Intentionality and Implementation of HIPs

1. Why HIPs? – Desired Results
2. Selection of HIPs (Based on evidence; students’ needs; and institutional context. Who has access? Who doesn’t?)
3. Defined Learning Outcomes (transparency) and Equity Goals
4. Quality Design Elements and Development Strategies
5. Assessment Strategies (Evidence to assess progress towards outcomes and goals)
6. Reflection/Integration (e.g. scale, resources, sustainability)
The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can by shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

**Definition**

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

**Framing Language**

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

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

**Glossary**

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

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

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org

**Definition**

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capstone</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation of issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding.</td>
<td>Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions.</td>
<td>Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence</strong>&lt;br&gt;Selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly.</td>
<td>Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning.</td>
<td>Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Influence of context and assumptions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.</td>
<td>Identifies own and others' assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.</td>
<td>Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) are acknowledged. Others' points of view are synthesized within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).</td>
<td>Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue. Others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).</td>
<td>Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusions and related outcomes</strong>&lt;br&gt;(implications and consequences)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical and reflect student's informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order.</td>
<td>Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints, related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.</td>
<td>Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DRAFT Checklist for Designing a Transparent Assignment

Thank you for helping to test this DRAFT checklist. Please send your suggestions and feedback to mary-ann.winkelmes@unlv.edu

PURPOSE:

Skills
- Does your purpose statement specify a skill or skill set that students will gain from doing this assignment?
- Does your purpose statement link that particular skill set to the larger context of:
  - recent topics of class sessions?
  - this part of the course?
  - the whole course?
  - the major? the discipline?
  - your institution's main learning outcomes?
- Does your purpose statement indicate the relevance and/or usefulness of this skill to the students' lives:
  - beyond the course? beyond the major? beyond college?

Knowledge
- Does your purpose statement specify content knowledge that students will practice while doing the assignment?
- Does your purpose statement link that particular knowledge to examples/contexts where this skill was important in the context of:
  - recent class sessions?
  - this part of the course?
  - the whole course?
  - the major? the discipline?
  - your institution's main learning outcomes?
- Does your statement indicate the relevance and/or usefulness of this knowledge to the students' lives:
  - beyond the course? beyond the major? beyond college?
- Would this assignment benefit from segmenting it into several assignments, each one focused on a discrete set of skills that should be mastered to insure students' successful completion of the next assignment in the sequence?

TASK:
- Does your description of the task:
  - Identify the very first thing students should do when they begin working on the assignment?
  - The very next thing they should do?
  - The next, etc.
- Does your description of the task help students to avoid wasting their time on unnecessary steps, unproductive time expenditure?
- Does your description help students to focus their time efficiently on producing the highest quality work possible in the time given?
- Would students benefit from some practice exercises (in the form of a pre-task) in class to prepare them to perform the task outside of class on the graded assignment?

CRITERIA:
- Can students use the criteria while they are working on the assignment to determine whether they are completing the assignment efficiently and effectively?
- Do the criteria take the form of a checklist students can use to evaluate the quality of their efforts while they are working on the assignment?
- Does the checklist specify characteristics of high quality work for this assignment?
- Can you help students apply the checklist to evaluating some sample work in class, so they understand how each criterion would look in practice?
- With your guidance, can the students collaboratively annotate several examples of work to indicate where/how the work satisfies the criteria? (These annotated examples may then be shared as a reference for students to use while they work on their own assignments.)
- Would a rubric (AAC&U VALUE examples) be helpful to students for this assignment?
- Does the rubric provide an amount of information that helps students at this phase in their learning?
- Does the rubric provide an overwhelming or counterproductive amount of information for students at this phase in their learning?
- Did you provide examples of good work, annotated to identify exactly where and how this work satisfies your criteria?
- Can you provide students with examples in class so they and you can test out your criteria checklist or rubric to be sure students know how to apply the criteria to multiple examples of work, and eventually their own work?
In a world awash in data . . . . . . . VALUE generates evidence.

VALUE INSTITUTE
Learning Outcomes Assessment at Its Best

Demonstrating quality and the achievement of learning outcomes is more important than ever. We are proud to be advancing new approaches to meaningful and effective assessment as a means of delivering on the promise of American higher education.

—Lynn Pasquerella, Association of American Colleges and Universities

With the VALUE Institute, we’re creating a nationwide effort to change the conversation about higher education quality, equity, and assessment to help educators use learning outcomes evidence to improve student success. The VALUE approach is both evidence-based and evidence-generating. It is a methodologically sound, authentic, and creative response to the need for direct evidence of the quality of student learning across critical skills and abilities associated with success in life and work. In contrast to a standardized test divorced from the curriculum, the VALUE Institute’s assessment of student learning achievement is based on the actual work students produce in response to assignments from the curriculum or co-curriculum.

Higher education institutions are invited to participate in the VALUE Institute by collecting samples of student work, uploading the work into the VALUE digital repository, and having the work scored by certified VALUE Institute faculty scorers. Participating institutions receive data and reports from the tested VALUE nationwide database for benchmarking student learning.

VALUE Rubric Outcomes
Student learning can be assessed on the following VALUE rubric outcomes:

Written Communication • Quantitative Literacy • Critical Thinking • Civic Engagement
Ethical Reasoning • Intercultural Knowledge and Competence • Global Learning

Explore How Your Institution Can Use Direct Evidence of Learning
to improve student success at valueinstituteassessment.org

Registration: June – October 2018
Artifact Collection: October 2018 – May 2019
Artifact Scoring: May 2019 – July 2019
Results Delivered: September 2019

The VALUE Institute will equip institutions and faculty with actionable data to develop effective teaching methods that will meet the needs of our students preparing for a 21st century workforce.

—Rob Anderson, State Higher Education Executive Officers Association

www.valueinstituteassessment.org
VALUE Institute Consortia

Institutions in multi-campus systems or institutions sharing similar missions or common research interests may be interested in participating as a consortium to coordinate common student learning outcomes and to work on mutual research or practice goals. To inquire about participating in VALUE as a consortium, email us at info@valueinstituteassessment.org

The Multi-State Collaborative to Advance Quality Student Learning (MSC) is a consortium of two- and four-year institutions that aggregate state- and project-level reporting of student learning outcomes; network faculty across all consortium institutions; inform state policy discussions related to quality student learning, equity, and assessment; and engage in other significant benefits from consortium participation. To inquire about this SHEEO-sponsored consortium, contact Denise Pearson, Principal Policy Analyst, State Higher Education Executive Officers Association (SHEEO). dpearson@sheeo.org

We’re Changing the Conversation. Join Us!

Students Matter
Our faculty members have shared the rubrics with students to help them see what different levels of learning look like.

—David Switzer, St. Cloud University

Faculty Matter
By using the VALUE rubrics . . . We have really changed the tenor of assessment from one of ‘policing’ faculty teaching practices to enriching conversations about teaching and learning and how assessment can inform those conversations.

—D. Alexis Hart, Allegheny College

Assignments Matter
The focus on sampling work that faculty assign and students complete as part of their courses allowed us to highlight the faculty role in assessing student learning while creating spaces for faculty to learn more about assessment and assignment design.

—Jeanne Mullaney, Community College of Rhode Island

The VALUE Institute Team
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