

Report of Value Rubric Review Group
Quantitative Literacy
November 5, 2014

Members: Suzanne Lay, Jason Reddoch, Shawn Robinson, Dave Weinberg, Anne Bledsoe, Eli Hall, Aparna Palmer, Matt Rosenberg, Lisa Driskell, Olga Grisak, Elizabeth Sharp, Eric Sandstrom, Jared Workman, Tim D'Andrea, Eliot Jennings, Lisa Friel, Gary Looft, Bette Schans

The review group for the quantitative literacy rubric met from 2 to 6 p.m. on November 5, 2014. The first hour of the session started with an explanation of the artifact used for scoring, discussion of the rubric categories and criteria, and a calibration of the same artifact for all members. Over the next two hours, the each person read and scored five artifacts (two reviewers scored the same 5 artifacts) for a total of 50 samples. During the remaining time, the group discussed the process and the usefulness of the rubric for assessing quantitative literacy in Essential Learning.

The following are comments and suggestions as a result of the discussion:

- The artifact used was developed for classes in MATH 113, College Algebra. It took time for the reviewers to understand the problem and how the answer was derived. Once that was established, there were members in the group who were uncomfortable scoring the artifact or chose not to participate. The calibration also was time consuming.
- A major discussion revolved around using artifacts from other disciplines besides math. If artifacts from MATH 110 or 113 are the only items assessed, there is no real meaning to assessing students in quantitative literacy for essential learning. Other disciplines that have quantitative literacy assessment in other courses should be able to also assess in the essential learning courses. Some natural and physical science courses could apply as well as some courses in the social behavioral sciences. Overall, the natural and physical science faculty were not in favor of assessing quantitative literacy in essential learning courses.
- It again appeared (as with Written Communication) that the lower criteria had words that should be at a higher level context. There was discussion of compressing the 6 categories into 3 especially since MATH 113 does not necessarily address Application/Analysis, Assumptions, and Communication. MATH 110 does. Would it be more appropriate to have a wider point scale (benchmark = 1-3, milestone 2 = 4-6, etc.)? This might make it easier to give a higher or lower score when trying to place the work with the terminology.
- Is the assessment cart being put before the curriculum horse? Do we determine what should be assessed in the current curriculum or are curricular revisions necessary based on the criteria of the rubric? Is this rubric appropriate to what is being taught or should is there a different one that is more appropriate to CMU? Do the experts on campus create a new rubric?
- There may be difficulty in assessing artifacts that do not have an explanation of how to solve or that have faculty assessing who do not have the expertise. Perhaps a rubric that is not as complicated as the AAC&U value rubric would be more beneficial to our process.

The results are as follows:

Interpretation:	2.00
Representation:	2.24
Calculation:	2.43
Application/Analysis:	1.56
Assumptions:	0.76
Communication:	1.38
Average of artifacts	1.73