of IN140 could 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*.

The 2009 Report was the first report with the opportunity to implement the assessment framework envisioned in the 2008 Report. This year's Report (2010) continues to implement that assessment framework.

(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 skills 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 skills 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 and experiential learning, 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. Faculty are encouraged to be creative in their selection of topics – the faculty member can create the course he or she has always wanted to teach, or explore an area of interest even if that area is not directly in their area of expertise, etc. Maximum freedom of choice is given to the faculty teaching the course. Regardless of the substantive content, 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 2009 semester, 28 sections of University Seminar were offered. This included 22 “regular” sections, four honors sections and two “enhanced” sections. All students taking seminar were co-enrolled in a section of IN150, Critical Writing, Reading and Research. Regular and honors sections averaged 19.6 students. The two enhanced sections averaged 15 students.

During the fall 2009 semester, 13 sections of University Seminar were taught by full-time faculty members, 5 by adjunct faculty members, and 10 by full-time administrators. Although most instructors taught only one section, 6 instructors taught two sections.

One section of University Seminar was offered during the spring 2010 semester. Of the 15 students enrolled in this section, 10 took but did not pass the course during the fall 2009 semester; 5 were new (transfer) 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. Judgments about quality instruction, however, 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. While these sorts of easily obtainable 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 who taught University Seminar during the fall 2009 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 2008 Report, given the reforms made to University Seminar in the past few years, new methods for assessing the course were 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 in time to be administered by University Seminar instructors during the 2008 fall, 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 2009 offerings of University Seminar represent the second 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 includes 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

Starting with the fall 2008 semester, all faculty teaching sections of University Seminar were asked to administer the University Seminar Survey. The plan was to have this happen each semester. However, the university moved to an on-line course evaluation system during the 2009-2010 year. This change caused a good bit of confusion toward the end of the 2009 fall semester. As a result of confusion regarding course evaluations, the University Seminar Survey was not distributed in a timely fashion to allow for its administration by seminar faculty. An effort was made to have CWRR faculty administer the survey, but this effort met with very limited success. Some responses were provided from each section, but only a total of approximately 115 students out of the 540 enrolled in University Seminar completed the survey. This represents a response rate of 21% (compared with a response rate of 82% for the previous year). Despite these problems, the data collected is presented below.

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 surveys, if available):

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.

Question	Spring 2006 (358 Respondents)	Spring 2007 (228 Respondents)	Spring 2008 (301 Respondents)	Fall 2008 (397-385 Respondents)	Fall 2009 (115 Respondents)
Course Content Challenging	2.70	2.85	2.61	3.08	2.94
Engaged in Critical Thinking	2.78	2.86	2.61	3.14	3.16
Engaged in Ethical Reasoning on Personal Issue	n/a	n/a	n/a	2.96	3.07
Engaged in Ethical Reasoning on Local, National, Global, Community Issue	n/a	n/a	n/a	2.96	3.12
Service learning was a purposeful experience	2.99	2.93	2.54	2.88	2.89
Service Learning Connected to Course	2.70	2.82	2.50	2.77	2.61
Engaged in Reflection on Service Learning	n/a	n/a	n/a	2.87	3.00
Orientation topics helped me	2.83	2.97	2.68	2.70	2.68

adapt to college life					
Cohort between IN140 and IN150 was strong	2.47	2.60	2.29	2.21	2.40
Course Equips Me to Succeed in College	2.63	2.79	2.50	2.74	2.71
Course was worth taking	2.86	2.97	2.76	2.89	2.84
Overall Index Score on Eight Items from Original YFYC Survey	2.75	2.85	2.56	2.80	2.77
Overall Index Score on Survey as Revised (11 Items)	n/a	n/a	n/a	2.84	2.86

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)	Fall 2009 (115 Respondents)
Course Content Challenging	49%	64%	56%	80%	68%
Engaged in Critical	51%	65%	56%	79%	82%

Thinking					
Engaged in Ethical Reasoning on Personal Issue	n/a	n/a	n/a	71%	80%
Engaged in Ethical Reasoning on Local, National, Global, Community Issue	n/a	n/a	n/a	75%	83%
Service learning was a purposeful experience	59%	66%	55%	74%	70%
Service Learning Connected to Course	50%	62%	54%	65%	59%
Engaged in Reflection on Service Learning	n/a	n/a	n/a	72%	79%
Orientation topics helped me adapt to college life	57%	74%	62%	65%	64%
Cohort between IN140 and IN150 was strong	38%	50%	42%	37%	41%
Course	48%	60%	50%	68%	67%

Equips Me to Succeed in College					
Course was worth taking	56%	69%	61%	68%	71%

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)	Fall 2009 (115 Respondents)
Course Content Challenging	31%	30%	31%	20%	32%
Engaged in Critical Thinking	29%	28%	30%	21%	18%
Engaged in Ethical Reasoning on Personal Issue	n/a	n/a	n/a	29%	20%
Engaged in Ethical Reasoning on Local, National, Global, Community Issue	n/a	n/a	n/a	25%	17%
Service learning was a purposeful experience	19%	26%	28%	26%	30%
Service Learning	32%	31%	30%	35%	41%

Connected to Course					
Engaged in Reflection on Service Learning	n/a	n/a	n/a	28%	21%
Orientation topics helped me adapt to college life	22%	19%	24%	35%	36%
Cohort between IN140 and IN150 was strong	40%	41%	42%	63%	59%
Course Equips Me to Succeed in College	32%	33%	35%	32%	33%
Course was worth taking	25%	25%	26%	32%	29%

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 2009 semester. The data also indicates the percentage change compared to the previous year (fall 2008). This information is placed immediately below the fall 2009 data. Data for all sections are included.

SIR Item	University Means	All IN140 Instructors	Full Time Faculty IN140 Instructors	Adjunct IN140 Instructors	Full Time Administration IN140 Instructors
Course Organization & Planning	4.34 +.02	4.19 +.08	4.39 +.48	3.81 (-.31)	4.12 (-.43)
Communication	4.40 +.03	4.27 +.06	4.42 +.38	4.12 (-.08)	4.15 (-.46)
Overall, Instructor	4.36 (-.01)	4.12 +.08	4.40 +.66	3.74 (-.50)	3.97 (-.68)
Overall, Course	4.19 +.04	3.84 +.09	4.11 +.65	3.51 (-.28)	3.67 (-.74)

The following table 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:

CATEGORY	ALL IN140 FACULTY	IN140 FT	IN140 ADJUNCT	IN140 ADMIN.
Org. & Planning	15 (53.6%)	9	1	5
Communication	16 (57.1%)	9	2	5
Overall, Instructor	15 (53.6%)	9	1	5
Overall, Course	10 (35.7%)	7	1	2

C. Syllabus Audit Data

For the fall 2009 semester, 21 total syllabi were collected. This represents syllabi for each section of IN140. 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. The number and percentage in brackets underneath the initial data entry represents the number and percentage of syllabi in compliance with the item last year.

**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	21 (100%) [19 (100%)]		
SOMEWHERE in SYLLABUS:			
Faculty contact info: name, office, office hours, office phone, email address	21 (100%) [19 (100%)]		
Course description: Standard description (see below) plus faculty written course description/overview	21 (100%) [14 (74%)]	[5 (26%)]	
Standard course learning goals (see below)	21 (100%) [14 (74%)]	[4 (21%)]	[1 (5%)]
Instructor's grading policy - scale and weights for assignments & for the semester	21 (100%) [17 (89%)]	[2 (11%)]	
Instructor's attendance policy - penalties	20 (95%) [18 (95%)]	1 (5%) [1 (5%)]	
Academic honesty & integrity statement (standard)	21 (100%) [16 (84%)]	[2 (11%)]	[1 (5%)]

University disability statement (standard, see below)	21 (100%) [17 (89%)]	[1 (5%)]	[1 (5%)]
Specification of a written assignment that will serve as ethical reasoning artifact for assessment purposes	20 (95%) [15 (79%)]	1 (5%) [1 (5%)]	[3 (16%)]
Specification of a written assignment that will serve as service learning with reflection artifact for assessment purposes	21 (100%) [14 (74%)]	[5 (26%)]	

D. Artifact Collection: Ethical Reasoning

For the second 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 assessed in IN140, University Seminar is as follows. Two artifacts (papers) are examined from each section. Assuming full participation by all sections and student enrollments of 20 students per section, this would represent a random review of 10% of students.

Actual participation for fall 2009 again fell short of full participation. A total of 44 ethical reasoning artifacts were examined. These artifacts were randomly selected from across 25 sections of University Seminar, with two artifacts coming from 19 sections and one artifact coming from 6 sections. This represents a participation rate of 89% of Seminar sections and a random sampling of 8.1% of the total students enrolled in University Seminar during the fall 2009 semester (540). No artifacts were examined from three sections (11%) of University Seminar sections. This was because students failed to post their papers to the Moodle folder.

On all artifacts, the assessor used pink highlight to flag specific items relevant to ethical reasoning. Green, yellow, and red highlight was then used to indicate the assessor’s comments. The assessor on all ethical reasoning artifacts was Dr. Money. Assessment was done based on the ethical reasoning rubric (see below). 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.

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 faculty coordinator of University Seminar (Dr. Money).

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 (20%)	13 (30%)	22 (50%)

(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, though limited in obvious ways due to the low response rate, indicate that we continue to solidify some of the significant gains that we made in a number of important areas. For example, the mean responses for “engaged in critical thinking” (3.16), “engaged in ethical reasoning on personal issue” (3.07),

“engaged in ethical reasoning on local, national, global community issue” (3.12), and “engaged in reflection on service learning” (3.00) were all-time highs, and the first time any mean response for any of these survey items has crossed the 3.0 threshold.

Likewise, the percentage of students with positive responses to those four items was 82%, 80%, 83%, and 79%, respectively. In other words, four out of every five students are indicating a positive response to the major academic skill components of the course. These data suggest, therefore, that we continue to do 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.

In addition, we achieved all-time high positive response on “course was worth taking” (71%).

As a whole, University Seminar students felt that they benefited from the inclusion of first-year orientation topics within their course. Nearly two-thirds (64%) 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.

The overall index score of 2.77 for the eight items that were continued from the original YFYC survey, which follows last year’s index score of 2.80, suggests that we have solidified the significant gains over the 2008 index score of 2.56. And the overall index score of 2.86 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. Just 41% of students 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 50% and the only item where the negative response was above 50%.

In sum, the data suggest that we have held onto the substantial gains that we made in 2009 over previous instantiations of the course.

B. SIR Data

This is the third 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 2009 semester, full-time faculty taught 13 (46%) of the 28 total sections. Adjunct faculty taught 5 sections (18%), while administrators taught 10 sections (36%).

The SIR data for the fall 2009 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. Clearly, we still have work to do in our effort to ensure that high quality teaching takes place in IN140. In terms of the number of individual faculty above/below the university mean on each item, the data show that 15 faculty (54%) scored above the university mean on the scale summary for organization and planning; 16 faculty (57%) scored above the university mean on the scale summary for communication; 15 faculty (54%) scored above the university mean on overall evaluation of instructor; finally, 10 faculty (36%) scored above the university mean for overall evaluation of course. This data is comparable to the data from previous year.

However, SIR data show that we substantially improved the quality of instruction in those sections taught by full-time faculty. The data show that the average mean scores for our full-time faculty teaching sections of IN140 were *higher* 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 is the first time that this has been the case. In addition, the data show that on three of the four items, the average mean scores for full time faculty teaching IN140 were *higher* than the mean scores for faculty at the university. Again, this is the first time this has ever been the case. In short, as a group, the full-time faculty teaching IN140 are judged by students to be *more* effective than faculty at the University as a whole. In short, we have significantly strengthened the quality of the full time faculty teaching IN140 (again, as measured by SIR data only).

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: 70% (50% last year)
- Administrator: 20% (40% last year)
- Adjunct: 10% (10% last year)

Communication:

- Full Time: 60% (60% last year)
- Administrator: 30% (30% last year)
- Adjunct: 10% (10% last year)

Overall instructor:

- Full Time: 60% (40% last year)
- Administrator: 30% (40% last year)
- Adjunct: 10% (20% last year)

Overall course:

- FT: 70% (50% last year)
- Admin: 20% (40% last year)
- Adj: 10% (10% 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: 20% (80% last year)
- Administrator: 50% (10% last year)
- Adjunct: 30% (10% last year)

Communication:

- Full Time: 20% (90% last year)
- Administrator: 50% (0% last year)
- Adjunct: 30% (10% last year)

Overall instructor:

- Full Time: 20% (90% last year)
- Administrator: 50% (0% last year)
- Adjunct: 30% (10% last year)

Overall course:

- FT: 20% (90% last year)

- Admin: 50% (0% last year)
- Adj: 30% (10% last year)

In general, relative to the percentage of courses taught by each category of instructor, the data show:

- 1) Full time faculty consistently over-represented in the top ten and consistently under-represented in the bottom ten.
- 2) Adjuncts and administrators consistently over-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 instructors to IN140. We need to reach a point where high quality instruction is offered across all sections, and not just in substantial pockets of those courses.

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 all items, faculty members are now constructing syllabi that are targeting the skills and responsibilities that are definitive of the course. Importantly, **100%** of syllabi now provide the standard description of the course (up from 74%), the standard description of the course learning goals (up from 74%), and explicit specification of a written assignment serving as the service learning with reflection artifact (up from 74%). Also, **95+%** of syllabi explicitly specified a written assignment that would serve as the ethical reasoning artifact (up from 79%). In fact, under the audit, only two items received anything other than a 100% rate of delivery. Those were the following:

- Attendance Policy: one syllabus stated attendance was expected, but did not set out a clear penalty for nonattendance.
- Specification of a Written Assignment for Ethical Reasoning: one syllabus identified several essays that as part of the assignments, but did not make it clear if either of those essays would serve as the ethical reasoning artifact.

As indicated in section (1) “Context” above, the course has been substantially revised in the recent past. Our instructors have shown an excellent commitment to modifying

their courses and syllabi so as bring them into compliance with the course as revised. Syllabi have been adjusted, modified, and organized so as to bring the desired uniformity to the presentation of the course. Again, this uniformity is not about substantive content or topic selection, but to the skills and activities that are definitive of the course. In addition, the distribution of the syllabus audit form in advance of the fall semester (as well as posting it online) has likely helped bring about this uniformity of presentation.

Last year’s report noted that “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.” The data reveal that faculty have made those revisions and that we have achieved near 100% marks on all items.

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 (22%)	13 (30%)	22 (50%)

This is essentially the second time that a sufficient number of artifacts have been examined to provide us with meaningful data. Hence, we are still in the process of building a baseline by which to judge future progress in student learning relative to ethical reasoning. Nevertheless, the data does allow us to make some preliminary (if tentative) judgments.

The data show that **80%** of student artifacts demonstrated at least adequate ethical reasoning skills. Intuitively, this is an solid percentage. Interestingly, this percentage is in line with the students’ self-reports on the University Seminar survey instrument regarding engagement in ethical reasoning (83-80%).

The data shows that we made substantive advances in terms of the percentage of artifacts assessed as **excellent**. The following table compares this year’s results with last year’s results.

Year	Nominal (Red— Stop)	Adequate (Yellow— Caution)	Excellent (Green— Go)
2008	24%	42%	34%
2009	20%	30%	50%

While we had approximately the same percentage of artifacts assessed as “nominal” and the same total percentage assessed as demonstrating at least adequate ethical reasoning skills, the mix was significantly different in the two categories, adequate and excellent. Last year, we had 42% of artifacts assess as adequate. We *decreased* that percentage to 30% this year. Importantly, the 12% of artifacts no longer assessed as adequate did not move into the nominal category. Instead, they moved into the excellent category. Last year, we had 34% of artifacts assess as excellent. We *increased* that percentage to 50% this year. These are significant and substantive gains.

Most, if not all, of the artifacts that assessed as nominal were classified in that way because the writing simply did not engage in ethical reasoning. In many cases, this could be a result of the type of prompt or assignment that is constructed. For example, several artifacts that assessed as nominal were fine examples of reflection on service learning. However, the artifact did not include any clear normative ethical judgment and/or any argument in support of that judgment. It is certainly possible to combine reflection on service learning with ethical reasoning. However, the prompt and assignment must be constructed so that students are directed to do more than simply reflect on service learning experiences.

(7) Trends and Improvement Plans

A. Improvement in Assessment Methods

We have now reached the point where we are able to assess a sufficient number of artifacts to provide us with data. We are getting artifacts from the vast majority of sections. Our goal, now, needs to be to *increase the overall total rate of compliance by students*. That is, we need to increase the number of students who are submitting artifacts so that the random sampling taken will, in fact, be a random sampling of IN140 students. We have made the submission process very easy. There is a central depository set up on Moodle. Students are sent step-by-step directions on how to upload their artifacts. Nevertheless, a large number of students simply do not follow through. We need to incentivize the students. How to do so will be a topic for collective discussion. Options might include: (a) penalization of grade for failure to upload the assignment;

(b) refusal or delay in releasing student grades; (c) entering all students who upload their assignment into a raffle contest; etc.

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. The faculty coordinator pledges to ensure that the survey is distributed to all seminar instructors in adequate time to provide the opportunity for proper administration.

While we made significant gains in the quality of teaching (as measured by SIR scores) among our full-time faculty teaching IN140, we lost ground with our adjuncts and administrators. We must continue to work to ensure that high quality teachers deliver this important element within our University Studies program. The faculty coordinator has drafted a memo making the case for a sustained effort to work in this direction. This memo will be sent to the VPAA before the start of the fall 2010 semester.

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) the ethical reasoning rubric, and (2) seven actual student artifacts that span the range of rubric-based scores (e.g., 12, 11, 8.5, 7, 7, 6, 4). This document will then be sent to all instructors scheduled to teach University Seminar in the fall 2010 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 2010 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 baseline for faculty development meetings and/or workshops over the course of the upcoming year. University wide workshops were held during the 2008-2009 academic 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. During the 2009-2010 academic year, presentations on ethical reasoning were made to faculty teaching (or interested in teaching) IN250/251. Since ethical reasoning is a skill thread that runs

vertically through the curriculum, it is important for faculty teaching the sophomore and junior level courses to be familiar with what is taking place in the freshman level course charged with introducing ethical reasoning to students.

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 and general discussion of prompt formation and construction so as to engage students in ethical reasoning. It is likely that instructors will gain more insight into how to target ethical reasoning in their assignments if the workshops are practically 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 identify ethical dilemmas that arose in their service learning experiences 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 not simply to identify ethical dilemmas, but to take a position on those issues and provide an argument in support of the position they take. 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.

The faculty coordinator has approached two instructors who have a track record of designing assignments that elicit solid ethical reasoning from their students: Roslyn O’Conner and Molly Pawsey. These instructors have been invited to lead an early fall 2010 workshop on “implementing ethical reasoning.” Each has agreed to lead this workshop. The workshop will revolve around brief presentations by these instructors on their strategies for engaging students in ethical reasoning. Each will present an overview of how she approaches this skill relative to her course, including text selections, assignment/prompt construction, feedback to students, etc. In advance of the workshop, the artifacts from these instructors’ sections that were assessed as part of the 2010 Report will be distributed, along with copies of the assignment prompts, and a copy of the ethical reasoning rubric used for assessment purposes. A round-table discussion can then ensue. The tentative date for this event is Tuesday, September 14. The faculty coordinators for the other sequential elements of our University Studies program have been informed of this event, as they might have an interest in extending an invitation to faculty teaching in the sequential courses, given that ethical reasoning is a common element of all IN courses (except CWRR).

C. First Week

Response to the 2008 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 during the 2008 fall semester. 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.

The pilot program is now no longer pilot. It has been fully incorporated into the first week schedule and is a standing part of our University Seminar experience. The fall 2010 First Week program will continue to include an introduction to ethical reasoning and a breakout session with each section in order to engage students in ethical reasoning at the very start of their academic career.

(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. We continue to look for ways to make 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 2009

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.

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.

Mary E. Garrison graduated from Western Illinois University in 1989 with a BA in Sociology and a minor in Law Enforcement. Mary earned her MSW in 2000 from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and her LCSW in 2001. Mary spent 15 years in community mental health working with individuals with severe and persistent mental illness prior to coming to Millikin as an Assistant Professor of Social Work. Mary's research and experiential learning interests are in the mental health and homeless arena. Mary's students have been involved in research and projects to benefit the Oasis Day Center as well as the City of Decatur and the 10 year plan to end chronic homelessness. Mary is the advisor of several student organizations including: NAMI on Campus, SASA (Students Against Sexual Assault), Best Buddies, Co-Advisor to Breakaway, faculty advisor to Tri Delta Sorority as well as the advisor to the Advocates of Change Learning Community in Hessler Hall.

Laurel Graham Marling is an adjunct instructor for Millikin's Communication Department. She received a B.A. in English from the University of Rochester, Rochester, NY in 1991 and a M.A. in English from the College of Charleston, Charleston, SC in 1999. Before teaching at Millikin, she worked as a Writing Consultant

for the College of Charleston and as a Curriculum Developer and Communication Specialist for a consulting firm in Madison, WI. Her teaching and research interests include the study of rhetoric and composition, adult education and training, 19th century British literature, and the prose and poetry of the Victorian writer Matthew Arnold.

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 Theo-Socratic 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.

Gary R. Shaw, Professor of Music and Director of Bands, teaches trombone and conducts the Symphonic Wind Ensemble at Millikin. He currently performs on trombone with the Millikin Faculty Brass Quintet, the Millikin-Decatur Symphony Orchestra and the Decatur Municipal Band. Dr. Shaw holds the DMA from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, The MM from Boston University and the BME from the New England Conservatory of Music. In summer 2009 he taught trombone for Millikin's Bella Musica immersion class in Urbana, Italy. He's an avid fan of baseball and the Boston Red Sox.

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>Student fails to show</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" (clarity, coherence, completeness), though in</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, completeness).</p>

awareness of consequences or implications of argument.	a limited way. Student shows some awareness of consequences or implications of argument.	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 –	Excellent (Green – Go)
----------------------	--------------------	------------------------

	Caution)	
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.