

Tippie RISE Experiential Course Rubric

| | (4) Element is strongly developed | (3) Element is present & adequately developed | (2) Element is present, but insufficient | (1) Element is lacking or absent |
|------------------------------|--|---|---|---|
| Readiness | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students thoroughly prepare for the experience as relevant to project. Clear and thorough guidelines and expectations are set to guide students to behavior that is professional, ethical, and otherwise desirable. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students sufficiently prepare for the experience as relevant. Multiple guidelines and expectations are set for student behavior. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students do not adequately prepare for the experience. Few guidelines or expectations are set for student behavior. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students do little or no preparation for the experience. Very few if any guidelines or expectations are set for student behavior. |
| Rigor | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community-partnership is central to the course and furthers numerous course learning outcomes. Project is worth more than 25% of grade or constitutes more than 20 hours of work at the partner organization. Student is graded on learning, not on participation alone. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community partnership furthers at least a few course learning outcomes. Project is worth at least 25% of grade or, for a 3 s.h. class, constitutes at least 20 hours of work at partner organization. Student is graded mostly on learning, not merely participation. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community partnership furthers very few course learning outcomes, and seems somewhat disconnected from the course. Project is worth less than 25% of class grade & constitutes less than 20 hours at partner organization. Student is graded mostly on participation. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community partnership is separate from the course learning outcomes. Project is worth a small portion of grade or is optional. Student is graded on participation alone. |
| Reciprocity | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partnership seeks mutually agreed upon outcomes which benefit the students and community partner and have lasting impact. Students' initiative significantly impacts the partner organization's needs. Community partner plays central role in identifying their needs. Students form relationship with community partner through direct, frequent contact. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partnership seeks mutually agreed upon outcomes which benefit the students and community partner. Students' initiative impacts the partner organization's needs. Community partner identifies their own needs. Students have direct and repeated contact with community partner. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desired outcomes benefit one party significantly more than the other. Students' initiative only partially impacts the partner org.'s needs. Community partner plays partial role in identifying their needs. Students have limited contact with community partner. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desired outcomes unclear and/or only benefit one party. Students' initiative has little/no impact on the partner org.'s needs. Community partner has no role in identifying their needs. Students have no direct contact with partner. |
| Reflection by Student | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students reflect on their learning and critically analyze the experience and its connection to the course content. Numerous structured reflections occur throughout the semester. Highly productive reflection in various forms, such as: class discussions or activities, journals, papers, and presentations. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students critically analyze their learning and experiences. Multiple structured reflections are built into the semester. Various productive reflection activities. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Somewhat superficial analysis of learning and experience; for example, just a summary or satisfaction assessment. Limited opportunities for reflection. Unproductive reflection activities, limited forms of reflection. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Little to no analysis of learning or experience. Reflection is not required. Reflection activities are unstructured or unplanned. |
| Review by Instructor | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instructor, jointly with community partner, frequently assesses the degree to which the collaboration meets the goals of the students, community partner, and course. Instructor frequently makes continual improvements to the class project that are responsive to constituencies. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> With input from community partner, instructor regularly assesses how well the collaboration meets the goals of the students, partner, and course. Instructor regularly makes necessary improvements to class project. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instructor occasionally assesses how well the collaboration meets the goals of the students, community partner, and course. Instructor makes minimal and infrequent improvements to class project with little input from partner. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instructor does not assess how well the collaboration meets the goals of the students, community partner, and course. Instructor does not make any significant improvements to class project. |

Modeled after:

Robison, N. & Skrable, C. (2011). Service-learning course syllabus rubric. Retrieved from <http://www.luc.edu/experiential/service-learning/newcoursedevelopment/>

With content derived in part from:

Adelaide Worth Daniels Key Center, University of North Carolina Asheville. (2013, August 30). Service learning designated course criteria. Retrieved from <https://keycenter.unca.edu/academic-service-learning>

Eyler, J. & Giles, D. (1999). Where's the learning in service-learning? San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Jacoby, B. & Associates. (1996). Service-learning in higher education: Concepts and practices. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Porter Honnet, E. & Paulsen, S. (1989). Principles of good practice for combining service and learning. Racine, WI: Johnson Foundation.