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| **Time Commitment:** 15 -30 mins | **Type:** Take-home assignment, project; In-class exercise | **Big Ideas:** Problem-based thinking; Values-Based Leadership |
| **OVERVIEW:**  The Assorted Rubrics Tool provides a series of rubrics that assess Written Assignments, Group/Team Presentations, and Technical Reports. Instructors can also use these rubrics to assess appropriate Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), relevant to their partnership with Serve-Learn-Sustain.  The following rubrics are adaptable for various types of assignments or projects you may have in your course. For written assignments, the Written Assignments Rubric is useful for focusing on aspects such as rhetorical awareness, stance, development of ideas, and organization. Additionally, we’ve included 3-4 SLOs that are most common in written assignments; however, any of the nine SLOs included on the SOLO Taxonomy Rubric may be assessed.  This tool was contributed by Drs. Carol Thurman and Owen Cantrell | | | |
| **INSTRUCTIONS:**   1. Use and adapt the rubric appropriate for your assignment (Written, Group/Team Presentation, Technical Report). 2. For the Group Presentation, you may use the RTOP (Reformed Teaching Observation Protocol) as an alternative or supplemental mode of assessment. 3. Choose the selected SLOs that your Written Assignment, Group/Team Presentation, or Technical Report assesses. 4. Utilize these sections in the SOLO Taxonomy Rubric to note changes in structural student knowledge. | | | |
| **SLS STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES & ASSESSMENT**  The Serve-Learn-Sustain toolkit teaching tools are designed to help students achieve not only SLS student learning outcomes (SLOs), but the unique learning outcomes for your own courses. Reflection, concept maps, rubrics, and other assessment methods are shown to improve student learning. For resources on how to assess your students’ work, please review our Assessment Tools at <http://serve-learn-sustain.gatech.edu/tool-category/assessment>.  **This tool achieve SLOs 1-2, 4-5, 7-8. See the end of this tool for further details.** | | | |

**Want Help?**

Carol Thurman is the contact for this tool. You can reach her at [carol.thurman@gatech.edu](mailto:carol.thurman@gatech.edu)

**Assorted Rubrics**

The Assorted Rubrics Tool provides a series of rubrics that assess Written Assignments, Group/Team Presentations, and Technical Reports. Instructors can also use these rubrics to assess appropriate Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), relevant to their partnership with Serve-Learn-Sustain.

The following rubrics are adaptable for various types of assignments or projects you may have in your course. For written assignments, the Written Assignments Rubric is useful for focusing on aspects such as rhetorical awareness, stance, development of ideas, and organization. Additionally, we’ve included 3-4 SLOs that are most common in written assignments; however, any of the nine SLOs included on the SOLO Taxonomy Rubric may be assessed.

For Group/Team Presentations, we have included two rubrics: a sample Group/Team Presentation rubric and the RTOP (Reformed Teaching Observation Protocol). Both can be used in conjunction with some sample SLOs following the sample Group/Team Presentation rubric.

Finally, the Technical Report rubric includes an extensive rubric for assessment, as well as 3-4 sample SLOs common for technical reports.

Rubric for Written Assignments

In your courses, you may include written work, such as essays, responses, reflections, or journals, to assess student learning. Written work can help students illustrate structural knowledge about a subject, as well as demonstrate connections between course learning and their experiences dealing with issues surrounding sustainability.

Below you’ll find a rubric that may be a useful starting point for your assignment. This rubric is easily adaptable for any written assignment. The rubric is adapted from the programmatic rubric for the [Writing and Communication Program](https://wcprogram.lmc.gatech.edu/) at Georgia Tech. The original rubric can be found [here](http://devlab.lmc.gatech.edu/wiki/index.php/Assignment,_Course,_and_Programmatic_Assessment).

Additionally, we have included some potential SLOs from Serve-Learn-Sustain that may be best-assessed using written work. While these are not the only SLOs that can be assessed by written work, they may be particularly useful in thinking about written assignments.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale** | **D or F Quality Work (60-69)** | **C Quality Work (70-79)** | **B Quality Work (80-90)** | **A Quality Work (90-100)** |
| **Rhetorical Awareness**  Response to situation, including purpose, audience, register, and context | Overlooks at least one aspect of the situation or assignment and thus compromises effectiveness | Attempts to respond to all aspects of the situation or assignment, but the attempt is incomplete | Addresses the situation or assignment in a complete but perfunctory or predictable way | Addresses the situation completely, with unexpected insight |
| **Stance**  Argument, significance and implications (“so what” factor) | Makes an overly general argument; significance is difficult to discern, or not appropriate to the rhetorical situation | Makes a simplistic or implicit argument, or multiple arguments that have no clear connection to one another; gestures towards significance, but does not fully develop it | Makes an explicit and straightforward argument that does not oversimplify the problem or question; explores at least one implication of the argument in depth | Makes a complex, unified argument that clearly articulates a position or stance; explores multiple implications of the argument |
| **Development of Ideas**  Evidence, analysis, and substance | Evidence and/or analysis is weak or contradictory; does not account for important evidence that could support or disprove the argument | Evidence provides minimal but necessary support to each point; attempted analysis is not sufficient to prove the argument | Evidence and analysis are substantive; they support the argument and related claims, but are mostly predictable | Evidence fully supports and proves the argument and all related claims; evidence is always paired with compelling analysis |
| **Organization**  Structure and coherence, including elements such as introductions and conclusions as well as logical connections between points | Uses insufficient unifying statements; uses few effective connections; some logical moves necessary to prove the argument are absent | Uses some effective unifying claims, but a few are unclear; inconsistently makes connections between points and the argument; employs simplistic organization | States unifying claims with supporting points that relate clearly to the overall argument and employs an effective but mechanical scheme | Asserts and sustains a claim that develops logically and progressively; adapts typical organizational schemes for the context; achieves substantive coherence |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale** | **D or F Quality Work (60-69)** | **C Quality Work (70-79)** | **B Quality Work (80-90)** | **A Quality Work (90-100)** |
| **SLO 1.1: Sustainability Awareness** | No identification of ecological, social, and economic systems and the relationships among them. Minimal understanding of sustainability and relationship between ecological, social, and economic systems. | Minimal identification of ecological, social, and economic systems. Ecological, social, and economic systems are identified as independent or unrelated to one another. | Robust identification that ecological, social, and economic systems are part of an overall structure and interrelated. Student situates identification within the context of the course. | Identifies stage 4 in the context of the course that can transfer to other contexts. |
| **SLO 1.2: Describe How Actions Impact Sustainability.** | No description of how their individual actions impact the sustainability of communities. | Minimal description of how individual actions impact the sustainability of communities. | Robust description of how individual actions impact the sustainability of communities. Student situates description within the context of the course. | Describes stage 4 in the contexts of the course that can transfer to other contexts. |
| **SLO 2.1: Describe How to Use Discipline to Make Communities More Sustainable** | No description of how to use discipline to make communities more sustainable | Minimal description of how to use discipline to make communities more sustainable. Student does not connect description to connect to professional practice. | Robust description of how to use discipline to make communities more sustainable and connects to professional practice. Student situates description within the context of the course. | Describes stage 4 in the contexts of the course that can transfer to other contexts. |
| **SLO 4: Develop and Manifest Personal Values and Beliefs** | No development and manifestation of personal values and beliefs consistent with their role as responsible community members. | Minimal development and manifestation of personal values and beliefs. Student does not relate values to their role as responsible community members. | Robust development and manifestation of personal values and beliefs as related to their role as responsible community members. Student situates development and manifestation of personal values and beliefs within the context of the course. | Development and manifestation of stage 4 in the contexts of the course that can transfer to other contexts. |

Rubric for Group/Team Presentations

In your courses, you may include group or team presentations, either done in class, remotely, or on a site dealing directly with community partners, that assesses student learning. Group/Team presentations can help students demonstrate knowledge about a subject and enact that knowledge with a specific audience.

Below you’ll find a rubric that may be a useful starting point for your assignment. This rubric is easily adaptable for any group/team presentation. Additionally, we’ve attached the RTOP (Reformed Teaching Observation Protocol), which can be used as a supplemental or additional method of assessing presentations.

You’ll also find some potential SLOs from Serve-Learn-Sustain that may be best-assessed using team/group presentations. While these are not the only SLOs that can be assessed by team/group presentations, they may be particularly useful in thinking about team/group presentations

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Assignment | Poor Example D-F | Moderate B-C | Excellent A |
| Organization of Presentation | No evidence of having practiced the presentation. Group members clearly do not know what to do next. No flow. | Some sense of flow in the presentation, not enough practice but some leadership and coordination evident. | Clear flow of talk for a seamless sense of topic. Evidence of intensive practice. Team working as a unit and leadership toward goal clear. |
| Content of Presentation | No evidence of time put into event planning. Information not organized to clearly explain strengths of team and purpose of event. | Some outside research incorporated into event planning. Information loosely organized. | Research and clarity of event evident. Strengths of team members conveyed in an organized and logical manner. |
| Transitions | No transition from introduction to key points to closing. Evident that transitions points were not planned by the team. Transition not automatic. | Transition points evident but awkward in nature. Introduction, points, and closing can be distinguished. Transitions are automatic but not timed well. | Each transition point attended to so that presentation conveys information in organized manner and transitions are smooth, automatic, and well-timed. |
| Logistics of presentation, where presenters stand, and attention to dress. | Disorganized presentation, presenters reading from power point/overheads, dress inappropriate, presenters not prepared. | Presentation loosely organized, minimal reading from the visual screen, dress acceptable, and presenters minimally prepared. | Well organized, little to no reading from the slides or screen, dress business casual, presenters well prepared and engaged in giving presentation. |
| Handouts, power point, presentation materials, and management of equipment. | No handouts, visuals lacking depth, lacking proper use of equipment, poor use of co-presentation materials, ie, candy. | Handout roughly related to presentation. Visuals minimal and lacking. | Handouts and visuals complement information. Equipment used with expertise. Co-presentation materials appropriate to talk. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SLO Outcome** | **Poor Example: D-F** | **Moderate: C** | **Moderate: B** | **Excellent: A** |
| **SLO 1.4: Evaluate How Decisions Impact the Sustainability of Communities** | No evaluation of how decisions impact the sustainability of communities. | Minimal evaluation of how decisions impact the sustainability of communities. Student does not link to decisions that impact the sustainability of communities to individual or social decision making. | Robust evaluation of how decisions impact the sustainability of communities that is linked to individual or social decision making. Student situates evaluation within the context of the course. | Evaluation of stage 4 in the contexts of the course that can transfer to other contexts |
| **SLO 2.1: Describe How to Use Discipline to Make Communities More Sustainable** | No description of how to use discipline to make communities more sustainable | Minimal description of how to use discipline to make communities more sustainable. Student does not connect description to connect to professional practice. | Robust description of how to use discipline to make communities more sustainable and connects to professional practice. Student situates description within the context of the course. | Describes stage 4 in the contexts of the course that can transfer to other contexts. |
| **SLO 3.1: Develop Approaches to Sustainability** | No development of approaches to sustainability and community-level needs. | Minimal development of approaches to sustainability. Student does not put approaches in in context with community-level needs. | Robust development of approaches to sustainability that is situated firmly within context to community-level needs. Student situates development of approaches within the context of the course. | Development of stage 4 in the contexts of the course that can transfer to other contexts. |
| **SLO 3.2: Communicate Effectively with the Public** | No effective communication with the public around creating sustainable communities. | Minimal effective communication with the public. Student does not consider ways to address these audiences around creating sustainable communities | Robust effective communication with the public that considers ways to address these audiences around creating sustainable communities. Student situates communication of the development of approaches within the context of the course. | Communication of stage 4 in the contexts of the course that can transfer to other contexts. |

Rubric for Technical Reports

In your courses, you may include technical reports, either compiled by individual students or done in groups, that assess student learning. Technical reports can be useful to have students summarize an experience (such as a community engagement project) or to detail recommendations they may have after a community engagement project.

On the next page you’ll find a rubric that may be a useful starting point for your assignment. This rubric is easily adaptable for any technical report.

You’ll also find some potential SLOs from Serve-Learn-Sustain that may be best-assessed using technical reports. While these are not the only SLOs that can be assessed by technical reports, they may be particularly useful in thinking about technical reports.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Issue** | **Wgt** | **Exceptional (3)** | **Acceptable (2)** | **Marginal (1)** | **Unacceptable (0)** | **Points** |
| **Writing** | Overall effectiveness of communication | 5 | [ ] The writer’s decisions about focus, organization, style/tone, and content made reading a pleasurable experience. Writing could be used as a model of how to fulfill the assignment. The purpose and focus of the writing are clear to the reader and the organization and content achieve the purpose well. Writing follows all requirements for the assignment. | [ ] The writer has made good decisions about focus, organization, style/tone, and content to communicate clearly and effectively. The purpose and focus of the writing are clear to the reader and the organization and content achieve the purpose well. Writing follows all requirements for the assignment. | [ ] The writer’s decisions about focus, organization, style/tone, and/or content sometimes interfere with clear, effective communication. The purpose of the writing is not fully achieved. All requirements of the assignment may not be fulfilled. | [ ] The writer’s decisions about focus, organization, style/tone, and/or content interfere with communication. The purpose of the writing is not achieved. Requirements of the assignment have not been fulfilled. |  |
| **Writing** | Clarity of writing | 3 | [ ] Writing flows smoothly from one idea to another. The writer has taken pains to assist the reader in following the logic of the ideas expressed. Sequencing of ideas within paragraphs and transitions between paragraphs make the writer’s points easy to follow. | [ ] Sentences are structured and word are chosen to communicate ideas clearly. Sequencing of ideas within paragraphs and transitions between paragraphs make the writer’s points easy to follow. | [ ] Sentence structure and/or word choice sometimes interfere with clarity. Needs to improve sequencing of ideas within paragraphs and transitions between paragraphs to make the writing easy to follow. | [ ] Sentence structure, word choice, lack of transitions and/or sequencing of ideas make reading and understanding difficult. |  |
| **Writing** | Demonstration of knowledge | 2 | [ ] Demonstration of full knowledge of the subject with explanations and elaboration. | [ ] Writer is at ease with content and able to elaborate and explain to some degree. | [ ] Writer is uncomfortable with content. Only basic concepts are demonstrated and interpreted. | [ ] No grasp of required subject matter. No understanding of major issues. No interpretation of results. |  |
| **Organization** | Flow of information | 2 | [ ] Information is presented in a logical, interesting way, which is easy to follow. | [ ] Information is presented in a logical manner, which is easily followed. | [ ] Work is hard to follow as there is very little continuity. | [ ] Sequence of information is difficult to follow. No apparent structure or continuity. |  |
| **Organization** | Division of information | 2 | [ ] All information is located in the appropriate section. | [ ] Some information is in the wrong section. | [ ] Many items are in the wrong section. | [ ] Lack of appropriate sections or many items are in the wrong section. |  |
| **Report** | Format  &  aesthetics | 1 | [ ] Report format is consistent throughout including heading styles, fonts, margins, white space, etc. | [ ] Report format is generally consistent. | [ ] Many departures from required report format. | [ ] Work fails to follow required report format. |  |
| **Figures & Graphs** | Format & captions | 1 | [ ] Departmental format is observed in all figures and graphs. Captions effectively communicate content. | [ ] Minor departures from required format or inconsistencies between figures and graphs. Captions effectively communicate content. | [ ] Many departures from required format or inconsistencies between figures and graphs. Captions are ineffective in communicating content. | [ ] Work fails to follow required format. Captions are ineffective in communicating content. |  |
| **Figures & Graphs** | Effectiveness | 2 | [ ] All figures are effectively interpreted and discussed in the report. | [ ] Most figures are properly interpreted and important features noted. | [ ] Many figures are not interpreted. Important features are not communicated or understood. | [ ] Figures are not used effectively. Little understanding of important features or issues. |  |
| **Figures & Graphs** | Citations | 1 | [ ] Citations consistent with format. | [ ] Minor inconsistencies referring to figures. | [ ] Many inconsistencies referring to figures. | [ ] Citations fail to follow required format or no citation provided. |  |
| **Tables** | Format & captions | 1 | [ ] Departmental format is observed in all tables. Captions effectively communicate content. | [ ] Minor departures from required format or inconsistencies between tables. Captions effectively communicate content. | [ ] Many departures from required format or inconsistencies between tables. Captions are ineffective in communicating content. | [ ] Work fails to follow required format. Captions are ineffective in communicating content. |  |
| **Tables** | Effectiveness | 2 | [ ] All tables are effectively interpreted and discussed in the report. | [ ] Most tables are properly interpreted and important features noted. | [ ] Many tables are not interpreted. Important features are not communicated or understood. | [ ] Tables are not used effectively. Little understanding of important features or issues. |  |
| **Tables** | Citations | 1 | [ ] Citations consistent with format. | [ ] Minor inconsistencies referring to tables. | [ ] Many inconsistencies referring to tables. | [ ] Citations fail to follow required format or no citation provided. |  |
| **Equations** | Format & Citation | 3 | [ ] Departmental format is observed in all equations. Citations consistent with format. | [ ] Minor departures from required format or inconsistencies between equations. Minor problems with citation of equations. Some symbols not properly defined. | [ ] Many departures from required format. Many problems with citation of equations. Many symbols not properly defined. | [ ] Work fails to follow required format. Failed to use MS Equation Editor. Words used instead of symbols. |  |
| **Mechanics** | Spelling | 2 | [ ] Negligible errors. | [ ] Minor errors. | [ ] Several errors. | [ ] Numerous errors. |  |
| **Mechanics** | Grammar | 3 | [ ] Negligible errors. | [ ] Minor errors. | [ ] Several errors. | [ ] Numerous errors. |  |
| **Readability** | Noise-Free | 3 | [ ] Report was free of “noise issues.” | [ ] Some instances of “noise.” | [ ] Many instances of “noise.” | [ ] Report plagued with distractions and ‘noise.” |  |
| **References** | References | 1 | [ ] Reference section complete, comprehensive and follows required format. | [ ] Minor inadequacies in references or inconsistencies in format. | [ ] Inadequate list of references or failure to follow required format. | [ ] No referencing system used. |  |
| **Overall Performance** |  |  | [ ] Exceptional (A-Level) | [ ] Acceptable (B&C Level) | [ ] Marginal (D-Level) | [ ] Unacceptable (F-Level) | TOTAL |
| **Points Required** |  |  | 105-84 | 83-58 | 57-48 | 47-0 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SLO Outcome** | **Exceptional (3)** | **Acceptable (2)** | **Marginal (1)** | **Unacceptable (0)** |
| **SLO 1.4: Evaluate How Decisions Impact the Sustainability of Communities** | No evaluation of how decisions impact the sustainability of communities. | Minimal evaluation of how decisions impact the sustainability of communities. Student does not link to decisions that impact the sustainability of communities to individual or social decision making. | Robust evaluation of how decisions impact the sustainability of communities that is linked to individual or social decision making. Student situates evaluation within the context of the course. | Evaluation of stage 4 in the contexts of the course that can transfer to other contexts |
| **SLO 2.1: Describe How to Use Discipline to Make Communities More Sustainable** | No description of how to use discipline to make communities more sustainable | Minimal description of how to use discipline to make communities more sustainable. Student does not connect description to connect to professional practice. | Robust description of how to use discipline to make communities more sustainable and connects to professional practice. Student situates description within the context of the course. | Describes stage 4 in the contexts of the course that can transfer to other contexts. |
| **SLO 3.1: Develop Approaches to Sustainability** | No development of approaches to sustainability and community-level needs. | Minimal development of approaches to sustainability. Student does not put approaches in in context with community-level needs. | Robust development of approaches to sustainability that is situated firmly within context to community-level needs. Student situates development of approaches within the context of the course. | Development of stage 4 in the contexts of the course that can transfer to other contexts. |

**Rubric Key:**

**Student Learning Outcomes**

**SLO 1: Develop Skills and Knowledge**

**SLO 1.1:** Students will be able to identify relationships among ecological, social, and economic systems.

**SLO 1.2:** Students will be able to describe how their actions impact the sustainability of communities.

**SLO 1.3:** Students will be able to demonstrate skills needed to work effectively in different types of communities.

**SLO 1.4:** Students will be able to evaluate how decisions impact the sustainability of communities.

**SLO 2: Connect to Professional Practice**

**SLO 2.1:** Students will be able to describe how they can use their discipline to make communities more sustainable.

**SLO 3: Put Knowledge and Skills into Action**

**SLO 3.1:** Students will be able to develop approaches to sustainability challenges in communities.

**SLO 3.2:** Students will be able to communicate effectively with the public about creating sustainable communities.

**SLO 4: Build Long Lasting Values and Beliefs**

**SLO 4.1:** Students will develop and manifest personal values and beliefs consistent with their roles as responsible members of local, national, international, and/or professional communities.

**SOLO (Structure of Observed Learning Outcomes) Taxonomy\***

**SOLO Stage 1: Pre-Structural:** Student demonstrates no understanding of the desired learning.

**SOLO Stage 2 & 3: Uni- & Multi-Structural:** Student demonstrates understanding of one or more relevant items, but sees items as independent or unrelated to each other.

**SOLO Stage 4: Relational:** Items are described as part of an overall structure and as being interrelated (not necessarily a greater number of items nominated than in multi-structural)

**SOLO Stage 5: Extended Abstract:** Items are described as part of an overall structure, and elements of the structure are seen to be applicable in other situations (i.e. transferable or generalizable).

\*from **“**Exploring Student Sustainability Knowledge using the Structure of Observed Learning Outcomes (SOLO) Taxonomy” by Dr. Mary Katherine Watson, Joshua Pelkey, Dr. Michael Owen Rodgers, and Dr. Caroline Noyes.

**SLS Student Learning Outcomes**

**Goal: Develop Skills & Knowledge**

1. Identify relationships among ecological, social, and economic systems
2. Describe how actions affect community sustainability
3. Work effectively in different communities
4. Analyze the impact of decisions on community sustainability

**Goal: Connect to Professional Practice**

1. Relate discipline to community sustainability

**Goal: Work in Diverse Contexts**

1. Create and evaluate approaches to addressing community sustainability
2. Communicate with the public about sustainable communities

**Goal: Build Long-Lasting Values and Beliefs**

1. Manifest personal values and beliefs demonstrating responsible community membership