PART I: GENERAL COURSE INFORMATION

**Course Description**
Higher education faces the challenge of providing evidence that students leave college with more knowledge and understanding than when they initially arrived. To maintain their accreditation, colleges and universities must provide empirical evidence that demonstrates how they are achieving their institutional goals and objectives—evidence that moves beyond rhetoric and anecdotally-based reports. This course will provide students with the knowledge and understanding of different program evaluation frameworks as well as the necessary quantitative and qualitative tools to design valid and reliable evaluation plans. Toward that end, class time and assignments will emphasize how to perform effective, high quality assessment and program evaluations, with a particular focus on assessing student learning within student affairs divisions and other programmatic areas of a college or university.

**Course Pedagogy (IMPORTANT)**
It is crucial that you understand that this is a collaborative, practice-oriented course, and as such may be somewhat different to other classes you have attended in the past. The course is built around the design of a program evaluation plan which you will develop during the semester as part of a group. While you are not expected to implement the evaluation plan, the final product should be a solid, strongly argued proposal which you could confidently pitch to a current or potential employer.

With this in mind, the sessions are built around developing an in-depth understanding of why evaluation is important, how to think about an evaluation problem, and various strategies to approach the different parts of an evaluation plan. You are responsible for considering these various dimensions and determine the most appropriate way to approach your chosen evaluation topic.

My responsibility is to guide and facilitate your learning process. This includes introducing you to the main tenets of evaluation design, providing guidance in terms of content, and most importantly, providing feedback on your work-in-progress. I cannot sufficiently stress the importance of this latter point. This is a cooperative, learn-by-doing class, and as such the peer-review process is essential to learning and skill development.
Course Expectations
This class is structured as a student-centered, collaborative course. As such, the class will be focused around the following learning tenets:

- Shared responsibility among all learners (both teachers and students) for constructing and making sense of knowledge within a community of practice;
- An appreciation of and support for multiple perspectives on knowledge and practice as well as opportunities to apply such understandings to relevant, open-ended, and realistic contexts;
- An emphasis on the critical role that peers play in the learning process, especially as it relates to helping one another decode, make meaning, and promote understanding of the subject.

Course Objectives
Upon completion of this course, students will be expected to:

- Understand the importance of evaluation and assessment in performing both formative and summative evaluations;
- Collaborate in the creation of evaluation instruments, including but not limited to surveys and interview/focus group protocols, to analyze and measure student learning and/or developmental outcomes;
- Develop skills in designing, analyzing, and interpreting evaluation plans;
- Work with peers in creating a comprehensive evaluation plan for the purposes of assessing policy or improving practice at the program, department, or institutional level.

Course Demands
Graduate courses are demanding; adding the asynchronous online element adds further challenges. It is imperative that students keep up with the readings and assignments. It is a good idea to schedule specific times to devote to completing the course readings and assignments. Some works are considerably longer than others, so check the syllabus each week and be certain you have allotted enough time to adequately cover the assigned readings.

Course Feedback and Special Circumstances
Students are urged to contact me should they have questions concerning course materials and procedures. If you have any special circumstance that may have some impact on your course work, please let me know so we can establish a plan for assignment completion. If you require assignment accommodations, please contact me early in the semester so that arrangements can be made with Services for Students with Disabilities (SSWD) (http://www.luc.edu/sswd/).

Throughout the semester, I welcome your input about course-related issues. If you have comments or suggestions about the class and how it might be improved, please do let me know—do not wait until the end of the semester. I take student feedback seriously and am open to make adjustments as far as circumstances allow.

Statement of Intent
By remaining in this course, students are agreeing to accept this syllabus as a contract and to abide by the guidelines outlined in this document.
PART II: LUC CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND DISPOSITIONS

Conceptual Framework
A conceptual framework that emphasizes “Social Action through Education” guides instructional, extracurricular, and professional activities at Loyola’s School of Education. The Loyola School of Education faculty are dedicated to promoting professionalism in service of social justice by developing students’ knowledge, skills, ethics, and service to improve educational opportunities for all members of society. This course contributes to the realization of this framework by engaging students with two key SOE Conceptual Framework Standards (CFS):

- CFS2: Candidates apply culturally responsive practices that engage diverse communities.
- CFS4: Candidates engage with local and/or global communities in ethical and socially just practices.

The course will engage with these standards by helping students develop the knowledge and skills necessary to design, implement, and analyze evaluation plans in a variety of schools and professional settings. Significantly, the students will examine the roles of equity and fairness in designing and implementing evaluation and assessment plans, paying particular attention to issues of multiculturalism and cultural bias, and advancing a professional culture of service to students, society, colleagues, and classroom peers.

IDEA Outcomes
The following learning outcomes are considered either essential or important based on the IDEA course rating system:

1. Learning to apply course material (to improve thinking, problem solving, and decisions)
2. Developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals in the field most closely related to this course
3. Acquiring skills in working with others as a member of a team
4. Learning to apply knowledge and skills to benefit others or serve the public good

IDEA Course Evaluation Link for Students
Each course you take in the School of Education is evaluated through the IDEA Campus Labs system. We ask that when you receive an email alerting you that the evaluation is available that you promptly complete it. To learn more about IDEA or to access the website directly to complete your course evaluation go to: http://luc.edu/idea/ and click on STUDENT IDEA LOGIN on the left hand side of the page.

Dispositions
All students are assessed on one or more dispositional areas of growth across our programs: Professionalism, Inquiry, and Social Justice. This course presents and encourages diverse perspectives on evaluation and assessment in higher education, as well as scholarship about how to design evaluation plans that serve diverse groups of stakeholders. In our examination of program evaluation strategies, we will always emphasize the ethics of conducting quantitative and qualitative research. We will also stress the evaluator’s responsibility to engage aspects such as access to technology, religion, gender, class, ability, race and ethnicity, student academic success, funding patterns, among others, that may play an important role in the design and implementation of evaluation research. This course addresses these issues and invites students to
critically reflect on them for their own current and future professional practice in higher education.

**LiveText**
All students, *except those who are non-degree*, must have access to LiveText to complete the benchmark assessments aligned to the Conceptual Framework Standards and all other accreditation, school-wide and/or program-wide related assessments. You can access more information on LiveText here: LiveText.

**Syllabus Addendum Link**

- [www.luc.edu/education/syllabus-addendum/](http://www.luc.edu/education/syllabus-addendum/)

This link directs students to statements on essential policies regarding *academic honesty*, *accessibility*, *ethics line reporting* and *electronic communication policies and guidelines*. We ask that you read each policy carefully.

This link will also bring you to the full text of our conceptual framework that guides the work of the School of Education – *Social Action through Education*.

**PART III: CLASS RESOURCES & EVALUATION**

**Email/Sakai**
Email will be used as the primary mode of correspondence for this course. As such, *it is imperative that you activate your Loyola University account and check it often*. Please also check your Loyola spam mail and mail foundry to ensure course related messages are not misdirected.

Additionally, Sakai will be used as a source of continual updates about course material. You can expect that all emails to the instructor will be responded to within 48 hours (if not sooner), not including weekends.

Given the emphasis on email and Sakai communications, please make sure you:

- **Check your email** at least 3 times per week (more often is better).
- **Be patient**. Don’t expect an immediate response when sending a message. Generally, 48 hours (not including weekends) is considered a reasonable amount of time to receive a reply.
- **Include “subject” headings** and use something that is descriptive and refers to a particular assignment or topic.
- **Be courteous** and considerate. Being honest and expressing yourself freely is important, but being considerate of others online is just as important as in the classroom.
Required Texts
All course readings will be available on the Sakai course website or through the library. While most readings should be immediately available, I may adapt some of the content for later sessions based on class needs. If this is the case, I’ll let you know ahead of time.


You can access it for free through the Loyola Library: [http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/luc/detail.action?docID=4438665](http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/luc/detail.action?docID=4438665). I recommend creating a folder for this class within the ebookcentral website and bookmarking it for quick reference.

Evaluation Criteria
The following criteria and procedures will be used to evaluate your work in this course to provide you with feedback and determine your course grade.

- Evidence during class discussion and in written assignments that course readings have been completed on time and with thought;
- Effective use of relevant literature and its vocabulary and frameworks to support claims;
- Balanced and critical discussion of ideas and arguments, with particular attention to underlying values and assumptions;
- Original thinking that adds insight;
- Consistent, well-prepared class attendance and participation;
- On-time submission of assignments;
- Correct grammar, spelling and punctuation; concise writing (i.e., not wordy).

The most common problems that detract from grades on assignments are:

- Superficiality – Lack of adequate thought and substance, usually due to inadequate time spent on the assignment;
- Inattention to instructions – Each assignment includes detailed instructions that should be read carefully before starting the project and reviewed again before submitting your work;
- Poor editing – particularly “typos” and grammatical errors
- Lateness – See policy below.

Note that all of these problems can be reduced by starting projects early, and the first two can be reduced by revising and asking others to review drafts.

Due Dates and Policy on Lateness and Absences
All assignments are due on the dates posted in this syllabus. Late assignments may be penalized one half-grade for each late day (or portion of a day). To avoid a reduction in grade, students with *emergency* situations must contact me in *advance* of the class to negotiate an alternative due date.

GRADING:
1. Class/Small Group Participation: 30 points
2. Preliminary manuscripts 1-3 (15 points each): 45 points
3. Final Evaluation Report: 25 points

Total points for an A: 96-100
Total points for an A-: 90-95
Total points for a B+: 87-89
Total points for a B: 84-86
Total points for a B-: 80-83
Total points for a C+: 77-79
Total points for a C: 74-76
Total points for a C-: 70-73

1. Participation (30% of final grade)
Throughout the semester you will be working as part of a team of 3. This is an essential, non-negotiable part of the class structure, meant to closely resemble the negotiations, support, and discussions you are likely to face in a real evaluation effort. Participation is essential in an online asynchronous class environment, and particularly in the type of collaborative work entailed in your group project. You are expected to communicate promptly, professionally, and constructively with your group and all your peers in the class.

In Session 3 you will be expected to identify the members of your evaluation project group. You will be working together during the rest of the semester and will complete all small group discussions and related tasks as a team.

IMPORTANT: If your team experiences difficulties during the semester you are expected to first try to resolve them among yourselves in a professional manner, or else bring your concerns to my attention as soon as possible. The final project is NOT the place to reveal undisclosed problems, but rather to focus on your individual and group learning.

Additional Logistics:
- All weekly course readings are available on Sakai Resources. For each session, there will be specific instructions posted under Sakai Lessons, so make sure to check ahead of time.
- For some sessions, the instructors will post mini-lectures to help you process the course readings. In other sessions, you will be asked to complete mini-components related to your project.
- For this course the week begins on Tuesday. VoiceThread discussions and related tasks are due on Thursday each week.
- The course instructors will make comments as needed on or after Thursday. Most of the time, instructor comments will focus on suggesting ways to improve the mini-components your group worked on that week. This is a highly personalized and time-intensive procedure, so please make sure to check back on the comments we make and edit your mini-component as needed. The more work you put into your weekly tasks will mean a lot less stress at the end of the semester.
2. **Preliminary manuscripts (45 points):**
Throughout the semester, your group will be responsible for completing three manuscripts. These assignments are meant to be building blocks that address the various components of an evaluation plan and culminate in a final written report. While these assignments will be graded (15 points per manuscript), your ability to incorporate feedback and revise and edit your manuscripts accordingly will be a much stronger determinant of your final grade. In other words, this class emphasizes the formative nature of evaluation and your improvement on each of these important manuscripts will be taken into consideration when evaluating your final portfolio. However, late assignments or assignments that are incomplete, poorly written, or done in haste will be marked down accordingly. The preliminary manuscripts should be submitted via the Sakai assignment link (see deadlines in Course at a Glance). Please use the following format to label each manuscript: [Last name author one, last name author two, MS 1, ELPS 431]. Omit the commas and brackets.

3. **Final assignment (25 points):**
Each group will submit a final written evaluation plan (See deadline in Course at a Glance). While there is no minimum length of this report, it should reflect the cumulative work you have done throughout the semester and incorporate the feedback presented to you throughout the semester. The report should be submitted via the Sakai Assignment tab as a single PDF document. Please use the following format to label your file: [Last name author one, last name author two, final ELPS 431]. Omit the commas and brackets.

As this report constitutes a significant portion of your final grade, I expect it to be comprehensive, professionally prepared, and of the quality in which you would feel confident presenting this to your employer. For those of you who are working on an evaluation report specifically tied to your current position, I would encourage you to consider providing your employer with a copy. For those of you who have the opportunity to implement aspects of your evaluation plan (which is not an expectation of the course), I am happy to work with you on an individual basis so that you might incorporate real results in your final report.
### PART V: COURSE AT A GLANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description &amp; Tasks</th>
<th>Required readings</th>
<th>Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15-Jan</td>
<td>Why Assessment Matters and Course Overview</td>
<td>We will introduce ourselves to one another and review the course syllabus, our expectations for the semester, and the course structure. We will spend most of tonight discussing the relevance of assessment in co-curricular programming. In doing so, we will discuss the student learning and developmental needs our work addresses and the utility of assessment in determining whether we are meeting those needs.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Complete short group assignment by Friday, January 18th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22-Jan</td>
<td>Introduction to Evaluation: Definitions and Basic Approaches</td>
<td>We will examine different definitions of and approaches to program evaluation, including the objective- and participant-oriented approaches, as well as summative vs. formative evaluation.</td>
<td>Schuh, J. H. (2011). <em>Assessment methods for student affairs</em>. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley &amp; Sons. (Ch. 1)</td>
<td>Small Group Discussion by Thursday, Jan. 24th. You will find your assigned group for this week under the corresponding Lesson tab on Sakai.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3       | 29-Jan| Evaluation in the Higher Education Context (Part I): Accreditation, Professional Standards, and Program Missions | Building on our discussion from the previous session, we will dissect the layers that inform program assessment efforts, emphasizing relationships between co-curricular assessment and institutional accreditation, professional standards in higher education, and program missions. We will also discuss how these layers inform the types of student learning and development supported by student affairs professionals and, therefore, the types of program assessment in which we engage. | Keeling, R.P. (2006). Learning reconsidered 2: Implementing a campus-wide focus on the student experience. Washington, D.C.: NASPA. (Introduction and Chapters 1-3, pp. vii – 16)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4    | 5-Feb | Evaluation in the Higher Education Context (Part II): Assessing Co-curricular Programs and Working with Stakeholders | As campus educators, we operate thinking that our programs and services contribute toward students’ learning and development in significant ways. But how do we know this? Assessing our efforts is central to understanding whether and how this is happening (and for whom learning and development are/are not happening and for what reasons). We begin to understand postsecondary educational program evaluation and assessment by contemplating the various definitions and approaches that have been used to make informed decisions about how well a particular program is achieving its stated goals and objectives. Based on the discussion from the previous two sessions, we consider the role of stakeholders and existing data in the program evaluation process. Required readings (Read in this order):  
- Schuh, J. (2013). Developing a culture of assessment in student affairs. *New Directions for Student Services*, 142, p. 89-98. Due:  
- Small Group Discussion by Thursday, February 7th. Beginning this week, you will be working with your evaluation group in all VoiceThread discussions. |
| 5    | 12-Feb | First Steps: Identifying and Selecting an Evaluation Question | This week we will consider the overall evaluation process and the various steps involved in designing, implementing, and analyzing an evaluation plan. We will also examine the process of identifying an evaluation question that will ultimately drive your semester-long project. Required readings:  
- Schuh (2011), *Ch. 2*  
- Fitzpatrick et al. (2004) *(Ch. 13, pp. 314-332)* Due:  
- Small Group Discussion/Tasks by Thursday, February 14th. You will find the instructions for discussion and/or task under the corresponding Sakai Lesson tab. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Reading Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>19-Feb</td>
<td>The Assessment Cycle and Program Logic Models</td>
<td>We will discuss how to specify a program’s learning goals by considering the broader categories of learning or development expected from participation in the program. We will discuss the utility of program logic models and how to develop these. In doing so, we will see the importance of logic models in delineating how program resources and activities translate into the types of short-term, intermediate, and longer-term student outcomes expected. Examining both program goals and logic models will allow us to translate program goals (i.e., what students should be able to do) into learning or developmental outcomes (i.e., how we know students are meeting our program goals) in a way that is easy to explain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Due:</strong></td>
<td>- Small Group Discussion/Tasks by Thursday, February 21&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;. You will find the instructions for discussion and/or task under the corresponding Sakai Lesson tab.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>26-Feb</td>
<td>Reverse engineering: Identifying and Mapping Outcomes and Program Activities/Processes</td>
<td>We will practice constructing student (learning) outcomes that are measurable. We will revisit program logic models to map precisely what to assess within a given program. We will connect the various activities/processes within a program to the different student outcomes related to them. We will discuss the benefits of assessing both program processes and student outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Due:</strong></td>
<td>- Small Group Discussion/Tasks by Thursday, February 28&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;. You will find the instructions for discussion and/or task under the corresponding Sakai Lesson tab.&lt;br&gt;- <strong>MS1 due by Sunday, March 3rd</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5-Mar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12-Mar</td>
<td>Measuring Student Outcomes and Process-related Elements: Quantitative Approaches (Part I)</td>
<td>We will begin a three-part discussion that explores quantitative approaches to assessment by focusing on the purposes and types of quantitative assessment designs. In Part I, we will focus on a review of quasi-experimentation and we will review the basic tenets of quantitative research design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Required readings:</strong></td>
<td>- Creswell (2009) <a href="#">Ch 8</a>&lt;br&gt;- Schuh (2011) <a href="#">Ch. 3 (51-64); Ch. 4 (77-87; 93-105</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Due:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Measuring Student Outcomes and Process-related Elements: Quantitative Approaches (Part II)

This week we will examine the basic tenets of survey design as you begin the process of developing a survey instrument for your evaluation project. This discussion will highlight the important considerations and potential pitfalls of writing a valid and reliable survey instrument. Each of you will be required to submit draft questions related to your survey instrument to the Forum in order to receive peer/instructor feedback.

**Required readings:**
- Schuh (2011), *Ch. 5 (107-127)*

**Due:**
- Small Group Discussion/Tasks by Thursday, March 21st. You will find the instructions for discussion and/or task under the corresponding Sakai Lesson tab.
- **MS2 Due by Sunday, March 31st.**

### Measuring Student Outcomes and Process-related Elements: Quantitative Approaches (Part III)

This week we review elements of quantitative data analysis, with an emphasis on using statistical software to perform descriptive and basic inferential analyses on survey data. We will discuss the criteria evaluators should keep in mind when deciding on the most appropriate statistical techniques for a given project.

**Required readings:**
- Huck, Chpt. 2

**Due:**
- Small Group Discussion/Tasks by Thursday, March 28th. You will find the instructions for discussion and/or task under the corresponding Sakai Lesson tab.
- **MS2 Due by Sunday, March 31st.**

### Measuring Student Outcomes and Process-related Elements: Qualitative Approaches (Part I)

This week we begin a two-part exploration of the use of qualitative techniques in program evaluation. We discuss interviews and focus groups, in answering evaluation questions that require a more nuanced and deeper understanding of why a particular process or outcome was derived from program participation. In addition, we will discuss the process of creating and writing an interview/focus group protocol.

**Required readings:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-Apr</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Measuring Student Outcomes and Process-related Elements: Qualitative Approaches (Part II)</td>
<td>Small Group Discussion/Tasks by Thursday, April 4th. You will find the instructions for discussion and/or task under the corresponding Sakai Lesson tab.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-Apr</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ethics and Bias in Program Evaluation</td>
<td>We close the semester with a dedicated recap of ethics and bias in designing a program evaluation—something that we have touched upon throughout the class, but which merits consideration on its own. What are potential sources of bias in our efforts to assess students’ learning and development? We will also review ethical considerations in assessment, including ethical frameworks and the informed consent process. Required readings: Henning, G.W., Roberts, D. &amp; Bresciani, M. (2016). <em>Student affairs assessment: theory to practice</em>. Sterling, VA: Stylus. (Ch. 15) Due: MS3 will be discussed orally with each group. Details TBD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-Apr</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>No class this week. Use this time to work on your assignments. Contact instructors if you want to schedule a group consultation prior to the final project deadline.</td>
<td>Final due</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX A: CHECKLIST FOR THE FINAL EVALUATION PLAN

1. The final evaluation plan should include two major areas:
   a. Final Narrative
   b. Appendices

2. The following are examples of what should be included in the narrative and appendices
   (Note: This is a comprehensive list and some items listed may not apply to your particular project).
   a. Narrative:
      i. Statement of the Problem
      ii. Significance of Problem
      iii. Context and History of the Program
      iv. Rich Description of the Program
      v. Stakeholders
      vi. Review of Literature/Conceptual Framework
      vii. Logic Model Description
      viii. Evaluation Approach
      ix. Evaluation Questions
      x. Quantitative Approach
      xi. Qualitative Approach
      xii. Limitations
      xiii. Timeline
      xiv. Budget
      xv. Next Steps
      xvi. References
   b. Appendices:
      i. Supporting Program Documents
      ii. Prior Evaluation Results/Instruments
      iii. Logic Model
      iv. Matrices and Heuristics
      v. Survey
      vi. Survey Construct Map
      vii. Protocols
      viii. Coding Rubric
      ix. Consent Forms
      x. Email invitations
      xi. Other

3. General Guidelines:
   a. This is a culminating portfolio of your work throughout the semester and the materials and documents should all be carefully proofread and edited.
   b. Make sure the narrative has appropriate transitions and that the text flows from one section to the next.
   c. Make sure you include an explanation in the narrative for any of the items in the appendices.
   d. I would recommend using section headers and/or tabs throughout the portfolio to organize your work.
   e. Make sure to upload your final plan to both the assignment tab in Sakai.
   f. For those of you who plan on administrating aspects of your plan in the future, please know I am available for further consultation.
## APPENDIX B: DISPOSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professionalism</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student meets all deadlines</td>
<td>Student demonstrates exceptional ability to work well with others,</td>
<td>Student demonstrates an ability to work well with others in a professional setting through</td>
<td>Student fails to demonstrate professional behavior in the academic or work setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lead educational initiatives, and show leadership qualities in</td>
<td>exhibiting behaviors such as punctuality, meeting deadlines, and being open and responsive to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>professional settings</td>
<td>feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student attends class and is punctual for all professional obligations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student communicates promptly with faculty, supervisors, employers, and peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no longer than 2 business days)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student is able to express himself or herself appropriately (verbally and in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writing) with faculty, supervisors, employers, and peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student is able to work effectively with peers on assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student demonstrates ethical behavior in all professional and graduate student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student adequately addresses feedback provided on coursework (e.g., grammar,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APA style, content)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student accurately cites material in academic work ascribing appropriate credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for information conveyed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>Student demonstrates exceptional ability to understand the situations</td>
<td>Student demonstrates ability to understand the situations of others and responds in an appropriate,</td>
<td>Student fails to consider the situation of others in making professional decisions and acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of others and responds in an appropriate, proactive manner</td>
<td>proactive manner</td>
<td>iniquitably</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student is considerate (verbally and nonverbally) or appropriately expressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feelings and opinions of others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student exhibits active listening skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student is able to accept constructive feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students can learn</td>
<td>Student exhibits exemplary understanding and practice reflecting the</td>
<td>Student believes and demonstrates in practice that all students, regardless of contextual</td>
<td>Student fails to understand and/or demonstrate in practice that all students, regardless of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>belief that all students, regardless of contextual influences, are</td>
<td>influences, are capable of learning</td>
<td>contextual influences, are capable of learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>capable of learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student is sensitive to cultural differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student respects the diversity of learning styles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student uses the framework of social justice in decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>