

2024-2025 Report  
of  
The Provost's Assessment Committee  
for  
General Education Learning Outcomes

**Committee Members:**

**Heather Batchelder** – Professor of Education, Chair

**Ali Ziegler** – Professor of Psychology

**Christopher Hay-Jahans** – Professor of Mathematics

**Colleen McKenna** – Professor of Information Systems

**Math Trafton** – Professor of English

**Joseph Liddle** – Professor of Mathematics

## I. Introduction

The Provost's Assessment Committee for General Education Learning Outcomes (PAC GELO) assesses the extent to which UAS undergraduate students have acquired broadly expected academic skills through the completion of UAS prescribed General Education Requirements (GER) coursework. The committee develops and modifies assessment tools and processes, they host regular assessment workshops, and they write an annual report to communicate their findings.

The GELOs are as follows:

1. **Effective Communication:** Communicate thoughts and ideas effectively, orally and in writing.
2. **Critical Thinking:** Demonstrate the ability to understand a problem/issue/task at hand, identify relevant facts and/or assumptions, synthesize and conceptualize available information, develop an effective strategy to tackle the problem/issue/task, and arrive at a valid conclusion.
3. **Creative Thinking:** Present creative works of expression, innovative approaches to tasks, or solutions to problems.
4. **Empirical Reasoning:** Articulate the scientific method and pose well-reasoned questions in the search for answers through data.
5. **Environmental and Community Engagement:** Explore Indigenous and global social perspectives with respect for diversity of people, different perspectives of resource sustainability, and human impact on the environment.

In the sections that follow, you will find details about the 2024-2025 workshops, results from this year's assessment activities, and suggestions for next steps.

---

## II. Method of Assessment

This year's fall workshop focused on the *Creative Thinking* and *Effective Communication* GELOs, and the spring workshop focused on the *Environmental and Community Engagement* GELO. Student work samples for these workshops are randomly selected by assigning each student work sample a sequential number, and then running a random number-generating application to determine which samples to assess.

In the spring semester, the *Critical Thinking* and *Empirical Reasoning* GELOs were jointly assessed through a single online assessment tool, which was administered to students in 200-level classes.

### *Artifacts, Workshops, and Assessment Tools*

#### **Fall 2024—Effective Communication and Creative Thinking**

In Fall 2024, workshop participants were divided into two groups: one to assess *Effective Communication* and the other to assess *Creative Thinking*. The group that assessed *Effective Communication* reviewed ten student work samples from a 200-level course titled "Writing and the Humanities." The assignment required students to select a primary text and interpret a theme from the text, using a "school of literary theory" to guide their analysis. This workshop group consisted of four PAC GELO members and one additional faculty volunteer.

The group that assessed *Creative Thinking* reviewed five student work samples, which consisted of poems and stories from a 200-level Creative Writing course (ENGL 261). There were two PAC GELO members and four other faculty volunteers in this group.

The typical student taking either of these courses is enrolled in an associate or bachelor's degree program, and they are often in their sophomore year. Both courses are GERs with a prerequisite of WRTG 111.

### **Spring 2025—*Environmental and Community Engagement***

To assess *Environmental and Community Engagement*, the committee reviewed an artifact from a 100-level Alaska Native Studies course that fulfills the Alaska Native Knowledge Graduation Requirement (ANKGR). The workshop group assessed ten research presentations, which consisted of PowerPoint slides with voice-overs. This was the second year the committee has used this assignment as an artifact to assess this rubric. The first year, there were some issues with large download sizes of the video presentations. This year, the issue was mitigated by providing workshop participants with download links to the videos in advance of the workshop. The workshop group consisted of five PAC GELO members and two other faculty volunteers.

In the spring, the PAC GELO committee gathered insights from all workshop volunteers on the strengths and weaknesses of each rubric, as well as the workshop format. These notes are reviewed each year, and changes are made based on this feedback.

To assess *Empirical Reasoning* and *Critical Thinking*, a newly revised online asynchronous assessment instrument was administered to students in a 100-level College Algebra course, a 200-level Calculus course and a 200-level Mathematics for Elementary School Teachers course. In previous years, we had administered two separate online assessments to students: one per GELO. The new tool was adapted from these tools by two PAC GELO members in summer 2024. The goal was to merge these two tools into a single online assessment instrument; to make some of the questions locally-relevant; and to test and weed out any questions that were repetitive, unclear, or ineffective. In addition, all questions were mapped to the relevant categories within the *Empirical Reasoning* and *Critical Thinking* rubrics.

---

## **III. Results**

As with the previous round of assessments, raw scores assigned by assessment teams were summarized using pivot tables. There were two aims: the first, to determine the consistency of the scores; and the second, to assess student learning, the actual purpose of the assessment process.

Results from assessments for each of *Effective Communication*, *Creative Thinking*, *Environmental and Community Engagement*, *Critical Thinking*, and *Empirical Reasoning* follow.

### **Results for *Effective Communication***

Scores assigned to students for this learning outcome are summarized below.

**Table 3.1:** Summary of scores obtained from the *Effective Communication* sample works includes mean scores (x), standard deviations (s), and percentages of scores greater than or equal to each benchmark.

Outcomes	% of work with a score ≥				
	mean	sd	1	2	3
1. Audience, context, and purpose...	1.29	0.46	100.0	21.0	0.0
2. Content material ...	1.51	0.56	100.0	45.7	2.9
3. Arrangement of material...	1.60	0.55	100.0	53.3	2.9
4. Supporting materials ...	1.21	0.81	78.1	23.8	5.7
5. Use of language...	1.23	0.84	76.2	29.5	3.8
<b>Overall Summaries</b>	<b>1.37</b>	<b>0.67</b>	<b>91.6</b>	<b>34.9</b>	<b>3.1</b>

Standard deviations are reasonably low suggesting fairly consistent student scores within each rubric criterion. Average overall score for all assessed criteria for the sample ranged over 1.21—1.60 with standard deviations ranging over 0.46—0.84. These suggest weak performances for this learning outcome. While the majority of the students assessed achieved the beginning level (1 or higher), considerably fewer achieved the proficient and advanced levels (2 - 3).

### Results for *Creative Thinking*

Scores assigned to students for this learning outcome are summarized below.

**Table 3.2:** Summary of scores obtained from the *Creative Thinking* sample works includes mean scores (x), standard deviations (s), and percentages of scores greater than or equal to each benchmark.

Outcomes	% of work with a score ≥				
	mean	sd	1	2	3
1. Vision and framework...	1.23	0.73	94.3	41.9	0.0
2. Details in ideas...	1.23	0.43	100.0	23.8	0.0
3. Approach to the task...	1.06	0.54	97.1	11.4	1.9
4. Use of existing info...	0.82	0.39	81.9	0.0	0.0
5. Outcome...	1.06	0.42	92.4	8.6	0.0
<b>Overall Summaries</b>	<b>1.08</b>	<b>0.53</b>	<b>93.9</b>	<b>17.3</b>	<b>0.4</b>

Standard deviations are again reasonably low suggesting fairly consistent student scores within each rubric criterion. Average overall score for all assessed criteria for the sample ranged over 0.82—1.23 with standard deviations ranging over 0.39—0.73, again suggesting weak performances for this learning outcome. Here, too, the majority of the students assessed achieved the beginning level (1 or higher), with considerably fewer achieving the proficient level (2 or higher) and only 1.9% achieving the advanced level (3) in only the “Approach to task” criterion.

### Results for *Environmental and Community Engagement*

Scores assigned to students for this learning outcome are summarized below.

**Table 3.3:** Summary of scores obtained from the *Environmental and Community Engagement* sample works includes mean scores (x), standard deviations (s), and percentages of scores greater than or equal to each benchmark.

Outcomes		% of work with a score $\geq$				
		mean	sd	1	2	3
	<b>1. Influence of Cultural Norms</b>	1.80	0.96	91.4	60.0	28.6
	<b>2. LIK and Perspectives</b>	1.76	0.82	95.7	60.0	20.0
	<b>3. Diverse Global Perspectives</b>	1.33	0.61	94.3	37.1	1.4
	<b>4. Human/Social Impact of Environment</b>	2.09	0.81	98.6	74.3	35.7
	<b>Overall Summaries</b>	1.74	0.85	95.0	57.9	21.4

The slightly higher standard deviations (over 0.5 and close to 1) suggest widely varying student scores within each rubric criterion. Average scores for all assessed criteria for the sample were generally low, ranging over 1.33—2.09, with standard deviations ranging over 0.61—0.96. While almost all of the students assessed achieved at least the beginning level (scores of 1 or higher) in all four criteria, a reasonably respectable percentage achieved the proficient level range, 37.1—74.3%. The percentage who achieved the advanced level dropped down further to a range of 1.4—35.7%.

### Results for *Critical Thinking*

Scores assigned to students for this learning outcome are summarized below. The instrument used continues to work well since scores for the past few implementations have been comparable.

**Table 3.4:** Summary of scores obtained from the *Critical Thinking* sample includes mean scores (x), standard deviations (s), and percentages of items with scores greater than or equal to each benchmark.

Outcomes		% of work with a score $\geq$				
		mean	sd	1	2	3
	<b>1. Understanding</b>	2.44	0.23	100.0	100.0	0.0
	<b>2. Facts/Assumptions</b>	2.45	0.30	100.0	100.0	0.0
	<b>3. Synthesis</b>	2.51	0.24	100.0	100.0	0.0
	<b>4. Strategy</b>	2.45	0.29	100.0	100.0	3.7
	<b>5. Conclusions</b>	2.45	0.30	100.0	100.0	3.7
	<b>Overall Summaries</b>	2.46	0.23	100.0	100.0	0.0

Standard deviations are well below 0.5 suggesting fairly consistent student scores within each rubric criterion. Average overall score for all assessed criteria for the sample ranged over 2.44—2.51 with standard deviations ranging over 0.23—0.30. All of the students assessed achieved the proficient level (2 or higher), with only 3.7% achieving the advanced level (3) in the “Strategy” and “Conclusions” criteria. These are fairly acceptable scores at the level being assessed.

### Results for *Empirical Reasoning*

Scores assigned to students for this learning outcome are summarized below. This instrument continues to work well, with past scores being fairly comparable.

**Table 3.5:** Summary of scores obtained for the *Empirical Reasoning* sample includes mean scores (x), standard deviations (s), and percentages of items with scores greater than or equal to each benchmark.

Outcomes	mean	sd	% of work with a score >=		
			1	2	3
1. Description	2.15	0.69	100.0	85.2	18.5
2. Factors	1.60	0.63	100.0	59.3	0.0
3. Design	2.06	0.60	96.3	85.2	3.7
4. Data Collection	1.93	0.61	96.3	77.8	3.7
5. Results	1.83	0.58	96.3	85.2	0.0
<b>Overall Summaries</b>	<b>1.91</b>	<b>0.54</b>	<b>96.3</b>	<b>77.8</b>	<b>0.0</b>

The scores earned are a little more spread out than for *Critical Thinking*, standard deviations ranged over 0.58—0.69, and the average scores for all criteria assessed were lower too. This being said, most of the students achieved the beginning level (scores of 1 or higher) and the majority of the students achieved the proficient level (scores of 2 or higher). However, not many achieved the advanced level with none for the “Factors” and “Results” criteria. These too are fairly respectable scores at the level being assessed.

## IV. Lessons Learned and Next Steps

The PAC GELO members have continued to assess GERs and modify GELO rubrics as needed. Our assessment workshops provide an opportunity to assess how well our students are meeting the general education learning outcomes and allow the PAC GELO team to refine our rubrics and tailor them more specifically to meet our needs. All GELOs have been assessed at least four times. Overall, we are satisfied with the content of the rubrics; however, we have continued to make improvements to the rubrics for clarity.

This section includes a breakdown of observations by PAC GELO members and assessment workshop participants, as well as an outline of the committee’s proposed next steps.

### *Assessment Observations*

As reported previously, the group feels comfortable with the process and structure of the assessment of sample artifacts according to the GELO rubrics. We are also very grateful for the faculty volunteers who participate in the workshops. We have several repeat volunteers that make the process run very smoothly. This year, we experimented with some new assessment approaches, and we are overall very satisfied with the results.

### Fall 2024 Workshop

In December 2024, the committee hosted a workshop to assess an artifact from Writing 111 using the *Effective Communication* and *Creative Thinking* rubrics. Continuing with this work, we assessed a new artifact from Writing 111. We combined both into a single session. Each committee member recruited one or two participants to assess two rubrics at once, using the same artifact set. Some insights from assessing the artifacts using the *Creative Thinking* and *Effective Communication* in one session:

- *It may be helpful to prepare an artifact specifically to address both effective comm and creative thinking that all students submit as a “pre” test as freshmen, and then again after they complete their GERs*
- *Considerations : decide on how best to administer (within a freshman class? As part of their orientation?), decide what would be a suitable length to convey an idea, yet not be overwhelming for students or reviewers.*
- *Instructions would need to clearly define the goal (communicate effectively and think creatively) without prescribing a particular topic and be specific to the rubric outcomes.*
- *It may help to edit the rubrics so they don’t refer to the “assigned task”?*
- *Should we consider going back to having separate artifacts for Effective Comm and Creative Thinking? We could return to having two separate workshops at the same time, or assessing fewer GELOs per year.*
- *Multiple comments were made that having details about what the professor assigned would be helpful.*

The artifact we used for the workshop was a better fit for the communication rubric; however, it was not a good match for the creative thinking rubric. It was harder to assess the artifact based on the creative thinking rubric. Moving forward, we would like to use an artifact from a creative writing course, as it would likely be a better fit for both rubrics. When these two rubrics were paired together, workshop participants were able to separate their assessment to focus entirely on the communication and then entirely on creativity; however, participants reported much greater confidence in more accurately assessing communication. While we understand that not all combinations of rubrics may work together smoothly, we plan to continue experimenting with combining different rubrics in the future. Our ideal long-term goal is to combine all five rubrics to a limited number of artifacts. Exams, or tests to demonstrate the potential for faculty to generate assignments that reinforce a more rounded student development, regardless of a course’s discipline.

## Spring 2025 Workshop

In May 2025, the committee hosted a workshop that focused on the *Environmental and Community Engagement* GELO. To begin the process, the committee again reached out to CACANE to discuss the *Environmental and Community Engagement* rubric and the possibility of getting an artifact from them to assess during the spring workshop. CACANE’s long-term goal is to have an assignment that is offered in multiple ANKGR courses. For the May 2025 workshop, an artifact from a single course was requested; we were able to obtain an artifact for the Spring 2025 workshop.

When reviewing the rubric for this GELO, the committee noted that the first column didn’t initially make sense. After some conversation, the committee ended up redefining it as “internal” and the last column as “external.” The committee also came up with temporary headers for those two columns to use for the workshop, but the plan is to wordsmith these before the next evaluation. These were the temporary column headers used:

Column 1: Influence of internal Cultural Norms (of the culture being discussed)...

Column 4: External Human /Social Impact on an Environment....

- *The committee questioned whether the global perspectives column seemed to fit at first, but a committee member pointed out that the “colonial perspective” is a global perspective, and many of the artifacts addressed this.*
- *Participants commented on how enjoyable the artifacts were to review, and what a good fit they were (overall) to the rubric.*

There are a few areas that the committee hopes to improve moving forward. Artifact-rubric fit has continued to be a minor area of concern. Although this did not cause any major issues, it is a part of the process that we are always interested in improving. Every year, there seem to be improvements made in our ability to select appropriate artifacts, but it's possible that there are other changes that could be made to the process that would eliminate this concern.

During the 2024/2025 academic year members of the AA and AS assessment committees will join the GELO Committee to participate in the workshops and they continue to utilize the GELO annual assessment reports. Both degrees mainly consist of GERs and the GELO data contributes to their effort avoiding duplication

### ***Rubric Design***

The *Environmental and Community Engagement*, the least-assessed rubric, continues to be a work in progress. Although we made some minor changes to the rubric, the plan is to continue to modify this rubric based on feedback from the workshop and CACANE. During the spring semester, CACANE proposed draft edits to the rubric, which were reviewed and approved. The suggestions included: changing the row header “NOT YET” to “NO EVIDENCE.” Additionally, it was determined that we should change “MASTERY” to “ADVANCED,” as the Committee agreed that students taking 200-level courses should not be expected to have “mastered” the subject matter yet!

At a time when UAS is thinking critically about decolonizing and Indigenizing higher education, it seems appropriate to interrogate our GELOs to better understand how they may address this goal.

### ***Next Steps***

In an effort to respond to some of the past challenges, the committee has been exploring the effectiveness of standardization through asynchronous online assessments. In the Summers of 2024/2025, two GELO members revised the two online instruments that have been used to separately assess *Empirical Reasoning* and *Critical Thinking*. They combined the two assessments into one and rewrote many of the questions to improve upon them and to make them more relevant to Alaskan students. They also mapped each question to the rubric categories. This instrument was tested in Spring 2025, and the eventual goal is to potentially use it as both a pre- and post-assessment tool.

Our assessment cycle continues as we plan to assess as many GELOs as possible. In the future, as the committee continues to refine our automated assessment for some GELOs, we hope to assess some GELOs twice within the same year. We currently plan to follow the assessment schedule we followed this year, perhaps adding even more assessment if the opportunity arises. The committee will therefore work according to the following tentative assessment schedule:

- **Fall 2025:** Online assessment of *Empirical Reasoning* and *Critical Thinking*, *Creative Thinking*, and *Effective Communication*.
- **Spring 2026:** *Environmental and Community Engagement* (address suggestions from CACANE for edits).

Throughout the last few years of assessment, the PAC GELO team has discussed the potential benefits of designing an artifact for a course in advance of the workshop to address some of the artifact-rubric design concerns mentioned previously. In other words, we welcomed the opportunity to work with a faculty volunteer to design an assignment prior to the beginning of the semester with the goal of using the assignment for the workshop. After much discussion, it appears that we have a faculty volunteer willing to attempt this. Although it is not required or expected for one course to fully meet all criteria of a GELO,

designing an assignment to meet the rubric could improve the assessment process and may even aid in the overall goal of closing the loop and better understanding our students' specific strengths and areas in need of improvement.

The committee also continues to work toward their long-term goal of helping UAS scale up the assessment processes. Within the past year, the charge of the committee has been clarified and, though it is not exclusively our responsibility to find ways to improve student scores in some of the weaker areas, we are still a part of the overall UAS mission to turn the results of assessment into useful information related to the instructional programs at UAS. The PAC GELO committee continues to engage with the larger UAS learning community to determine whether undergraduate students are meeting the GELO outcomes.

## RUBRICS

1. **EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION:** Communicate thoughts and ideas effectively, orally and/or in writing.

	AUDIENCE, CONTEXT, AND PURPOSE...	CONTENT MATERIAL (CENTRAL MESSAGE OR ARGUMENT)...	ARRANGEMENT OF MATERIAL...	SUPPORTING MATERIALS (DETAILS, INFORMATION, RESOURCES)...
NOT APPLICABLE	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
NO EVIDENCE (0)	<input type="checkbox"/> ...are not considered.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...is not appropriate for the assigned task.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...is not organized.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...are not present or are not appropriate.
BEGINNING (1)	<input type="checkbox"/> ...are somewhat considered.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...is presented in a somewhat general manner that is relevant to the assigned task.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...incorporates basic transitions through shifts in topic.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...are clearly referenced within the work.
PROFICIENT (2)	<input type="checkbox"/> ...are clearly aligned with the assigned task.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...is developed or presented in a specific and detailed manner.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...follows consistent patterns throughout the entire work.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...are relevant to the assigned task and are integrated effectively.
ADVANCED (3)	<input type="checkbox"/> ...are addressed according to the assigned task, with full nuance and complexity, demonstrating deep understanding.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...effectively, clearly and creatively conveys the central message or argument in a compelling manner.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...skillfully maintains the work's cohesiveness.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...are used to thoroughly develop ideas appropriate for the discipline and genre of the assigned task.

2. **CRITICAL THINKING (CURRENT):** Demonstrate comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas and/or theories, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion, conclusion, or solution

**CRITICAL THINKING (PROPOSED):** Demonstrate the ability to understand a problem/issue/task at hand, identify relevant facts and/or assumptions, synthesize and conceptualize available information, develop an effective strategy to tackle the problem/issue/task, and arrive at a valid conclusion.

***Current Critical Thinking Rubric:***

	ISSUE OR PROBLEM TO BE CONSIDERED CRITICALLY...	PERSPECTIVE, THESIS, OR HYPOTHESIS...	ASSUMPTIONS...	INFORMATION TAKEN FROM SOURCES...	CONCLUSION OR RELATED OUTCOMES...
NOT APPLICABLE	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
NO EVIDENCE (0)	<input type="checkbox"/> ...is not stated.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...is not stated.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...are not acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...is not present.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...is not present.
BEGINNING (1)	<input type="checkbox"/> ...is implied.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...is implied.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...are identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...is included.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...is tied to some of the information discussed.
PROFICIENT (2)	<input type="checkbox"/> ...is presented in a clear and logical manner.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...is explicitly stated.	<input type="checkbox"/> ... are discussed.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...is used to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...clearly identifies some related outcomes (consequences or implications).
ADVANCED (3)	<input type="checkbox"/> ...is framed in such a manner that delivers information necessary for clear and complete understanding.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...takes into account the complexities of the issue.	<input type="checkbox"/> ... are used to question the context and/or others' assumptions.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...is used to develop an effective and comprehensive analysis or synthesis.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...incorporates opposing viewpoints and/or limitations.

## ***Proposed Critical Thinking Rubric:***

	<b>A - Understanding</b>	<b>B - Facts/Assumptions</b>	<b>C - Synthesize/Conceptualize</b>	<b>D - Strategy</b>	<b>E - Conclusion</b>
<b>Not Applicable</b>					
<b>No Evidence (0)</b>					
<b>Beginning (1)</b>					
<b>Proficient (2)</b>					
<b>Advanced (3)</b>					
<b>Comments</b>					
<b>A:</b> Demonstrate the ability to understand a problem/issue/task at hand.					
<b>B:</b> Identify relevant facts and/or assumptions.					
<b>C:</b> Synthesize/conceptualize available information.					
<b>D:</b> Develop an effective strategy to tackle the problem/issue/task.					
<b>E:</b> Arrive at a valid conclusion.					

**3. CREATIVE THINKING:** Present creative works of expression, innovative approaches to tasks, or solutions to problems.

*The committee will explore revisions to this rubric based on feedback from the Fall 2022 workshop.*

	STUDENT'S VISION AND FRAMEWORK OF EXPLORING IDEAS...	DETAILS IN STUDENT'S IDEAS, QUESTIONS, FORMATS, OR PRODUCTS...	STUDENT'S APPROACH TO THE TASK...	STUDENT'S USE OF EXISTING MODELS...	STUDENT'S OUTCOME (OBJECT, SOLUTION, OR IDEA)...
NOT APPLICABLE	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
NO EVIDENCE (0)	<input type="checkbox"/> ...relates strictly to the assigned task.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...relate strictly to the assigned task.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...relates strictly to the assigned task.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...copies or restates what is already available.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...does not serve its intended purpose.
BEGINNING (1)	<input type="checkbox"/> ...considers alternative perspectives.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...show signs of original thought.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...considers alternative processes.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...shows signs of deviation from expectations and common assumptions.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...serves its intended purpose (for example, solving a problem or addressing an issue).
PROFICIENT (2)	<input type="checkbox"/> ...actively explores alternative perspectives.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...demonstrate uniqueness and novelty.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...experiments with alternative processes.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...actively explores ideas in alternative contexts.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...makes an original contribution in its intended purpose.
ADVANCED (3)	<input type="checkbox"/> ...engages in untested and potentially risky approaches to the assigned task(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> ...challenge traditional limitations.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...applies alternative processes with consideration to consequences.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...synthesizes what is already available to apply ideas in a new context.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...provides a meaningful answer to the task in an original and surprising context.

**4. EMPIRICAL REASONING:** Apply the scientific method to well-reasoned questions in the search for answers through data.

	A DESCRIPTION OF THE PROBLEM...	FACTORS APPLICABLE TO THE PROBLEM...	DESIGN OF THE STUDY...	DATA COLLECTION METHOD...	RESULTS...
NOT APPLICABLE	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
NO EVIDENCE (0)	<input type="checkbox"/> ...is not present.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...are not identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...is not present.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...is not identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...are not present.
BEGINNING (1)	<input type="checkbox"/> ...is outlined.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...are identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...is described in terms of its purpose and objective.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...is identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...are summarized as appropriate to the discipline.
PROFICIENT (2)	<input type="checkbox"/> ...is clear and complete.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...are classified clearly.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...identifies appropriate methodology.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...is implemented correctly.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...are interpreted as appropriate to the discipline.
ADVANCED (3)	<input type="checkbox"/> ...is formulated to include a proper and precise research question.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...are formulated into an appropriate testable hypothesis.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...identifies limitations of the proposed study.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...is used to produce (or leads toward) consistent and accurate data.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...are used to provide clear and concise scientific explanations of analysis.

**5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT:** Explore Indigenous and global social perspectives with respect for diversity of people, different perspectives of resource sustainability, and human impact on the environment.

*Modified in Spring 2023 based on input from the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Alaska Native Education (CACANE).*

	INFLUENCE OF CULTURAL NORMS...	LOCAL INDIGENOUS KNOWLEDGE (LIK) AND PERSPECTIVES...	DIVERSE GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES...	HUMAN/SOCIAL IMPACT ON AN ENVIRONMENT...
NOT APPLICABLE	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
NO EVIDENCE (0)	<input type="checkbox"/> ...is not acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...are not acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...are not acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...is not acknowledged.
BEGINNING (1)	<input type="checkbox"/> ...is acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...are acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...are acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...is acknowledged.
PROFICIENT (2)	<input type="checkbox"/> ...is supported with examples.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...are developed through examples.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...are developed through examples.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...is developed through examples.
ADVANCED (3)	<input type="checkbox"/> ...is analyzed and/or interrogated.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...are analyzed to thoroughly develop ideas.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...are analyzed to thoroughly develop ideas.	<input type="checkbox"/> ...is analyzed in a way that expresses the need for respectful engagement.