



PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY VALUE RUBRIC

Based upon the AAC&U Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric: <http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/ethical-reasoning>

Foundation Component Areas Where Personal Responsibility is Taught: Communication, Language, Philosophy & Culture, History and Government/Political Science

The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities from across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

In developing an assessment plan for the CORE, the THECB strongly encouraged institutions to use “externally informed benchmarks”¹ in the assessment of the Core. As such, UHD has committed to using the VALUE rubrics as part of its assessment plan for the core.

Definition

The THECB defines Personal Responsibility as the ability to connect choices, actions, and consequences to ethical decision-making. AAC&U uses the language of Ethical Reasoning to describe reasoning 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.

Framing Language

This rubric is intended to help faculty evaluate work samples and collections of work that demonstrate student learning about ethics. Although the goal of a liberal education should be to help students turn what they’ve learned in the classroom into action, pragmatically it would be difficult, if not impossible, to judge whether or not students would act ethically when faced with real ethical situations. What can be evaluated using a rubric is whether students have the intellectual tools to make ethical choices.

The rubric focuses on five elements: Ethical Self Awareness, Ethical Issue Recognition, Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts, Application of Ethical Principles, and Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts. Students’ Ethical Self Identity evolves as they practice ethical decision-making skills and learn how to describe and analyze positions on ethical issues. Presumably, they will choose ethical actions when faced with ethical issues.

Glossary

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

- Core Beliefs: Those fundamental principles that consciously or unconsciously influence one's ethical conduct and ethical thinking. Even when unacknowledged, core beliefs shape one's responses. Core beliefs can reflect one's environment, religion, culture or training. A person may or may not choose to act on their core beliefs.
- Ethical Perspectives/Concepts: The different theoretical means through which ethical issues are analyzed, such as ethical theories (e.g., utilitarian, natural law, virtue) or ethical concepts (e.g., rights, justice, duty).
- Complex, multi-layered (gray) context: The sub-parts or situational conditions of a scenario that bring two or more ethical dilemmas (issues) into the mix/problem/context/for student's identification.
- Cross-relationships among the issues: Obvious or subtle connections between/among the sub-parts or situational conditions of the issues present in a scenario (e.g., relationship of production of corn as part of climate change issue).

¹ THECB Assessment of the Core Guidelines: <http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/index.cfm?objectid=417252EA-B240-62F7-9F6A1A125C83BE08> (Retrieved 10/6/2014).



PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY VALUE RUBRIC

Based upon the AAC&U Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric: <http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/ethical-reasoning>



Definition

The Core Curriculum Objective of Personal Responsibility is defined as the ability to connect choices, actions, and consequences to ethical decision-making. Personal Responsibility Foundational Component Areas are taught in Communication, Language, Philosophy & Culture, American History, and Government/Political Science.

| | <i>Mastery (Senior Level) Point-value: 4</i> | <i>Proficient (Junior Level) Point-value: 3</i> | <i>Developing (Sophomore Level) Point-value: 2</i> | <i>Basic (Freshman Level) Point-value: 1</i> | <i>Skill is evident but performance falls below Freshman Level² Point-value: 0</i> | <i>No Evidence: The assignment may not elicit skill or the student failed to articulate.</i> |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| Ethical Self-Awareness | Student articulates the origins of his/her core beliefs and the core beliefs themselves. Discussion contains detail and analysis. | Student articulates both the origins of his/her core beliefs and the core beliefs. | Student articulates either the origins of his/her core beliefs or the core beliefs, but not both. | Student demonstrates an awareness of his/her core beliefs. | Student cannot effectively articulate his/her core beliefs. | |
| Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts | Student demonstrates an awareness of ethical theories, standards, and/or practices, presents an understanding of them, and accurately discusses them. | Student demonstrates an awareness of ethical theories, standards, and/or practices, presents an understanding of them, and attempts a discussion of them, but includes errors. | Student demonstrates an awareness of ethical theories, standards, and/or practices and presents an understanding of them. | Student demonstrates an awareness of ethical theories, standards, and/or practices. | Student does not demonstrate an awareness of the applicable ethical theories, standards, or practice. | |
| Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts | Ethical perspectives are applied persuasively to an ethical question, and implications of actions/consequences are thoroughly considered. | Ethical perspectives are applied persuasively to an ethical question, and implications of actions/consequences are not completely considered. | Ethical perspectives are applied to an ethical question satisfactorily. | Ethical perspectives are applied to an ethical question unsatisfactorily. | Unclear which ethical perspective/concept the student applied to the situation at hand. | |
| Evaluation of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts | Student states an ethical position and articulates objections to or limitations of that position. Additionally, the discussion of different perspectives/concepts offers a thorough evaluation of the development of the perspectives/concepts with minor or no errors. | Student states an ethical position and articulates objections to or limitations of that position. Additionally, the discussion of different perspectives/concepts offers an evaluation of the development of the perspective/concept that is incomplete or contains errors. | Student states an ethical position and articulates objections to or limitations of that position. | Student states an ethical position but does not articulate objections to or limitations of that position. | Student states an ethical position but misrepresents or misunderstands the position he/she has adopted. | |

² Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample that does not meet Basic (Freshman Level) performance. Evaluators are encouraged to check the “No Evidence” if the rubric dimension is not evident in the work. For example, if a student has articulated a core belief but it’s not possible for the evaluator to follow the student’s meaning, the student would receive a 0-Below Freshman level. By contrast, No Evidence category would be selected if the student did not include any indication of his core beliefs.