The results above are based on the scoring of a sample of 66 artifacts selected randomly from an overall sample of 147 artifacts submitted by 10 faculty from courses with at least one prerequisite (so as to increase likelihood that students are not first semester freshmen) in the following disciplines: philosophy, humanities, education, psychology, sociology, business, geography. These were also courses that met the Multicultural/Global Awareness Intensive Value. Each artifact was evaluated by
two faculty who had participated in a group norming session. The faculty came to an agreement as to the appropriate scores for each artifact.

Comments from assessors:
We struggled with the fact that the assignments did not often ask the students to demonstrate the outcomes identified on the rubric: (I’m not sure these need to be repeated here if this is going to be a handout. If it is the basis of a PowerPoint, then the repeat would be good.)
- Demonstrate knowledge of significant global issue(s)
- Compare physical conditions and cultural practices of their own cultures with those of others through an interdisciplinary approach
- Recognize and appreciate the ways in which people in their community, nation, and throughout the world are increasingly interconnected
- Communicate knowledge of the diverse forms of creativity as expressed through the arts locally, regionally, and globally as well as the value of cultural expression

Therefore we could not evaluate what students know [or if they have developed these abilities]; we could only evaluate what they were asked to demonstrate. It is possible that in some cases a student was capable of beyond what they demonstrated, but they were not asked to do more.

It was not always clear that there was a global issue in the questions that students were asked to answer.

It is always challenging to apply a rubric. However, if students had been specifically asked to demonstrate the knowledge delineated by the rubric and the ISLO, it appeared the rubric would work well. Our one question was on whether to include a N/A column. As this ISLO is new to the college, it is not surprising that faculty were not shaping assignments to assess this knowledge. If GP continues to be an outcome we feel is important for our students, then we may wish to reexamine:
   1) the abilities identified in the rubric – do we agree on them? Do we want to edit them?
   2) How what we are asking students to demonstrate in their projects, papers and exams supports these abilities

Currently, however, there may be a gap between what we have stated as a goal – that students would develop this sort of knowledge while they are with us – and what we ask students to demonstrate.
In the charts below, please note that the blue area is what we are aiming for – substantial ability by graduation. And again, remember, the assignments we evaluated were not developed with the Global Awareness rubric abilities in mind, since they had not yet been developed! But if we are in agreement with the abilities of the rubric, then we have to think about how these abilities can be developed.