**High-Impact Practice Evaluation Rubric**

**Introduction**

The purpose of this form is to serve as a guide to the high-impact course auditor. Contained within this document is a guide to each of the questions on the High-Impact Practice Exit Form. Under each question is a rationale for its inclusion, what the question is measuring, and what the evaluator should be looking for in the question answers. In addition, a rubric for each question has been provided for quality comparison purposes. Answers may provide information useful for the evaluation of multiple questions, so any answers can be consulted and considered for the evaluation of any question.

Each question is worth four points, with “not evident” valued at 0 points and “exemplary’ valued at 4 points. Points should be tallied as the interviewer evaluates the form. It is up to the faculty’s institution to decide what point value/level should be the goal. The purpose of this quality assurance measurement is for institutions to challenge faculty to find ways to improve and, as such, a score of exemplary cannot be realistically attained in every category. Finally, it should be noted not every course topic can be evaluated equally using this rubric; STEM courses, in particular, will possibly not score as highly as a humanities course will.

If this evaluation is being conducted at the course level, rather than the section level, ensure that each faculty has contributed two artifacts and co-authored the form. Due to the nature of coding at the course level, quality assurance should be determined by the weakest section in the course.

**Rubrics**

**Student Outcomes**

Under-represented minorities have less access to HIPs and receive more benefits from the practice, so it is imperative that institutions are addressing this equity issue at the course level. By looking at the data provided in the tables, student outcomes should be approximately equal after accounting for institutional and national trends, which can be researched as part of this process if desired. If one or more demographics achieve significantly less than another, then the course cannot be high-impact for all students. Comparing demographic data for the course you are evaluating with a similar course not designated high-impact may yield useful comparative data for evaluative purposes.

**Course Objectives**

Course objectives listed should closely match the course objectives on the syllabus. They should be clear, concise, and utilize upper-level thinking processes as defined by Bloom’s Taxonomy (Appendix 1), which was used in collaboration with the AAC&U Value Rubrics and HIP research to create this assessment rubric. Course objectives should be easily relatable to, or directly reference, the faculty’s chosen high-impact practice.

**Course Background A**

This question measures faculty engagement and enthusiasm for HIPs. If a faculty member does not demonstrate enthusiasm for the project, then that attitude will likely pass to their students and they will not be engaged with the practice and receive the benefits.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Exemplary** | **Proficient** | **Emerging** | **Not Evident** |
| Faculty expresses complete and enthusiastic interest in the practice | Faculty expresses belief and some interest in the practice | Faculty expresses belief in the HIP values  | Faculty expresses disinterest in the practice |

**Course Background B**

This question measures to what extent the faculty understands the context of their chosen HIP and its suitability for their specific context. Answer should be logical and easy to follow, so a lay person could understand why that HIP is suitable for that course. For example, faculty may connect their ancient history course to study abroad in Greece as an example of suitability.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Exemplary** | **Proficient** | **Emerging** | **Not Evident** |
| Fully articulate explaining relevant contexts of the HIP and how the context of their classroom matches that context | Articulates either context or suitability well, but may be missing one or the other | Briefly articulates surface-level observations about suitability | No demonstrated understanding of context or suitability |

**Course Background C**

This question is measures to what extent the faculty member understands the high-impact practice they’ve utilized in the course. There should be an awareness, if not the verbatim definition, of your institution’s definitional criteria for the high-impact practice.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Exemplary** | **Proficient** | **Emerging** | **Not Evident** |
| Fully aware of institutional definition of chosen HIP and able to concisely connect the definition to course outcomes | Moderate understanding of institutional definition, but lacks detail | Face-value understanding of the pedagogy | No understanding of definitional criteria for HIP or no application to course objectives |

**Course Background D**

This question measures the faculty’s interest in professional development and the extent of their growth mindset.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Exemplary** | **Proficient** | **Emerging** | **Not Evident** |
| Vast history of assessing and improving HIP in the classroom and mindset suggests willingness and enthusiasm to grow and learn. | History of professional development and growth mindset evident | Willingness to improve demonstrated, but no history | No willingness to improve or engage with assessment demonstrated |

**Course Background E**

This question measures if a faculty member already has plans to make amendments to the course to improve their HIP. When making suggestions for improvement, consider what the faculty member is already doing or not doing to improve the course.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Exemplary** | **Proficient** | **Emerging** | **Not Evident** |
| History of altering the course to improve HIP and indicates future improvements | History of altering the course to improve HIP | History of altering the course, but no mention of HIP | No plan to make alterations to the course and no history of doing so |

**Student Outcomes A**

This question measures to what extent the faculty member understands the researched benefits of the high-impact practice and the benefits their students specifically have gained. Answer should demonstrate frequent, high-quality student feedback and assessment and at least a basic understanding of the researched benefits of high-impact pedagogies.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Exemplary** | **Proficient** | **Emerging** | **Not Evident** |
| Rigorous student assessment and a proficient understanding of the impact of their HIP. Answer also demonstrates a background knowledge in HIP research. | Understanding of student benefits, but not articulate on background research  | Understanding of the research, but cannot apply results to course outcome | No demonstrated understanding of HIP research and no evidence of student assessment for HIP benefits |

**Student Outcomes B**

This question measures if the faculty member has been assessing students’ success with their HIP. Answer should demonstrate regular assessment and reflection, as well as attempts to improve the implementation of their HIP. If students are not meeting the objectives to successfully partake in a high-impact practice, then it is questionable as to if they will receive the benefits of said practice.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Exemplary** | **Proficient** | **Emerging** | **Not Evident** |
| Complete understanding of their students’ levels of achievement and how it is related to their HIP | Regular HIP assessments, but little demonstrated reflection on them | Sparse, purely informal assessment that may or may not relate to HIP | Faculty has not assessed students for the HIP and has not reflected on ways to improve student success with the HIP |

**Student Outcomes C**

This question measures a key issue in the implementation of HIPs: accessibility. Faculty should demonstrate an understanding of accessibility in their classroom and have taken steps or planned to address accessibility of their course instruction in the implementation of their HIP.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Exemplary** | **Proficient** | **Emerging** | **Not Evident** |
| Strong commitment to inclusion and diversity by taking steps to ensure accessibility in the implementation of their HIP | Strong commitment to diversity, but action steps are missing, ineffective, or irrelevant. | Commitment to diversity, but no recognition of it in the classroom | No commitment to inclusive practices and has not considered accessibility in their class |

**Student Outcomes D**

This question measures whether there are any assessment methods not captured by the rubrics or class artifacts. Exemplary faculty will utilize a variety of assessment techniques – both formal and informal.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Exemplary** | **Proficient** | **Emerging** | **Not Evident** |
| Large breadth of quality assessment techniques returned to students in a timely fashion | Infrequent (1-3) quality assessments of student progress with HIP | Faculty assess students less than 3 times per semester | Faculty does not assess students. |

**HIP Key A**

This question measures one of the key elements of high-impact practices: investment over time. Answer should demonstrate students are engaged with a large project throughout the entire semester (or longer) or periodic smaller assignments that tie together to form something larger. In addition, this should be successfully demonstrated by at least one of the classroom artifacts.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Exemplary** | **Proficient** | **Emerging** | **Not Evident** |
| Significant student effort over time is evident with one large assignment assigned at the beginning of the semester or a cumulative, multi-part assignment | Faculty has long or interconnected projects, but they are not particularly challenging or engaging for the students | Faculty may have some longer, but unconnected assignments | Faculty does not demonstrate students’ engagement over time with large, or multi-part, assignments |

**HIP Key B**

This question measures to what extent diversity is a feature of the course. Experiences with diversity is a key element to HIPs, regardless of the practice or the student demographics.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Exemplary** | **Proficient** | **Emerging** | **Not Evident** |
| Introduces unique classroom experiences related to many forms of diversity | Course includes several materials or activities related to diversity | Face-value or token inclusion of diverse ideas | No inclusion of diverse peoples or ideas in the curriculum |

**HIP Key C**

This question measures student outcomes that may or not be captured by the classroom artifacts. For many HIPs, experiences outside of the classroom are necessary for a quality practice and provide the promised benefits. Outside activities should be meaningful, varied, and unique to be exemplary practices.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Exemplary** | **Proficient** | **Emerging** | **Not Evident** |
| Students engage with course materials outside the class extensively in unique, real-world applicable ways  | Students engage in activities outside the class formally, but with no learning outcomes | Students engage outside the course informally | Students have no engagement outside of the course |

**HIP Key D**

This question measures an important high-impact concept: timely feedback. Faculty should be engaging students with personal, meaningful feedback often throughout the course. Exemplary feedback will be evidenced by student incorporation of the feedback over the semester.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Exemplary** | **Proficient** | **Emerging** | **Not Evident** |
| Faculty strives for expedient delivery of detailed feedback relevant for future assignments, future coursework, and life post-graduation. | Faculty offers timely and personal feedback, but not in frequent intervals throughout the semester | Faculty offers timely feedback, but not personal feedback | Faculty does not offer timely, individual feedback throughout the semester |

**HIP Key E**

This question measures the role of reflection in the curriculum. Reflection is a key part of high-impact pedagogy and cannot be separated from the practice. Reflection must be meaningful and should demonstrate personal growth.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Exemplary** | **Proficient** | **Emerging** | **Not Evident** |
| Classroom artifacts demonstrate highly meaningful, periodic reflection and provide opportunity for immense personal growth. | Students may have significant reflection, but not in stages throughout the course | Surface-level reflection is briefly acknowledged | Reflection is not evident in the curriculum |

**HIP Key F**

This question measures another key aspect of high impact pedagogy: high expectations. Course expectation should challenge students to achieve beyond what they believe possible and beyond what they were capable of before taking the course. Classroom artifacts should demonstrate students attaining new hard and/or soft skills.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Exemplary** | **Proficient** | **Emerging** | **Not Evident** |
| Faculty challenges students with rigorous standards and classroom artifacts demonstrate student attainment beyond standards | Rigorous standards but student achievement does not demonstrate attainment of standards | Standards provide students with little challenge | Standards set at an inappropriately high or low level and classroom artifacts do not demonstrate student growth |

**HIP Key G**

This question measures the original thought required by the students in the course.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Exemplary** | **Proficient** | **Emerging** | **Not Evident** |
| Coursework challenges students to be creative and innovative and classroom artifacts clearly demonstrate creativity | Coursework pushes students to be innovative, but assignments can be completed without innovative thinking | Faculty mentions pushing students toward creativity, but there is no evidence | Coursework requires no original thought |

**HIP Key H**

This question measures the course’s inclusion of one of the key HIP elements: opportunity to discover relevance of learning. Furthermore, class material should not only be relevant, but it should also be presented to students as relevant with ample opportunity to discuss application.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Exemplary** | **Proficient** | **Emerging** | **Not Evident** |
| Coursework makes clear connections to applications in career and life | Professor provides opportunities to make some connections, but they may not have a long duration of relevance | Students can make some connections to career, but is not intentionally expressed by faculty | Coursework does not illustrate relevance to real life  |

**HIP Key I**

This question measures the level of open discourse in the course. For students to have the opportunity to authentically engage with the materials, they must feel safe sharing their views and experiences with others.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Exemplary** | **Proficient** | **Emerging** | **Not Evident** |
| Classroom artifacts demonstrate open and honest engagement with the material has occurred | Professor models open discourse, but classroom artifacts suggest group think | Students demonstrate beginner level engagement with materials | Artifacts demonstrate students have no authentic engagement with the material; rote memorization. |

**Classroom Artifacts A**

This question measures to what extent the faculty knows how their assignments relate to their HIP. Evaluator should take what the faculty answers as context to evaluating if the classroom artifacts have demonstrated successful implementation of the high-impact practice.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Exemplary** | **Proficient** | **Emerging** | **Not Evident** |
| Artifacts impressively demonstrate thorough engagement with the practice and significant student growth and learning | Artifacts suggest engagement with HIP, but little student growth is demonstrated | Artifacts demonstrate minimal engagement with HIP and no student growth | Artifacts demonstrate no engagement or application of the HIP and/or no student growth is evident |

**Classroom Artifacts B**

This question measures the quality of the course objectives as they relate to the industry/profession. If the course is to be considered high-impact, then the goals of the course should be more than for the sake of learning itself – but, rather, should be transferrable to the student’s life beyond graduation.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Exemplary** | **Proficient** | **Emerging** | **Not Evident** |
| Course goals have an explicit relationship to the related profession and faculty articulates how the skill will be transferrable throughout the student’s life | Course goals will develop skills useful for the profession, but may not be explicitly stated | Course goals are useful for life after graduation, but do not develop marketable skills for students’ profession | Course goals are not relevant to life after graduation and faculty has not articulated value of course skills |

**Additional Comments**

Any information contained in the additional comments section may give more information related to the high-impact pedagogy that was not captured by the quality assurance rubric. Comments should be taken into consideration in drawing final conclusions and writing the summary.

Appendix 1: Blooms Taxonomy

