

TWU Core Objectives Rubric 2017-2018

Objectives	Criteria	Description	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
<h2>READING & WRITING ACROSS THE CORE</h2> <p><i>The following criteria, related to our Reading & Writing across the Core initiative, all apply to multiple core objectives -- which means that the more of them you use, the more likely it is that you can use the same assessment/assignment in more than one year.</i></p>					
Critical Thinking Personal Responsibility	Use of Evidence	Does the student employ available information effectively and responsibly, with clear awareness of source strengths and weaknesses?	3. The student persuasively supports claims with warranted information from credible sources appropriate to the claim , which may include outside sources, assignment data, class materials, and/or original field or laboratory research.	2. The student supports claims with information from arguably credible sources, which may include outside sources, assignment data, class materials, and/or original field or laboratory research.	1. Does not meet level 2. Examples of work that might not meet level 2 include claims unsupported by sources, claims supported by Web sites that should have been better vetted, interviews with people not qualified to speak on the claim that they are supporting.
<p>Definitions for boldfaced terms for Use of Evidence</p> <p>Warranted—The assumptions and logic linking the evidence to the claim are sound. For instance, a paper that routinely mistakes correlation for causation might be providing relevant evidence, but it wouldn't be warranted. In general, for level 3, the student should be making justifiable connections between claims and evidence.</p> <p>Appropriate to the claim = A climate scientist's article might be very good for scientific claims, but shakier for economic claims about the impacts of carbon tax policies. At the same time, a Wikipedia article might be very good evidence of what crowd editing produces, and Tweets might be good evidence of online social behaviors.</p>					
Critical Thinking Empirical & Quantitative Skills	Evidence Analysis	Does the student reveal credible patterns in the available evidence?	3. Effectively organizes evidence to reveal important patterns, differences, or similarities related to focus.	2. Organizes evidence, but the presentation is not effective in revealing important patterns, differences, or similarities.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Evidence is listed, but is not organized and/or is unrelated to focus.
Communication Personal Responsibility	Content Development	Does the student effectively develop ideas, arguments, or other forms of discourse?	3. Effectively uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work.	2. Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: The artifact might develop simple ideas in some parts of the work while leaving other critical elements under-developed.

TWU Core Objectives Rubric 2017-2018

Objectives	Criteria	Description	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
		<p>Definitions for boldfaced terms for Content Development</p> <p>Effectively = The author's reasons and support help the author meet a rhetorical goal (to persuade, to entertain, to inform, to build understanding or rapport, etc.).</p> <p>Appropriate = The author's reasons and support are well-chosen with regard to the author's audience and purpose.</p> <p>Relevant = The author's reasons and support avoid red herrings, non sequiturs, false equivalencies. The content is developed in ways clearly relevant to the author's points.</p> <p>Compelling = The author's content development is memorable, persuasive, or emotionally resonant in ways that meet the author's goals.</p>			
Communication Social Responsibility	Audience-Appropriate Approach & Structure	Does the student follow conventions and employ organizational structures appropriate for the genre of work being attempted and the audience in question?	3. The work skillfully employs conventions and organizational schemes appropriate to the genre and audience, though it may innovate in clearly communicated ways to solve challenges specific to the issues or problem being addressed.	2. The work generally follows conventions and organizational schemes appropriate to genre and audience.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: The artifact might leave out the Works Cited/Reference list even though such a feature would be expected by audiences for that genre or type of work.
		<p>Definitions of boldfaced terms for Audience-Appropriate Approach & Structure</p> <p>Genre = Type or kind of communication, such as experimental report, business memo, literature review, staff study, annotated bibliography. Each genre has its own conventions, or set of expectations that streamline the experience for audiences and communicators.</p> <p>Generally = That is, the student gets the most important elements and does a serviceable job at them, though there may be (largely cosmetic) deviations from expectation (example: remembering to cite, but getting the article title format wrong).</p>			
Empirical & Quantitative Skills Critical Thinking	Define Problem	Does the student formulate an effective problem statement?	3. Demonstrates the ability to construct a clear, adequately detailed problem statement with evidence of most relevant contextual factors. Statement may be insightful.	2. Develops a clear problem statement with evidence of some relevant contextual factors, but statement needs more revision or refinement. Example: Statement may be overlooking an important factor.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Problem statement is unclear about the problem or struggles to identify contextual factors.

TWU Core Objectives Rubric 2017-2018

Objectives	Criteria	Description	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
Empirical & Quantitative Skills Communication	Data Interpretation	Does the student accurately translate information from data, graphs, charts, and other quantitative formats?	<p>3. Provides accurate explanations of information presented in empirical or mathematical formats. Makes reasonable inferences based on that information.</p> <p>For example, accurately explains trends in data, has a reasonable understanding of relationships among variables, and makes reasonable predictions regarding what the data suggest about future events.</p>	<p>2. Provides accurate explanations of information presented in empirical or mathematical formats.</p> <p>For instance, accurately explains trend data shown in a graph or accurately explains the outcomes of a study.</p>	<p>1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Attempts to explain the information presented in empirical or mathematical formats, but draws incorrect conclusions about what the information means. For example, misinterprets outcomes, trends, and relationships.</p>
Personal Responsibility Communication	Access and Use Information Ethically and Legally	Does the student follow academic integrity and other source-related ethical and legal practices?	<p>3. Demonstrates an appropriate understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information. Students correctly use all of the following information use strategies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) use of citations and references; 2) choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; 3) using information in ways that are true to original context; 4) distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution. 	<p>2. Demonstrates an appropriate understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information. Students correctly use all but one of the following information use strategies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) use of citations and references; 2) choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; 3) using information in ways that are true to original context; 4) distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution. 	<p>1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Artifact fails to use citations when appropriate.</p>
Personal Responsibility Critical Thinking	Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically	Accurately evaluates sources of information according to appropriate criteria.	<p>3. Accurately classifies and evaluates sources of information according to appropriate criteria, identifying legitimate and illegitimate uses for those sources, or using them legitimately in an argument.</p>	<p>2. Accurately classifies sources of information and evaluates them with moderate success using established criteria.</p>	<p>1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Inaccurately classifies sources, uses inappropriate criteria for evaluation of sources, or misses significant weaknesses or strengths to sources.</p>

TWU Core Objectives Rubric 2017-2018

Objectives	Criteria	Description	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
Social Responsibility Critical Thinking	Apply Knowledge to Social Issues	Does the student make connections among the fields being studied and social issues?	3. Connects and extends knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline to one's role in social issues.	2. Analyzes knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline, making relevant connections to one's role in social issues.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Attempts to connect misunderstood knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline to social issues.
Social Responsibility Teamwork	Use Multiple Perspectives in Problem Solving	Does the student draw on multiple disciplinary perspectives to propose solutions to problems?	3. Plans and evaluates more complex solutions to social challenges that are appropriate to their contexts using multiple disciplinary perspectives (such as cultural, historical, and scientific).	2. Formulates practical yet elementary solutions to social challenges that use at least two disciplinary perspectives (such as cultural, historical, and scientific).	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Only considers one disciplinary perspective.
Teamwork Critical Thinking	Apply Criteria through Peer Review	Does the student provide feedback to peers that's based on accurately understood, established standards?	3. Accurately reviews peer artifacts through the lens of multiple, established community standards, providing appropriately in-depth, thoughtful commentary on substantive issues (content, structure, rhetorical approach).	2. Clearly attempts to review peer artifacts through the lens of multiple, established community standards, providing occasionally in-depth or thoughtful commentary on substantive issues (content, structure, rhetorical approach), although the reviewer may at times misunderstand either the content being reviewed or the criteria being applied.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Reviewer may apply standards or criteria that are inappropriate to the subject being reviewed; may engage in rushed, token, drive-by reviewing; or may only review a narrow range of surface issues, such as grammar.
Teamwork Communication	Clarity of Peer Review	Is the student's feedback to peers coherent and clear?	3. Delivers feedback that is clearly articulated, appropriately formatted, and sufficiently detailed, so that a reasonable reader would come away informationally prepared to revise. (Feedback may refer to outside sources, like textbooks, or to specialized terms within the discipline, or to established proofreading/copy-editing marks, and still warrant level 3 if a reasonable reader would be able to look them up.)	2. Delivers feedback that is articulated, formatted, and detailed with enough attention that it is usually clear, though a reasonable reader may have one or two follow-up questions that could not be answered by looking up a term or consulting a textbook.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: The reviewer's comments may be unclear often enough that a reasonable reader might give up trying to make sense of them.

TWU Core Objectives Rubric 2017-2018

Objectives	Criteria	Description	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
Communication Empirical & Quantitative Skills Social Responsibility	Comprehension	Communicates deep understanding of a text, going beyond explicit messages to draw plausible inferences from clues within the text.	3. Draws complex and persuasive inferences about a source's message and its author's attitude, beyond that author's explicit message. May draw for evidence on the text itself, general background knowledge, and/or specific knowledge of the author's context.	2. Demonstrates basic understanding by drawing plausible inferences about context and purpose of source material. May evaluate how textual features (e.g., sentence and paragraph structure or tone) contribute to the author's message.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: The student's understanding of sources may be impossible to assess due to overreliance on quotation without discussion or context.

COMMUNICATION

CONTENT

These criteria apply to challenges in which students interpret, transform, represent, or calculate based on qualitative or quantitative material.

Communication	Central Message		3. Central message is clear and consistent with the supporting material. May be compelling (precisely stated, appropriately repeated, memorable, and strongly supported.)	2. Central message is basically understandable, but there is room for improvement. Example: Supporting material may not be consistent with message.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Central message may be unclear due to internal contradictions.
Communication Empirical & Quantitative Skills Social Responsibility	Comprehension	Communicates deep understanding of a text, going beyond explicit messages to draw plausible inferences from clues within the text.	3. Draws complex and persuasive inferences about a source's message and its author's attitude, beyond that author's explicit message. May draw for evidence on the text itself, general background knowledge, and/or specific knowledge of the author's context.	2. Demonstrates basic understanding by drawing plausible inferences about context and purpose of source material. May evaluate how textual features (e.g., sentence and paragraph structure or tone) contribute to the author's message.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: The student's understanding of sources may be impossible to assess due to overreliance on quotation without discussion or context.
Communication Personal Responsibility	Content Development	Does the student effectively develop ideas, arguments, or other forms of discourse?	3. Effectively uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work.	2. Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: The artifact might develop simple ideas in some parts of the work while leaving other critical elements under-developed.

TWU Core Objectives Rubric 2017-2018

Objectives	Criteria	Description	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
		<p>Definitions for boldfaced terms for Content Development</p> <p>Effectively = The author's reasons and support help the author meet a rhetorical goal (to persuade, to entertain, to inform, to build understanding or rapport, etc.).</p> <p>Appropriate = The author's reasons and support are well-chosen with regard to the author's audience and purpose.</p> <p>Relevant = The author's reasons and support avoid red herrings, non sequiturs, false equivalencies. The content is developed in ways clearly relevant to the author's points.</p> <p>Compelling = The author's content development is memorable, persuasive, or emotionally resonant in ways that meet the author's goals.</p>			
Communication	Explanation of Issues		3. Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described sufficiently, so that understanding of the issue is not seriously impeded by omissions.	2. Issue/problem to be considered critically is explained, but explanation is incomplete or unsatisfactory. For example: The artifact may leave some important terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description.
Rhetoric, Strategy, & Design					
Communication Social Responsibility	Audience-Appropriate Approach & Structure	Does the student follow conventions and employ organizational structures appropriate for the genre of work being attempted and the audience in question?	3. The work skillfully employs conventions and organizational schemes appropriate to the genre and audience, though it may innovate in clearly communicated ways to solve challenges specific to the issues or problem being addressed.	2. The work generally follows conventions and organizational schemes appropriate to genre and audience.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: The artifact might leave out the Works Cited/Reference list even though such a feature would be expected by audiences for that genre or type of work.
		<p>Definitions of boldfaced terms for Audience-Appropriate Approach & Structure</p> <p>Genre = Type or kind of communication, such as experimental report, business memo, literature review, staff study, annotated bibliography. Each genre has its own conventions, or set of expectations that streamline the experience for audiences and communicators.</p> <p>Generally = That is, the student gets the most important elements and does a serviceable job at them, though there may be (largely cosmetic) deviations from expectation (example: remembering to cite, but getting the article title format wrong).</p> <p>Skillfully = When the student uses conventions, it is to good effect -- and when the student deviates from convention, it's for strategic, effective reasons. (Most</p>			

TWU Core Objectives Rubric 2017-2018

Objectives	Criteria	Description	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
Communication	Integrated Communication		3. Fulfills the assignment(s) by choosing a format, language, or graph (or other visual representation) to explicitly connect content and form, demonstrating awareness of purpose and audience while enhancing meaning.	2. Fulfills the assignment(s) by choosing a format, language, or graph (or other visual representation) that connects in a basic way what is being communicated (content) with how it is said (form).	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Images have been integrated into a PowerPoint, but the purpose of those images isn't clear.
Communication	Organization		3. Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable within the artifact, making the content of the artifact cohesive.	2. Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is intermittently observable within the artifact.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is not observable within the artifact.
Cosmetics					
Communication	Control of Language, Syntax, and Mechanics		3. Uses straightforward or even graceful language that effectively conveys meaning to readers. Although the artifact may contain errors, they do not impede understanding and are rare enough that they are easy to miss.	2. Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although artifact may include distracting error patterns.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Language struggles may make the text difficult to understand.
Communication	Oral Delivery	How effectively does the speaker speak? (Can only assess recordings or in-person presentations.)	3. Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation interesting; speaker appears comfortable and confident.	2. Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation understandable.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Mumbling or poor projection impedes understanding of a live or multimedia presentation.
CRITICAL THINKING					
Argumentation					
Critical Thinking Personal Responsibility	Use of Evidence	Does the student employ available information effectively and responsibly, with clear awareness of source strengths and weaknesses?	3. The student persuasively supports claims with warranted information from credible sources appropriate to the claim , which may include outside sources, assignment data, class materials, and/or original field or laboratory research.	2. The student supports claims with information from arguably credible sources, which may include outside sources, assignment data, class materials, and/or original field or laboratory research.	1. Does not meet level 2. Examples of work that might not meet level 2 include claims unsupported by sources, claims supported by Web sites that should have been better vetted, interviews with people not qualified to speak on the claim that they are supporting.

TWU Core Objectives Rubric 2017-2018

Objectives	Criteria	Description	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
		<p>Definitions for boldfaced terms for Use of Evidence</p> <p>Warranted—The assumptions and logic linking the evidence to the claim are sound. For instance, a paper that routinely mistakes correlation for causation might be providing relevant evidence, but it wouldn't be warranted. In general, for level 3, the student should be making justifiable connections between claims and evidence.</p> <p>Appropriate to the claim = A climate scientist's article might be very good for scientific claims, but shakier for economic claims about the impacts of carbon tax policies. At the same time, a Wikipedia article might be very good evidence of what crowd editing produces, and Tweets might be good evidence of online social behaviors.</p>			
Critical Thinking	Student's position		3. Specific position (perspective, thesis/ hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue. Others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/ hypothesis), and limits of position may be acknowledged.	2. Specific position (perspective, thesis/ hypothesis) is clear and arguable, acknowledging different sides of an issue.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Specific position (perspective, thesis/ hypothesis) is stated but is either safe or simplistic.
Critical Thinking	Conclusions and Related Outcomes		3. Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	2. Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified.
Analysis					
Critical Thinking Empirical & Quantitative Skills	Evidence Analysis	Does the student reveal credible patterns in the available evidence?	3. Effectively organizes evidence to reveal important patterns, differences, or similarities related to focus.	2. Organizes evidence, but the presentation is not effective in revealing important patterns, differences, or similarities.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Evidence is listed, but is not organized and/or is unrelated to focus.
Critical Thinking	Influence of context and assumptions		3. Analyzes or evaluates own and others' assumptions as well as relevant contexts when presenting a position.	2. Questions some assumptions and identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa).	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: May be unclear about what an assumption is, or may treat context as an afterthought.

TWU Core Objectives Rubric 2017-2018

Objectives	Criteria	Description	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
Critical Thinking	Textual Analysis		3. Identifies relations among ideas, text structure, or other textual features, to evaluate how they support an advanced understanding of the text as a whole.	2. Recognizes relations among parts or aspects of a text, such as effective or ineffective arguments or literary features, in considering how these contribute to a basic understanding of the text as a whole.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Identifies aspects of a text (e.g., content, structure, or relations among ideas) but does not effectively synthesize textual evidence in support of an understanding of the text as a whole.
Content & Discipline Mastery					
Critical Thinking	Apply Disciplinary Knowledge		3. Concepts and theories are used effectively in accordance to their disciplinary origins, in ways adopted by disciplinary experts. Theories and generalizations are consistently supported with examples or findings from the disciplines involved. Conversely, concrete cases and examples are interpreted with disciplinary concepts and theories.	2. The student uses disciplinary concepts, theories, perspectives, findings, or examples in simplistic, general, or mechanical ways—as in the “textbook” version of a discipline. Key claims are sometimes not supported, or concrete disciplinary examples are disconnected from key claims. Some misconceptions and unwarranted use of jargon may be present.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: A disciplinary knowledge base is not discernible in the sense that the ideas and information included do not stem from any particular disciplinary tradition. Misconceptions and folk beliefs abound. In some cases, jargon is used with little evidence of understanding. And /or the student misuses sources in a major way—e.g., non-credible sources, misunderstanding the meaning of source(s), relying too heavily on one source.
Critical Thinking	Apply Disciplinary Methods		3. The student accurately employs methods, modes of thinking (e.g., ways to select evidence or construct causal accounts), and validation criteria to construct knowledge in one or more of the selected disciplines, exhibiting awareness of the constructed nature of disciplinary knowledge (e.g., the provisional nature of insights, the limits of generalizations, the multiplicity of interpretations).	2. The student shows awareness of or uses disciplinary methods and modes of thinking in one or more of the included disciplines, but employs them mechanically, superficially, or algorithmically. There may be oversimplifications and misconceptions about methods (e.g., if someone assumes statistics results are true).	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: The student shows little to no awareness of the methods, habits of mind, and validation criteria by which knowledge is constructed and verified in the disciplines. Opinions and information summaries are presented as matters of fact.

TWU Core Objectives Rubric 2017-2018

Objectives	Criteria	Description	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
Critical Thinking	Existing Knowledge, Research, and/or Views		3. Synthesizes in-depth information from relevant sources representing various points of view/approaches.	2. Presents information from relevant sources representing limited points of view/approaches.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Presents information from irrelevant sources representing limited points of view/approaches.
Critical Thinking	Source Use & Evaluation		3. Uses carefully selected, credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are situated within the discipline and genre of the artifact. Sources may include scholarly, primary, or government data.	2. Uses credible, relevant sources to support ideas appropriate for the discipline and genre of the artifact.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Uses sources to support ideas in the artifact, but they are not credible.
Problem-Solving Activities					
Empirical & Quantitative Skills Critical Thinking	Define Problem	Does the student formulate an effective problem statement?	3. Demonstrates the ability to construct a clear, adequately detailed problem statement with evidence of most relevant contextual factors. Statement may be insightful.	2. Develops a clear problem statement with evidence of some relevant contextual factors, but statement needs more revision or refinement. Example: Statement may be overlooking an important factor.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Problem statement is unclear about the problem or struggles to identify contextual factors.
Critical Thinking	Evaluate Outcomes of Attempted Solutions	After attempting a solution or observing an attempted solution, does the student effectively <i>and explicitly</i> evaluate the outcome? (Student must be asked to do this evaluation explicitly. We cannot assess implied steps left off of a paper or activity.)	3. Reviews results of an attempted solution according to criteria appropriate to the solution's goals, and identifies specific areas where further work is needed.	2. Reviews results of an attempted solution according to criteria appropriate to the solution's goals, though some of those criteria may be unconvincingly addressed. Considers the need for further work.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Reviews results of an attempted solution superficially. May not consider need for further work, or else may not have appropriate criteria for evaluating the outcomes.
Critical Thinking	Evaluate Potential Solutions		3. Evaluation of solutions effectively and insightfully covers history of problem, logic/reasoning, feasibility of solution, and impacts of solutions.	2. Evaluation of solutions at least briefly addresses the following: history of problem, logic/reasoning, feasibility of solution, and impacts of solution.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Evaluation of solutions is superficial and may neglect one or more of the following: history of problem, logic/reasoning, feasibility of solution, or impacts of solution.

TWU Core Objectives Rubric 2017-2018

Objectives	Criteria	Description	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
Critical Thinking	Identify Strategies		3. Identifies multiple, viable approaches for solving the problem, each of which might be seriously proposed by someone interested in the outcome.	2. Identifies multiple approaches for solving the problem, but one option is clearly framed at an advantage to the others. For example, the other options might be straw-ideas that no rational person would advocate, or they might be mischaracterized, or they might be oversimplified.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Identifies only a single approach for solving the problem.
Critical Thinking	Implement Solution		3. Implements the solution in a manner that effectively addresses the problem and multiple contextual factors.	2. Implements the solution in a manner that addresses the problem and multiple contextual factors, but not always effectively.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Implements the solution in a manner that addresses the problem but ignores relevant contextual factors.
Critical Thinking	Propose Solutions/Hypotheses		3. Proposes one or more solutions/ hypotheses that indicate comprehension of the problem. Solutions/ hypotheses are sensitive to contextual factors, including ethical, logical, or cultural dimensions.	2. Proposes one solution/hypothesis that is "off the shelf" rather than individually designed to address the specific contextual factors of the problem.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Proposes a solution/ hypothesis that is difficult to evaluate because it is vague or only indirectly addresses the problem statement.

EMPIRICAL/QUANTITATIVE

Working with Data & Visualizations

These criteria apply to challenges in which students interpret, transform, represent, or calculate based on qualitative or quantitative material.

Empirical/ Quantitative	Calculation		3. Calculations attempted are successful and sufficiently comprehensive to solve the problem or test scientific hypotheses.	2. Calculations attempted are either unsuccessful or represent only a portion of the calculations required to comprehensively solve the problem or test hypotheses.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Calculations are attempted but are neither successful nor comprehensive.
Empirical/ Quantitative	Evidence Analysis		3. Effectively organizes evidence to reveal important patterns, differences, or similarities related to focus.	2. Organizes evidence, but the presentation is not effective in revealing important patterns, differences, or similarities.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Evidence is listed, but is not organized and/or is unrelated to focus.

TWU Core Objectives Rubric 2017-2018

Objectives	Criteria	Description	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
Empirical & Quantitative Skills Communication	Data Interpretation	Does the student accurately translate information from data, graphs, charts, and other quantitative formats?	<p>3. Provides accurate explanations of information presented in empirical or mathematical formats. Makes reasonable inferences based on that information.</p> <p>For example, accurately explains trends in data, has a reasonable understanding of relationships among variables, and makes reasonable predictions regarding what the data suggest about future events.</p>	<p>2. Provides accurate explanations of information presented in empirical or mathematical formats.</p> <p>For instance, accurately explains trend data shown in a graph or accurately explains the outcomes of a study.</p>	<p>1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Attempts to explain the information presented in empirical or mathematical formats, but draws incorrect conclusions about what the information means. For example, misinterprets outcomes, trends, and relationships.</p>
Empirical/ Quantitative	Data Representation		<p>3. Skillfully converts relevant information into an insightful mathematical portrayal in a way that contributes to a further or deeper understanding.</p>	<p>2. Converts relevant information into a mathematical portrayal that is appropriate or accurate.</p>	<p>1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Resulting mathematical portrayal may be inappropriate or inaccurate, or may focus on information irrelevant to the problem.</p>
Empirical/ Quantitative	Textual Analysis		<p>3. Identifies relations among ideas, text structure, or other textual features, to evaluate how they support an advanced understanding of the text as a whole.</p>	<p>2. Recognizes relations among parts or aspects of a text, such as effective or ineffective arguments or literary features, in considering how these contribute to a basic understanding of the text as a whole.</p>	<p>1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Identifies aspects of a text (e.g., content, structure, or relations among ideas) but does not effectively synthesize textual evidence in support of an understanding of the text as a whole.</p>
<p>Problem-Solving Activities <i>These criteria apply to activities in which students identify problems affecting the world or a community and attempt to solve those problems, or in which they attempt to come up with hypotheses to explain phenomena or trends.</i></p>					
Empirical/ Quantitative	Define Problem		<p>3. Demonstrates the ability to construct a clear, adequately detailed problem statement with evidence of most relevant contextual factors. Statement may be insightful.</p>	<p>2. Develops a clear problem statement with evidence of some relevant contextual factors, but statement needs more revision or refinement. Example: Statement may be overlooking an important factor.</p>	<p>1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Problem statement is unclear about the problem or struggles to identify contextual factors.</p>

TWU Core Objectives Rubric 2017-2018

Objectives	Criteria	Description	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
Empirical/ Quantitative	Evaluate Outcomes of Attempted Solutions		3. Reviews results of an attempted solution according to criteria appropriate to the solution's goals, and identifies specific areas where further work is needed.	2. Reviews results of an attempted solution according to criteria appropriate to the solution's goals, though some of those criteria may be unconvincingly addressed. Considers the need for further work.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Reviews results of an attempted solution superficially. May not consider need for further work, or else may not have appropriate criteria for evaluating the outcomes.
Empirical/ Quantitative	Evaluate Potential Solutions		3. Evaluation of solutions effectively and insightfully covers history of problem, logic/reasoning, feasibility of solution, and impacts of solutions.	2. Evaluation of solutions at least briefly addresses the following: history of problem, logic/reasoning, feasibility of solution, and impacts of solution.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Evaluation of solutions is superficial and may neglect one or more of the following: history of problem, logic/reasoning, feasibility of solution, or impacts of solution.
Empirical/ Quantitative	Propose Solutions/Hypotheses		3. Proposes one or more solutions/ hypotheses that indicate comprehension of the problem. Solutions/ hypotheses are sensitive to contextual factors, including ethical, logical, or cultural dimensions.	2. Proposes one solution/hypothesis that is "off the shelf" rather than individually designed to address the specific contextual factors of the problem.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Proposes a solution/ hypothesis that is difficult to evaluate because it is vague or only indirectly addresses the problem statement.

Empirical or Quantitative Research Projects

The following criteria apply to projects involving research design, the designating of assumptions, and conclusions that apply findings.

Empirical/ Quantitative	Application / Analysis		3. Uses empirical results or quantitative analysis of data as the basis for competent, thoughtful judgments, drawing appropriately qualified, insightful, and reasonable conclusions from this work.	2. Uses empirical results or quantitative analysis of data as the basis for limited (without inspiration or nuance, ordinary) judgments, drawing plausible conclusions from this work.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Uses empirical results or quantitative analysis of data as the basis for conclusions, but conclusions are not plausible.
Empirical/ Quantitative	Assumptions		3. Explicitly describes assumptions and provides compelling rationale for why each assumption is appropriate. Shows awareness that confidence in final conclusions is limited by the accuracy of the assumptions.	2. Explicitly describes assumptions and provides compelling rationale for why assumptions are appropriate.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Explicitly describes assumptions but rationale for them is not compelling.

PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Self-Regulation

TWU Core Objectives Rubric 2017-2018

Objectives	Criteria	Description	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
Personal Responsibility	Connections to Experience		3. Effectively selects and develops examples of life experiences, drawn from a variety of contexts (e.g., family life, artistic participation, civic involvement, work experience), to illuminate concepts/theories/frameworks of fields of study.	2. Compares life experiences and academic knowledge to infer differences, as well as similarities, and acknowledge perspectives other than own.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Identifies connections among life experiences and those academic texts and ideas perceived as similar and related to own interests, but ignores differences.
Personal Responsibility	Reflection and Self-Assessment		3. Insightfully evaluates changes in own learning over time, recognizing complex contextual factors (e.g., works with ambiguity and risk, deals with frustration, considers ethical frameworks).	2. When called upon to do so, evaluates changes in own learning over time, articulating strengths and challenges to improvement.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: When called upon to do so, describes own performances with simplistic descriptors of success or failure.
Personal Responsibility	Transfer		3. Effectively adapts and applies skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation to new situations, using them to solve problems or explore issues.	2. Uses skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies gained in one situation in a new situation in an attempt to solve or understand problems or issues.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Fails to recognize relevance of previously learned strategy to new situation.
Research Responsibilities					
Personal Responsibility Communication	Access and Use Information Ethically and Legally	Does the student follow academic integrity and other source-related ethical and legal practices?	3. Demonstrates an appropriate understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information. Students correctly use all of the following information use strategies: 1) use of citations and references; 2) choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; 3) use of information in ways that are true to original context; 4) distinction between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution.	2. Demonstrates an appropriate understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information. Students correctly use all but one of the following information use strategies: 1) use of citations and references; 2) choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; 3) use of information in ways that are true to original context; 4) distinction between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Artifact fails to use citations when appropriate.

TWU Core Objectives Rubric 2017-2018

Objectives	Criteria	Description	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
Personal Responsibility Critical Thinking	Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically	Accurately evaluates sources of information according to appropriate criteria.	3. Accurately classifies and evaluates sources of information according to appropriate criteria, identifying legitimate and illegitimate uses for those sources, or using them legitimately in an argument.	2. Accurately classifies sources of information and evaluates them with moderate success using established criteria.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Inaccurately classifies sources, uses inappropriate criteria for evaluation of sources, or misses significant weaknesses or strengths to sources.
Personal Responsibility	Uses Information Purposefully		3. Communicates, organizes and synthesizes information from sources to achieve a clear purpose.	2. Communicates and organizes clearly relevant information from sources, but may not always synthesize it or reliably connect it to the claims being made.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Much of the outside information appears to have been used as filler.
Personal Ethics					
Personal Responsibility	Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts		3. Independently applies ethical perspectives/concepts to a new example of an ethical question, and does so accurately. May consider the specific implications of the application.	2. Applies ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, independently (to a new example), but the application is inaccurate.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Applies ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question with support (using examples, in a class, in a group, or a fixed-choice setting) but is unable to apply ethical perspectives/concepts independently (to a new example).
Personal Responsibility	Ethical Issue Recognition		3. Recognizes ethical issues when issues are presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context and/or can grasp cross-relationships among the issues.	2. Recognizes basic and obvious ethical issues and grasps (incompletely) the complexities or interrelationships among the issues.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Recognizes basic and obvious ethical issues but fails to grasp complexity or interrelationships.
Personal Responsibility	Ethical Self-Awareness		3. Analyzes and evaluates both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs. May revise beliefs through the act of reflection.	2. Discusses both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: States either his/her core beliefs or articulates the origins of the core beliefs, but not both.
Personal Responsibility	Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts		3. Names the theory or theories, can accurately present the gist of said theory or theories, and accurately explains the details of the theory or theories used.	2. Names the major theory or theories she/he uses, can accurately present the gist of said theory or theories, and attempts to explain the details of the theory or theories used.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Names the major theory she/he uses, but may only communicate the gist of the theory through shorthands or simplistic reductions.

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

TWU Core Objectives Rubric 2017-2018

Objectives	Criteria	Description	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
Analyzing Social Systems					
Social Responsibility Critical Thinking	Apply Knowledge to Social Issues	Does the student make connections among the fields being studied and social issues?	3. Connects and extends knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline to one's role in social issues.	2. Analyzes knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline, making relevant connections to one's role in social issues.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Attempts to connect misunderstood knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline to social issues.
Social Responsibility	Comparing Cultures		3. Analyzes substantial connections among worldviews, power structures, and experiences of multiple cultures historically or in contemporary contexts, incorporating respectful, meaningful interactions with other cultures.	2. Explains and connects two or more cultures historically or in contemporary contexts with some acknowledgement of power structures, demonstrating respectful interaction with varied cultures and worldviews.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Describes the experiences of others historically or in contemporary contexts primarily through one cultural perspective.
Social Responsibility	Cultural Self-Awareness		3. Recognizes new perspectives about own cultural rules and biases (e.g., not looking for sameness; comfortable with the complexities that new perspectives offer.)	2. Identifies own cultural rules and biases (e.g., with a strong preference for those rules shared with own cultural group and seeks the same in others.)	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: May show minimal awareness of, or a refusal to acknowledge, own cultural rules and biases.
Social Responsibility	Knowledge of Cultural Worldview Frameworks		3. Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.	2. Demonstrates adequate understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Demonstrates surface or partial understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.
Social Responsibility	Perspective Taking		3. When investigating subjects within natural and human systems, evaluates subjects through multiple perspectives (such as cultural, disciplinary, and ethical).	2. Accurately identifies and explains multiple perspectives (such as cultural, disciplinary, and ethical) when exploring subjects within natural and human systems.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Shows awareness of multiple perspectives, but misunderstands or inaccurately portrays one.

TWU Core Objectives Rubric 2017-2018

Objectives	Criteria	Description	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
Social Responsibility	Understanding Social Systems		3. Analyzes major elements of social systems, including their historic and contemporary interconnections and the differential effects of human organizations and actions, to pose solutions to complex problems in the human and natural worlds.	2. Examines the historical and contemporary roles, interconnections, and differential effects of human organizations and actions on social systems within the human and the natural worlds.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: May identify the basic role of some social institutions while failing to explore their effects.
Social Action					
Social Responsibility Teamwork	Use Multiple Perspectives in Problem Solving	Does the student draw on multiple disciplinary perspectives to propose solutions to problems?	3. Plans and evaluates more complex solutions to social challenges that are appropriate to their contexts using multiple disciplinary perspectives (such as cultural, historical, and scientific).	2. Formulates practical yet elementary solutions to social challenges that use at least two disciplinary perspectives (such as cultural, historical, and scientific).	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Only considers one disciplinary perspective.
Social Responsibility	Responsible Action		3. Evaluates the ethical, social, and environmental consequences of global systems and identifies a range of responsible interventions in the interest of personal and civic responsibility.	2. Explains, as appropriate, the ethical, social, and environmental consequences of local and national decisions on social systems.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: In explaining consequences of decisions that have social impact, neglects the environmental dimension even though it would be applicable.
Social Responsibility	Social Identity and Commitment		3. Provides evidence of experience in activities related to social issues and describes what she/he has learned about her or himself as it relates to a growing sense of social identity and commitment.	2. Evidence suggests involvement in activities related to social issues is generated from expectations or course requirements rather than from a sense of social identity.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Provides little evidence of her/his experience in activities related to social issues and does not connect experiences to social identity.
Social Attitude					
Social Responsibility	Asks and Pursues Questions about Cultures		3. Asks deeper questions about other cultures and seeks out answers to these questions.	2. Asks multiple simple or surface questions about other cultures.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Expresses minimal interest in learning more about other cultures, possibly asking just one token question.
Social Responsibility	Interprets Intercultural Experiences with Empathy		3. Interprets intercultural experience from the perspectives of more than one worldview and demonstrates ability to act in a supportive manner that recognizes the feelings of another cultural group.	2. Identifies components of other cultural perspectives but responds in all situations with own worldview.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Views the experience of others through own cultural worldview.

TWU Core Objectives Rubric 2017-2018

Objectives	Criteria	Description	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
Social Responsibility	Evaluates Social Impacts of Local Actions		3. Credibly evaluates the social impact of one's own and others' specific local actions on the natural and human world.	2. Effectively analyzes ways that human actions influence the natural and human world.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Can report what others have said about the connections between an individual's personal decision-making and certain social issues, but struggles to analyze those connections independently.

TEAMWORK

Conducting Peer Reviews

Teamwork Critical Thinking	Apply Criteria through Peer Review	Does the student provide feedback to peers that's based on accurately understood, established standards?	3. Accurately reviews peer artifacts through the lens of multiple, established community standards, providing appropriately in-depth, thoughtful commentary on substantive issues (content, structure, rhetorical approach).	2. Clearly attempts to review peer artifacts through the lens of multiple, established community standards, providing occasionally in-depth or thoughtful commentary on substantive issues (content, structure, rhetorical approach), although the reviewer may at times misunderstand either the content being reviewed or the criteria being applied.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Reviewer may apply standards or criteria that are inappropriate to the subject being reviewed; may engage in rushed, token, drive-by reviewing; or may only review a narrow range of surface issues, such as grammar.
Teamwork	Constructive Framing of Peer Review		3. Critical perspectives are effectively framed as constructive attempts to help rather than as attacks. After considering the review, a reasonable reader could be expected to be emotionally prepared to revise.	2. Although the reviewer doesn't engage in overt hostility, critical feedback being provided is delivered flatly or bluntly enough -- or else, in a tone that's inconsistent enough -- that a reasonable reader might be discouraged from revising.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: The reviewer seems unconcerned that there is another human being on the other end of the feedback being received, and may seem more focused on the sport of critique than on trying to help. Or, alternatively, the reviewer is entirely too polite and avoids substantive, unexpected feedback. (A typical example of the latter would be: "It looks good. I just noticed some proofreading issues. Fix those, and I'm sure you'll have an A!")

TWU Core Objectives Rubric 2017-2018

Objectives	Criteria	Description	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
Teamwork Communication	Clarity of Peer Review	Is the student's feedback to peers coherent and clear?	3. Delivers feedback that is clearly articulated, appropriately formatted, and sufficiently detailed, so that a reasonable reader would come away informationally prepared to revise. (Feedback may refer to outside sources, like textbooks, or to specialized terms within the discipline, or to established proofreading/copy-editing marks, and still warrant level 3 if a reasonable reader would be able to look them up.)	2. Delivers feedback that is articulated, formatted, and detailed with enough attention that it is usually clear, though a reasonable reader may have one or two follow-up questions that could not be answered by looking up a term or consulting a textbook.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: The reviewer's comments may be unclear often enough that a reasonable reader might give up trying to make sense of them.
Internal Team Dynamics					
Teamwork	Stage of Group Development		3. Norming & Performing: The team has agreed on a unified purpose/vision, team roles, and norms or procedures (which may be explicitly encoded or implicitly agreed upon). The team's work is characterized by cohesiveness and interdependence among team members, as well as freely expressed substantive conflict over ideas. Team members indicate (perhaps in surveys, comments, reflective statements) that they usually feel comfortable sharing their thoughts and reservations with the rest of the group.	2. Storming: The team has determined a unified vision or purpose is necessary but is embroiled in disagreement over how to proceed. Group norms and procedures do not yet exist. Much of the team's energy is focused on emotional reactions to the task at hand (anxiety, fear, anger, frustration) and to disagreements about group pecking orders.	1. Forming: This stage does not meet level 2 and is characterized by a dysfunctional relationship with conflict. For instance: The team might avoid conflict to get along or else tend toward personal or procedural conflict rather than conflict over ideas. As a result, the team may try to break its task up into individual assignments which are then assembled without any unifying or cohesive group vision. The team may be characterized by a combination of group overconfidence and individual hesitancy.
Teamwork	Contributes to Team Meetings		3. Offers alternative solutions or courses of action that build on the ideas of others. Attends team meetings consistently and completes assignments in a timely manner.	2. Offers new suggestions or material to advance the work of the group. Attends team meetings consistently and completes assignments in a timely manner.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Student contributes by sending uncited cut-and-pastes from the Web to teammates, or forwards links, without helping to digest, apply, or credit that material.

TWU Core Objectives Rubric 2017-2018

Objectives	Criteria	Description	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
Teamwork	Individual Contributions Outside of Team Meetings		3. As level 2, but proactively takes an interest in the contributions of other team members, ensuring they complete their tasks on time, encouraging quality work, and/or coordinating efforts to ensure the	2. Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished advances or improves the project.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Completes tasks by deadline, but in a make-work, checklist fashion.
Teamwork	Facilitates the Contributions of Team Members		3. Engages team members in ways that facilitate their contributions to meetings by constructively building upon or synthesizing the contributions of others. May notice when someone isn't participating and invite their perspectives.	2. Engages team members in ways that facilitate their contributions to meetings by restating the views of other team members and/or asking questions for clarification.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Listens to others without interrupting -- but also without asking questions or restating views.
Teamwork	Fosters Constructive Team Climate		3. Supports a constructive team climate by doing three or more of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication. • Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work. • Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members. • Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it. 	2. Supports a constructive team climate by doing any two of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication. • Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work. • Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members. • Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it. 	1. Does not meet level 2.
Teamwork	Responds to Conflict		3. As level 2, but also addresses destructive conflict directly and constructively, helping to manage/resolve it in a way that strengthens overall team cohesiveness and future effectiveness.	2. Avoids making or responding to personal attacks while responding to alternative perspectives with active listening.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Passively accepts alternate viewpoints/ideas/opinions, or else responds to substantive disagreement with personal attacks.

Coordinated Efforts (Team Performances & Lab Work)

TWU Core Objectives Rubric 2017-2018

Objectives	Criteria	Description	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
Teamwork	Follows Directions of Conductor, Captain, or Director		3. Generally attends to the director most of the time when directions are initially provided, attempting to follow directions and play the assigned role; asks questions if needed to clarify expectations.	2. Attends to the director some of the time when directions are initially provided, attempting to follow directions and play the assigned role; does not ask questions, even if not performing the role correctly.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Attends minimally to the director without real attempts to participate actively in the activity.
Teamwork	Handles or Sets-Up Shared Property		3. Carries gear to and from storage areas (as able), with appropriate attention to avoiding damage and ensuring safety.	2. Carries gear to or from the storage area (as able), but demonstrates some carelessness and lack of concern for damage and/or safety.	1. Does not meet Level 2. For example: Does not, though able, sufficiently participate in the set-up and cleanup of the work area.
Teamwork	Responds to Director Feedback		3. Usually adjusts performance of team role based on director feedback.	2. Sometimes adjusts performance of team role based on director feedback.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Makes minimal attempts to conform to director feedback to group or individuals.
Working with Conflicting Perspectives					
Teamwork	Limitations and Implications	Does the student sufficiently address the limits of his or her own evidence and possible implications of the evidence that might seem to undermine the student's argument?	3. Thoroughly discusses relevant and supported limitations and implications, going beyond the obvious and simplistic.	2. Presents relevant and supported limitations and implications, but they may be obvious or simplistic.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Presents limitations and implications, but they are irrelevant and unsupported.
Teamwork	Perspective Taking		3. When investigating subjects within natural and human systems, evaluates subjects through multiple perspectives (such as cultural, disciplinary, and ethical).	2. Accurately identifies and explains multiple perspectives (such as cultural, disciplinary, and ethical) when exploring subjects within natural and human systems.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Shows awareness of multiple perspectives, but misunderstands or inaccurately portrays one.
Cultural Awareness					
Teamwork	Cultural self-awareness	How well does the student demonstrate awareness that her culture is socially constructed and its rules may differ from other cultures?	3. Recognizes new perspectives about own cultural rules and biases (e.g., not looking for sameness; comfortable with the complexities that new perspectives offer.)	2. Identifies own cultural rules and biases (e.g., with a strong preference for those rules shared with own cultural group and seeks the same in others.)	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: May show minimal awareness of, or a refusal to acknowledge, own cultural rules and biases.

TWU Core Objectives Rubric 2017-2018

Objectives	Criteria	Description	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
Teamwork	Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks		3. Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.	2. Demonstrates adequate understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Demonstrates surface or partial understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.
Teamwork	Responds to Intercultural Experiences with Empathy		3. Interprets intercultural experience from the perspectives of more than one worldview and demonstrates ability to act in a supportive manner that recognizes the feelings of another cultural group.	2. Identifies components of other cultural perspectives but responds in all situations with own worldview.	1. Does not meet level 2. For example: Views the experience of others through own cultural worldview.
Team Presentations					
Teamwork	Transitions from and to Teammates		3. The speaker's contributions are smoothly integrated into the group's work, picking up where the previous speaker left off and/or setting up the speaker to follow.	2. The speaker clearly attempts to connect his or her portion of the presentation to the contributions of speakers who precede and/or follow.	1. Does not meet level 2.
Teamwork	Supports Team When Not Speaking		3. The student in question supports the whole team even when not speaking. In addition to dressing appropriately for the team's purposes, remaining engaged, and maintaining supportive body language, the team member helps out as appropriate by operating technology, watching time, fetching materials, dimming lights, distributing handouts, or fulfilling other team needs before, during, or after the event.	2. When not speaking, the student in question is nonverbally supportive of whichever teammate is talking by avoiding distracting dress, body language, or behavior, and by appearing engaged in what the team is doing.	1. Does not meet level 2.
Teamwork	Contribution to a Cohesive Team Thesis		3. The speaker's contribution plays a clear and significant role in the support and development of the team's thesis.	2. The speaker's contribution is consistent with the team's overall thesis, and his or her material appears relevant to the team's subject and purpose.	1. Does not meet level 2. Guidance: If the team as a whole lacks a coherent thesis, award a 1 for this student.