**Junior Cornerstone Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs):**

Upon completion of their Junior Cornerstone, students will

1. Participate effectively in a collaborative project
2. Engage productively in the methodologies and skills specific to a particular discipline
3. Competently present collaborative work to an audience of peers

**Guidelines for instructors teaching the class:**

* See Appendix 1 for the JCS syllabus template. All JCS instructors must use this template, as well as the required grade breakdown, so as to have common language and requirements across the various JCS sections.
* Each instructor must include the common assignment (see below), which is designed to measure SLO #1, and must assess it using the provided rubric (also included below). It is strongly encouraged that instructors take heed of the following advice from the AAC&U: “It is recommended that work samples or collections of work for this outcome come from one (or more) of the following three sources: (1) students' own reflections about their contribution to a team's functioning; (2) evaluation or feedback from fellow team members about students' contribution to the team's functioning; or (3) the evaluation of an outside observer regarding students' contributions to a team's functioning [of which the below rubric would allow].” In other words, in assessing the common assignment, instructors should use the common assignment rubric along with information gathered via peer ratings, as well as self-ratings. See Appendix 2 for further information on other forms of rating.
* It is strongly encouraged that the product of the common assignment also be worth at least 20% of the final course grade, though individual instructors may divide the required 20% collaborative work into smaller assignments if they so desire.
* Instructors should also include an assignment or assignments that allow for students to attain the desired learning outcomes of SLOs #2 and #3.
  + Though students will no doubt be engaging in disciplinary methods and content in the common assignment, the focus of the common assignment is for students to gain an appreciation for and skill in collaborative learning. Thus, there should be another assignment which asks students to focus on and engage in the methodologies, content, and skills specific to the discipline of the Cornerstone. In other words, because the JCS meets the JCS requirement AND a disciplinary requirement in the student’s university requirements, each JCS should provide a deeper window into its discipline. Instructors are encouraged to develop this assignment as they see fit; however, it must be worth at least 20% of the final course grade.
  + SLO #3 asks that students enhance their communication skills, particularly their oral communication, through some sort of presentation. Certainly, it makes most sense to have students present their final product of the common assignment to their class peers, but again instructors may develop this assignment as they see fit. Other possible venues may be video presentations (for an online JCS), a convocation, or BURS.
* Instructors are encouraged to contact the Junior Cornerstone Coordinator with any questions.

Cont. below

**JCS Common Assignment:**

The common assignment will be collaborative project that allows students to engage in the methodology and skill sets particular to the discipline of the Cornerstone in which they are enrolled. The nature of the collaboration, as well as the topic and desired outcomes of the project are within the discretion of the instructor; however, the process of the collaboration will be assessed using the below rubric.

The assessment of the collaborative project must be worth at least 20% of the final course grade.

**RUBRIC**

Framing language (from the AAC&U Teamwork VALUE rubric):

Two characteristics define the ways in which this rubric is to be used. First, the rubric is meant to assess the teamwork of an individual student, not the team as a whole. Therefore, it is possible for a student to receive high ratings, even if the team as a whole is rather flawed. Similarly, a student could receive low ratings, even if the team as a whole works fairly well. Second, this rubric is designed to measure the quality of a **process**, rather than the quality of an end **product**. As a result, work samples or collections of work will need to include some evidence of the individual’s interactions within the team. The final product of the team’s work (e.g., a written lab report) is insufficient, as it does not provide insight into the functioning of the team.

It is recommended that work samples or collections of work for this outcome come from one (or more) of the following three sources: (1) students' own reflections about their contribution to a team's functioning; (2) evaluation or feedback from fellow team members about students' contribution to the team's functioning; or (3) the evaluation of an outside observer regarding students' contributions to a team's functioning. These three sources differ considerably in the resource demands they place on an institution. It is recommended that institutions using this rubric consider carefully the resources they are able to allocate to the assessment of teamwork and choose a means of compiling work samples or collections of work that best suits their priorities, needs, and abilities.

*Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet “needs development” level performance.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1: Needs Development | 2: Developing | 3: Proficient | 4: Exemplary |
| **Individual Preparation and Effort** | * Rarely completes assigned individual tasks * Does not come to group meetings prepared * Rarely produces work that is thorough and helps to advance the project | * Inconsistently completes assigned individual tasks * Does not always come to group meetings prepared * Produces work that is inconsistent and does not always help to advance the project | * Often completes assigned individual tasks * Often comes to group meetings prepared * Often produces work that is thorough and helps to advance the project | * Always completes assigned individual tasks * Always comes to group meetings prepared * Always produces work that is thorough and helps to advance the project |
| **Group**  **Contribution** | * Rarely facilitates the progress of the project by synthesizing and/or building on the ideas and contributions of other group members * Rarely engages other group members by inviting ideas or encouraging participation * Is not aware of group members’ skill sets, including oneself, and rarely volunteers for tasks and/or helps delegate to others | * Sometimes facilitates the progress of the project by synthesizing and/or building on the ideas and contributions of other group members * Sometimes engages other group members by inviting ideas or encouraging participation * Is somewhat aware of group members’ skill sets, including oneself, and sometimes volunteers for tasks and/or helps delegate to others | * Often facilitates the progress of the project by synthesizing and/or building on the ideas and contributions of other group members * Often engages other group members by inviting ideas or encouraging participation * Is somewhat aware of group members’ skill sets, including oneself, and often volunteers for tasks and/or helps delegate to others | * Always facilitates the progress of the project by synthesizing and/or building on the ideas and contributions of other group members * Always engages other group members by inviting ideas or encouraging participation * Is cognizant of group members’ skill sets, including oneself, and volunteers for tasks and/or helps delegate to others |
| **Interpersonal Engagement** | * Rarely treats other group members with respect * Does not listen to or consider others’ ideas * Is rarely polite, encouraging, and motivational; may in fact be hostile, denigrating, or passive | * Inconsistently treats other group members with respect * Considers others’ ideas occasionally, but does not always listen effectively * Is sometimes polite, encouraging, and motivational | * Mostly treats other group members with respect * Mostly listens to and considers others’ ideas * Is often polite, encouraging, and motivational | * Always treats other group members with respect * Always listens to and considers others’ ideas as valid possibilities * Is consistently polite, encouraging, and motivational |
| **Active**  **Engagement** | * Rarely attends to group communication and meetings * Does not plays a role in helping resolve conflicts and foster team cohesiveness; may contribute, instead, to creating conflict | * Sometimes attends to group communication and meetings * Plays a supporting role in helping resolve conflicts and foster team cohesiveness | * Mostly attends to group communication and meetings * Plays an important role in helping resolve conflicts and foster team cohesiveness | * Always attends to group communication and meetings * Plays a leading role in helping resolve conflicts and foster team cohesiveness |