

AAC&U Oral Communication VALUE Rubric (Modified)

Course (including Section Number): _____ Instructor's Name: _____

Rater's Name: _____ Presenter's Name: _____

	Capstone 4	Milestones		Benchmark 1
	4	3	2	1
Organization	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable and is skillful and makes the content of the presentation cohesive.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable within the presentation.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is intermittently observable within the presentation.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is not observable within the presentation.
Language	Language choices are imaginative, memorable, and compelling, and enhance the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are thoughtful and generally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are mundane and commonplace and partially support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are unclear and minimally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is not appropriate to audience.
Delivery	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation compelling, and speaker appears polished and confident.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation interesting, and speaker appears comfortable.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation understandable, and speaker appears tentative.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) detract from the understandability of the presentation, and speaker appears uncomfortable.
Supporting Material	A variety of types of supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, and/or analogies) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that significantly supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, and/or analogies) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that generally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, and/or analogies) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that partially supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	Insufficient supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, and/or analogies) make reference to information or analysis that minimally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.
Central Message	Central message is compelling (precisely stated, appropriately repeated, memorable, and strongly supported.)	Central message is clear and consistent with the supporting material.	Central message is basically understandable but is not often repeated and is not memorable.	Central message can be deduced, but is not explicitly stated in the presentation.

ETHICAL REASONING VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org



Definition

Ethical Reasoning involves thinking, talking, and writing about right and wrong human conduct. It requires students to be able to assess their own ethical values and the social context of problems, recognize ethical issues in a variety of settings, think about how different ethical perspectives might be applied to ethical dilemmas, and consider the ramifications of alternative actions. Students' ethical self-identity evolves as they practice ethical decision-making skills and learn how to describe and analyze positions on ethical issues.

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance. Evaluators may indicate «not applicable» when a performance descriptor is not relevant to the entire sample.

		Levels of Competence				
		Exceeds Expectation 4	Meets Expectation 3	Developing 2	Emerging 1	Absent 0
Performance Descriptors	Ethical Self-Awareness	Student discusses in detail/analyzes both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs and discussion has imagination, depth, and clarity.	Student discusses in detail/analyzes both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs.	Student states both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs.	Student states either their core beliefs or articulates the origins of the core beliefs but not both.	Student did not meet cell one level performance.
	Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	Student names, presents the gist, and explains multiple details of the concepts or theories used.	Student names concepts or theories she/he uses, presents the gist of said theory or theories, and explains some details of the theory or theories used.	Student names the theory she/he uses, and is only able to present the gist of the named theory.	Student only names the theory she/he uses.	Student did not meet cell one level performance.
	Ethical Issue Recognition	Student recognizes the complexity of ethical issues identifying the , multilayered (gray) context AND discusses the cross-relationships among the issues.	Student recognizes ethical issues within a complex context OR discusses cross-relationships among the issues.	Student recognizes simple ethical issues and begins a discussion of competing points of view	Student presents own ethical values or opinions with minimal reflection or elaboration.	Student did not meet cell one level performance.
	Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	Student applies ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, extends them to creative new examples, and considers several implications of the application.	Student independently applies ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, extends them to new examples, but considers only one implication of the application.	Student applies ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question and extends them to known examples (in a class, in a group, or a fixed-choice setting).	Student applies ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question without support.	Student did not meet cell one level performance.
	Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	Student states a position and states the objections to, assumptions behind, and implications of different ethical perspectives/concepts; student's defense against objections is effective and convincing.	Student states a position and states the objections to, assumptions behind and implications of different ethical perspectives/concepts; and student's response to the objections is adequate.	Student states a position and states the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/concepts but does not respond to them (and ultimately objections, assumptions, and implications are compartmentalized by student and do not affect student's position.)	Student states a position but does not state the objections to and assumptions and limitations of the different perspectives/concepts.	Student did not meet cell one level performance.

Reprinted [or Excerpted] with permission from *Assessing Outcomes and Improving Achievement: Tips and tools for Using Rubrics*, edited by Terrel L. Rhodes. Copyright 2010 by the Association of American Colleges and Universities.

*This rubric has been modified by faculty at The University of Tulsa for use in the institutional assessment project.