A Holistic Scoring Rubric for Student Work: Woodbury’s Principles as Applied to Select General Education and Major Courses:

This rubric explicitly defines five of the six Woodbury Principles: Innovation and Creativity, Communication, Transdisciplinarity, Social Responsibility, and the Integrated Student. (Woodbury University 2007-2008 Course Catalog, p. 1). The underlying principle that this rubric implicitly defines is the Woodbury principle of Academic Quality:

“In times of great change, standards can change. The university seeks, as it has always done, to add value to the lives of its students through the educational experiences it provides. At the same time, the course and outcomes of learning must adhere to the highest principles and goals. This provides assurance to the students and to the community that the learning at Woodbury University is not only significant but of significant quality” (Woodbury University 2007-2008 Course Catalog, p. 1).

Below, a professor will find five pages, each representing one of the five previously mentioned principles, each divided into four columns. Each page’s left-hand column has three parts:

1. definition of a principle by citing the Woodbury 2007-2008 Catalog, pg. 1;
2. description of three kinds of evidence (not an exhaustive list) relevant to the principle; and
3. general education outcomes as adopted by the Woodbury Faculty Senate in March, 2005 (slightly modified from Our Students’ Best Learning: A Framework for Accountability Worth of Our Mission (American Association of Colleges and Universities, 2004, pp. 5-6) and grounded in the ideas laid out in Greater Expectations: A New Vision for Learning as a Nation Goes to College (American Association of Colleges and Universities, 2002)) and that most closely align with the selected Woodbury principle.

Each page’s three right-hand columns describe how student work in a course may be categorized at three levels: exemplary, satisfactory, and below expectations. The language and descriptions used are from a merging of the standards and values expressed in the left-hand column. Under each of these three columns is a score range representing specific levels of achievement.

Curriculum & Learning Outcomes: How Faculty Can Encourage Their Students’ Success

A department, program, and/or faculty member may revise or design a curriculum or course with this rubric in mind. If this rubric is used as a guide when revising and/or designing a course, then the students completing that course are more likely to meet the learning outcomes of this rubric, setting them up for success at the program and university levels. Or, said another way, this rubric may be read as a university-level generalization of the specific curricular learning outcomes that a department, program, or faculty member create. Hence, student work may meet the university’s general learning outcomes, as read in this rubric, while meeting the specific learning outcomes for a curriculum or course, assuming that the faculty group has conscientiously aligned their specific curricular learning outcomes with the university outcomes found in this rubric.

Although this rubric is used for assessment purposes at the end of a course and after student work is completed, having favorable results or “scores” depends on faculty members planning for a course’s learning outcomes to support the Woodbury principles. In addition, this rubric may be used for pedagogical purposes at the beginning of a course or as a means for explaining and justifying the
course’s learning outcomes to the students. If desired by a department, faculty members may determine students’ grades by applying this rubric to their work.

This rubric and/or the department’s rubric, however, are only good if faculty members have regularly scheduled conversations (i.e., calibration sessions) in which faculty members agree on their understanding of a course’s learning outcomes and agree on the evidence students may provide for meeting these outcomes. These conversations need to be regularly scheduled for these reasons:

(1) New faculty members will need to be inculcated into previous curricular and pedagogical agreements.
(2) A faculty group needs to adjust previously held agreements to accommodate how new students are meeting learning outcomes in unexpected ways.
(3) A faculty group may want to change learning outcomes and need to agree on the implementation and ramifications of the changes.
(4) The key to holistic scoring of student work is maintaining strong inter-rater reliability (the degree to which different observers give consistent values to the same work) and agreements derived from this assessment practice.

These regularly scheduled conversations thus allow faculty and students to adjust curriculum and learning outcomes while still agreeing on common standards rooted in these core principles.

How to Use the Rubric

The Woodbury principles, which are categories in the rubric, define university-wide curricular goals as adopted in 2006. In the rubric, the statements that help define and refine a principle are based on university-wide learning outcomes adopted in 2005. Hence, the rubric begins to define more clearly and specifically these learning outcomes and is a means for direct assessment of these outcomes. Not all outcomes apply to all courses or curricula. A course’s or curriculum’s particular learning outcomes may be designed to satisfy a particular Woodbury principle or two. It does not presuppose that a particular curriculum or course sufficiently covers all the principles involved. In such a case, only the applicable parts of this rubric should be applied to the student work from that course. In other words, if a course’s learning outcomes are meant to address all the Woodbury principles, then this rubric in its entirety should be applied holistically to the student work. However, if a course’s learning outcomes are designed to address, for instance, the Woodbury principles of “communication” and “social responsibility,” then only those parts of the rubric should be holistically applied for the purpose of measuring how well that particular course’s learning outcomes are integrated into the university-wide learning outcomes.

The rubric is to be applied to a portfolio or a collection of student work (tests, assignments, presentations, papers, drawings, exhibitions, group projects, student’s websites, and fieldwork activities) from one course as part of the direct assessment of that course’s learning outcomes. A department’s faculty members need to be involved with the process of “scoring” or “rating” student portfolios or collections for the rubric and assessment process to be reliable and valid. As validity is established through norming, calibration, and/or training sessions – all acceptable words for the same event – then faculty members may move toward demonstrating “inter-rater reliability.” Briefly, inter-rater reliability refers to how frequently two faculty members, independent of each other, give the same score to a student’s portfolio. When faculty members agree 80% of the time, the lowest acceptable inter-rater reliability has been established. Faculty members typically agree more than 80% of the time when curriculum is designed to meet a rubric’s criteria and when the calibration sessions are conducted by an experienced assessor.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovation and Creativity</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Below Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| “Creativity suggests that one is a maker of knowledge, goods, concepts and not just a receiver of them. Innovation suggests that what one makes is new and forward-looking. We try to foster the values of innovation and creativity in all members of our community.” | The evidence:  
  - Introduces new, complex and relevant ideas or approaches that go beyond commonly held knowledge or methods.  
  - Determines a future course of events, not merely repeating past activities, knowledge, or solutions.  
  - Demonstrates a highly developed perspective that engages academic and professional colleagues as well as challenges their sensibilities, if not traditions.  
  - Demonstrates an accurate and sensitive awareness of differing cultural viewpoints and a fluent understanding of differing intellectual traditions.  
  - Questions or even breaks with cultural and intellectual assumptions, including academics culture as defined by a disciplinary or professional tradition  
  - Offers pragmatic, inter-generational solutions. | The evidence:  
  - Introduces an audience to a few new, complex or relevant ideas that partially synthesize possible solutions to a problem.  
  - Presents perspectives that are not well-integrated, where a profession’s or community’s past may be too emphasized.  
  - Does not clarify a better future for the community-based problem  
  - Representations of ground-breaking knowledge are not well-defined, although they might be suggested implicitly.  
  - Partially developed perspectives suggest innovation in need of developing or better application.  
  - Demonstrates a partial and somewhat sensitive awareness of contrastive cultural and intellectual traditions, but stubbornly seems accepting of the “status quo” as defined by social, academic, and professional traditions. | The evidence:  
  - Introduces singular rather than multiple perspectives, hence, setting aside questioning academic and social tradition.  
  - Demonstrates a lack of awareness of differing cultural and intellectual traditions to the point that they seem unexamined  
  - Pragmatic analysis seems uninspired and distant, defined by common professional or academic knowledge rather than developing it or adding to it  
  - Shows an underdeveloped understanding of a discipline’s past, if not the purpose of an education. |
| Possible Evidence as Appropriate for Discipline:                                                                 | The reviewer feels that she or he has been introduced to an original and inspiring idea that stimulates her or his own creativity. | The reviewer feels drawn to fill in the gaps and close the loop on ideas that are only partially realized. | The reviewer sees little originality, inter-cultural or other kinds of awareness or engagement with collaborative processes. |
| The professors see….  
  - Concepts that go beyond common knowledge or course content  
  - Critical awareness of differing viewpoints  
  - Original and forward-looking proposals or ideas | Conceptual Basis: The student demonstrates “intercultural knowledge and collaborative problem-solving skills—achieved and demonstrated in a variety of collaborative contexts (classroom, community-based, international, and online) that prepare students both for democratic citizenship and for work both in their local communities and in a global society.” |                                                                 | |
| Score (10 point Scale):  
  - 9 to 10 Points  
  - 6 to 8 Points  
  - 0 to 5 Points |                                                                 |                                                                 |                                                                 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Below Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The diversity of forms in which communications take place has swelled, as have the people and places that one must communicate with. In addition to the expanding media, the types of communication have expanded and given heightened importance to visual and physical as well as written and oral communication. We strive to produce good communication and excellent communicators across diverse media and audiences.” Possible Evidence as Appropriate for Discipline:</td>
<td>The evidence:</td>
<td>The evidence:</td>
<td>The evidence:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Demonstrates in written, visual and spoken forms a seamless movement between communication that persuades, informs, analyzes, interprets, and/or entertains.</td>
<td>o Suggests difficulty with transitions between communication that persuades, informs, analyzes, interprets, and/or entertains.</td>
<td>o Often fails to use communication to persuade, inform, analyze, interpret, and/or entertain in purposeful ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Clearly shows specific purposes, superior organization, and visual appeal in terms of text-image and presenter-information relationships.</td>
<td>o Shows some purpose, organization, and visual elements in terms of text-image and presenter-information relationships.</td>
<td>o Lacks specificity, purpose, and/or coherence, and include misusing the discipline’s vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Embodies critically used and trustworthy sources; strategic communications between sites or groups; and/or contextualized 2-D and/or 3-D models which may be physical or representational models, tables, graphs, illustrations, etc.</td>
<td>o Is supplemented by web-based publications and enhanced by applied software but not in consistent and critical ways.</td>
<td>o Suggests incompetence by including plagiarism, ineffective illustrations, poor grammar, and/or imperfect, decontextualized 2-D and 3-D models.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Basis: The student demonstrates “strong analytical, communication, quantitative, and information skills—achieved and demonstrated through learning in a range of fields, settings, and media, and through advanced studies in one or more areas of concentration.”</td>
<td>o Meets academic and professional standards in terms of genre conventions and audience expectations.</td>
<td>o Reveals an adequate awareness of some genre conventions and expectations, but the use of both general and specialized vocabulary may not be consistent or include some insensitive or inaccurate usage.</td>
<td>A reviewer finds him- or herself wanting to explain the communications because the originator does not understand his or her audience’s needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The reviewer feels that he or she has learned from the student who is an excellent communicator across diverse media and is addressing multiple audiences well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score (10 point Scale): 9 to 10 Points          6 to 8 Points          0 to 5 Points
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transdisciplinarity</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Below Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Transdisciplinarity understands the interdependence of all knowledge and widens the forms of knowing to include emotional intelligences, intuition, and physical knowing. It recognizes the importance of collaboration among the disciplines to solve complex problems. We believe that collaboration of people, each able to make a unique contribution, is important.”</td>
<td>The evidence:</td>
<td>The evidence:</td>
<td>The evidence:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Displays differing but relevant disciplinary and professional perspectives, empathizing, if not collaborating, with traditionally oppositional forces, and balancing perspectives by using argument-counterargument.</td>
<td>o Suggests an attempt to integrate differing disciplinary and professional perspectives, an awareness of competing social forces and contrary stake holders while relying primarily on one specific disciplinary method or mode of analysis.</td>
<td>o Reflects a poorly understood or applied method or methods and may have only one mode of analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Includes qualitative and/or quantitative reasoning and provides evidence founded on spatial relationships or experiments or explanations that make intuitive connections.</td>
<td>o Includes either qualitative or quantitative reasoning or evidence founded on theoretical, but possibly not empirical, data.</td>
<td>o Reaches vague and unverifiable conclusions, offering less than significant insights, due to a lack of dialogue between distinctive fields or disciplines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Establishes inter- and intra-relationships regarding chosen elements and an emerging issue.</td>
<td>o Makes intuitive connections that are in need of consistent explanation.</td>
<td>o Neglects inter- and intra-relationships between elements and an emerging issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Reaches verifiable conclusions as well as comparative and significant insights regarding complex community-relevant problems in collaboration with academic and professional colleagues.</td>
<td>o Establishes inter- and intra-relationships between elements and an emerging issue may not be comprehensive.</td>
<td>o Does not reflect the choice of a substantial or important community-relevant problem or utilize collaborative approaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Basis: The student demonstrates a “deep understanding of and hands-on experience with the inquiry practices of disciplines that explore the natural, social, and cultural realms—achieved and demonstrated through studies that build conceptual knowledge by engaging learners in concepts and modes of inquiry that are basic to the natural sciences, social sciences, humanities, and arts.”</td>
<td>The reviewer thinks that multiple disciplinary perspectives create trustworthy, worthwhile, unique knowledge relevant to a community.</td>
<td>The reviewer feels that the work suggests that a scholar or professional is emerging; however, the work itself seems incomplete in some (not all) aspects.</td>
<td>The reviewer believes that the work represents failure to move beyond specific disciplinary boundaries at some fundamental levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score (10 point Scale):</th>
<th>9 to 10 Points</th>
<th>6 to 8 Points</th>
<th>0 to 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Responsibility</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Below Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| “Social responsibility no longer is an option for the educated. At base social responsibility implies a respect for the planet, a respect for its people and the environment. It asserts that all action has impact on the planet and that understanding that impact and accepting responsibility for one’s actions is the moral and ethical condition for the educated global citizen. Civic engagement has come to embrace principles of sustainability as well as social justice. Members of our community will be socially responsible.” Possible Evidence as Appropriate for Discipline: | The evidence:  
  o Shows that moral and ethical choices are part of one’s personal, social, and professional life and considers issues in light of such variables as race, class, and gender  
  o Engages representatives of the community beyond the university in the hope of creating a greater common good or an awareness of an injustice not being adequately addressed by civic institutions.  
  o Considers how sustainability and environmental justice affects the project, the profession, and the global capitalist system.  
  o Successfully navigates between self-interest and the common good, and between communities that exclude as well as include individuals.  
  The reviewer understands how the work argues for a particular ethical stance and develops an idea that benefits a community. | The evidence:  
  o Implies that moral and ethical choices are relevant to professional as well as social and personal life, intimating that race, class, and gender issues are meaningful.  
  o Does not fully engage in a dialogue regarding how such issues actually affect the community beyond the university.  
  o Does not fully appreciate the impact of environmental issues on the profession and on having a just society.  
  o Partially attempts to balance self-interest, capitalism, the common good and the social implications of professional decisions.  
  The reviewer appreciates the striving for a better understanding of professional relationships affecting communities. | The evidence:  
  o Seems to privilege “book knowledge” over civic engagement, so moral and ethical considerations are not well-understood or are lesser considerations.  
  o Although race, class, and gender may be recognized as important in society in general, their place in the analysis is not well-defined.  
  o Environmental issues may not be presented or not presented as pertinent.  
  o The interplay between self-interest, capitalism, and the common good may not be shown as relevant or as considerations in terms of professional aspirations.  
  The reviewer doubts that there is an understanding social responsibility as a professional consideration and as the profession’s commitment to building better communities. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score (10 point Scale):</th>
<th>9 to 10 Points</th>
<th>6 to 8 Points</th>
<th>0 to 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integrated Student</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Below Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| “Because of the principles above, Woodbury University finds it more important than ever to assure that the aspects of a student’s personal and professional life are fully integrated. What one will do as a professional is an outgrowth of what one will become as a person. All parts of the university will work on producing this integrated student.” | The evidence:  
- Moves easily between individual interest, disciplinary niche, and a professional commitment to a community and standards.  
- Facilitates these connections through the transfer of skills learned from other sources  
- Succeeds in blending individual reflection, group dialogue, and organizational structures to achieve a high level of collaboration and communication. | The evidence:  
- May make not inter-relate self-interest, disciplinary niche, and professional commitment to standards.  
- Displays inconsistent understandings that appear as partially failing to transfer learned skills learned to the present task.  
- Inconsistent understandings are facilitated by under appreciating self-reflection, group dialogue, or organizational structures.  
- Collaboration and communication are incomplete, yet some values that are meaningful in professional and social contexts are presented. | The evidence:  
- Misunderstands fundamental relationships between self-interest, a disciplinary niche, and the professional community.  
- Demonstrates failing to transfer skills and knowledge from previous sources so that the present work is compartmentalized and obscure. Difficulty may be found in not developing self-reflection or group dialogues, and not taking advantages of organizational structures.  
- Reveals fully incomplete collaborative learning and communication. |}

Possible Evidence as Appropriate for Discipline:

- Participation in a variety of professional and campus activities
- Working as a facilitator or mediator between groups and disciplinary perspectives
- Adjusting communication style for various audiences

Conceptual Basis: The student demonstrates “habits of mind that foster integrative thinking and the ability to transfer skills and knowledge from one setting to another—achieved and demonstrated through advanced research and/or creative projects in which students take the primary responsibility for framing questions, carrying out an analysis, and producing work of substantial complexity and quality.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score (10 point Scale):</th>
<th>9 to 10 Points</th>
<th>6 to 8 Points</th>
<th>0 to 5 Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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