

## Assessment Data Mathematical, Information and Computer Sciences

**Learning Outcome:** Students will be able to gather relevant information, examine information and form a conclusion based on that information (Critical Thinking).

**Outcome Measure:**  
ETS Proficiency Profile

**Criteria for Success:**  
85% of the students will be marginal or proficient at Level 2 Reading/Critical Thinking.

**Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):**

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

**Longitudinal Data:**

	Percentage of Students Marginal or Proficient				
	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
ETS Proficiency Profile Level 2 Critical Thinking	80.0%	92.3%	100.0%	84.2%	91.7%

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

Our students have been meeting the benchmark on the ETS exam. The variability has to do with the small sample size.

**Changes to be Made Based on Data:**

None at this time.

**Rubric:**

ETS provides the scores.

## **Assessment Data Mathematical, Information and Computer Sciences**

**Learning Outcome:** Students will be able to speak about their work with precision, clarity and organization (Oral Communication).

**Outcome Measure:** Annual: Each student will be required to give an oral presentation on a topic in their field as a part of their participation in the Senior Seminar. The audience for this talk will include department faculty, fellow students and possibly some alumni. The students will be given the evaluation criteria in advance of their presentation and will be rated by the faculty using a rubric with a scale of 4 (outstanding) to 1 (unsatisfactory) in the following areas:

- Command of background material
- Organization
- Oral presentation skills (added as part of the new rubric in the spring of 2010)
- Use of presentation tools
- Ability to field questions from the audience

Note that the department has a mapping between its rubric and the AAC&U Oral Communication Value Rubric.

**Criteria for Success:** 80% of the students should have an average score of at least 2.5 in each of the major areas in the department rubric. This translates to 80% of the students being above a 3.5 in the AAC&U rubric.

Our translation from our data to the AAC&U is included. Our department continues to provide the students with our departmental rubric because it has been developed over many years and works effectively with our majors.

### **Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):**

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

### Longitudinal Data:

Oral Presentation	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Background	94%	88%	100%	95%	100%	100%	92%	100%	95%	100%
Organization	94%	94%	100%	85%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	92%
Oral presentation skills (2010)			100%	90%	100%	100%	92%	100%	95%	100%
Presentation Tools	88%	94%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Ability to field questions	81%	100%	100%	100%	83%	100%	100%	89%	100%	100%

AAC&U “translation” (we have only done this for the years that PLNU has been making use of the DQP)

Oral AAC&U	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Organization	100%	100%	100%	100%	92%
Language	100%	92%	100%	100%	100%
Delivery	100%	92%	100%	95%	100%
Supporting Material	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Central Message	100%	100%	89%	100%	100%

### Conclusions Drawn from Data:

In general, the students have been performing reasonably well in the area of giving oral presentations. We attribute this to the fact that we intentionally have students presenting technical material in front of others starting in their freshman year.

### Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Over time we have increased our standards and expanded the rubric to increase clarity for students and to push them to speak at a professional level. Looking at the scores, it is possible to see the times when alterations have been made:

- 2008-09 Standards tightened
- 2009-10 Rubric expanded to include more detailed instructions

### Oral Presentation Rubric Update (4/12/17)

Criteria	Outstanding	High Satisfactory	Low Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Command of background material	<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly knows material and key facts by memory <input type="checkbox"/> Expands on PPT slides <input type="checkbox"/> Content appropriate for audience	<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly knows key facts with a few memory slips <input type="checkbox"/> Some expansion on PPT slides <input type="checkbox"/> Partial audience adaptation of content	<input type="checkbox"/> Reads some information; knows some facts from memory <input type="checkbox"/> No expansion of PPT slide content <input type="checkbox"/> Little audience adaptation of content	<input type="checkbox"/> Reads sentences from slides <input type="checkbox"/> Dependent on notes <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks audience adaptation of content
Organization	<input type="checkbox"/> Clear and concise outline <input type="checkbox"/> Relevant graphics and key text items on slides <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation is between 10-15 minutes	<input type="checkbox"/> Clear outline <input type="checkbox"/> Too much information on slides (not concise) <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation 1 minute outside of the range (10-15 minutes)	<input type="checkbox"/> Some sense of outline <input type="checkbox"/> Too much detailed information on slides <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation 2 minutes outside of the range (10-15 minutes)	<input type="checkbox"/> No clear outline <input type="checkbox"/> Slides are in paragraphed; too much detailed information on one slide <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation 3 minutes outside of the range (10-15 minutes)
Oral Presentation skills	<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly has practiced several times; smooth transitions <input type="checkbox"/> Engages audience in content multiple time and engagement is well connected to talk (questions, examples, etc) <input type="checkbox"/> Free of disfluencies (ah, umh) <input type="checkbox"/> Is clearly heard in the room and makes an uses inflection for emphasis <input type="checkbox"/> Engaged audience through eye contact <input type="checkbox"/> Engaged audience through gestures	<input type="checkbox"/> Has practiced but transitions are not smooth <input type="checkbox"/> Engages audience at least twice in content (questions, examples, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> A few disfluencies (ah, umh, er) <input type="checkbox"/> Can be understood most of the time and uses some inflection <input type="checkbox"/> Some engagement of audience through eye contact <input type="checkbox"/> Some engagement of audience through gestures	<input type="checkbox"/> Has practiced presentation but cannot verbally make transitions between slides <input type="checkbox"/> Audience engagement at least once with content (questions, examples, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> Many disfluencies (ah, umh, er) <input type="checkbox"/> Can sometimes be understood and uses little inflection <input type="checkbox"/> Infrequent eye contact <input type="checkbox"/> Distracting gestures or mannerisms	<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly did not practice presentation; Does not anticipate content of next slide <input type="checkbox"/> No audience involvement <input type="checkbox"/> Disfluencies (ah, umh, er) detract from presentation <input type="checkbox"/> Can not be heard and/or speaks in a monotone <input type="checkbox"/> Little audience awareness or eye contact <input type="checkbox"/> Frequent distracting gestures or mannerisms
Use of Presentation Tools	<input type="checkbox"/> PPT background is matched to content, legible font, seamless transitions <input type="checkbox"/> Graphics imbedded and matched to topic, necessary hyperlinks work	<input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate PPT slide backgrounds, transitions & font <input type="checkbox"/> Most graphics imbedded and matched to topic, most necessary hyperlinks work	<input type="checkbox"/> Distracting PPT slide backgrounds and transitions, font hard to read <input type="checkbox"/> Some inappropriate graphics or use of PPT embellishments, necessary hyperlinks don't work	<input type="checkbox"/> No attention given to PPT slide backgrounds and transitions, font illegible <input type="checkbox"/> Distracting use of embellishments, graphics not connected to topic
Ability to field questions	<input type="checkbox"/> Able to answer questions clearly and without hesitation and prepared material to answer anticipated questions	<input type="checkbox"/> Can answer all questions with some hesitation	<input type="checkbox"/> Able to answer half of the questions with hesitation	<input type="checkbox"/> Unable to answer any questions

# Translation between MICS and AAC&U Rubric

MICS Category	MICS Item Position in Rubric	AAC&U Category
Clear and concise outline	4	Organization
Relevant graphics and key text items on slides	5	Organization
Presentation length is +/- 30 seconds of time limit	6	Organization
Expands on PPT slides	2	Language
Content appropriate for audience	3	Language
Engages audience	8	Language
Transitions	7	Delivery
Free of disfluencies (ah, uhm)	9	Delivery
Is clearly heard in the room and uses inflection for emphasis	10	Delivery
Engaged audience through eye contact	11	Delivery
Engaged audience through gestures	12	Delivery
PPT background is matched to content, legible font, seamless transitions	13	Delivery
Relevant graphics and key text items on slides	5	Supporting
Graphics imbedded and matched to topic, necessary hyperlinks work	14	Supporting
Clearly knows material and key facts by memory	1	Central Message
Able to answer questions clearly and without hesitation	15	Central Message

### AAC&U Value Rubric

	<b>Capstone 4</b>	<b>Milestones 3</b>	<b>Milestones 2</b>	<b>Benchmark 1</b>
<b>Organization</b>	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable and is skillful and makes the content of the presentation cohesive.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable within the presentation.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is intermittently observable within the presentation.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is not observable within the presentation.
<b>Language</b>	Language choices are imaginative, memorable, and compelling, and enhance the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are thoughtful and generally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are mundane and commonplace and partially support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are unclear and minimally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is not appropriate to audience.
<b>Delivery</b>	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation compelling, and speaker appears polished and confident.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation interesting, and speaker appears comfortable.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation understandable, and speaker appears tentative.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) detract from the understandability of the presentation, and speaker appears uncomfortable.
<b>Supporting Material</b>	A variety of types of supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that significantly supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that generally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that partially supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	Insufficient supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make reference to information or analysis that minimally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.
<b>Central Message</b>	Central message is compelling (precisely stated, appropriately repeated, memorable, and strongly supported.)	Central message is clear and consistent with the supporting material.	Central message is basically understandable but is not often repeated and is not memorable.	Central message can be deduced, but is not explicitly stated in the presentation.

## **Assessment Data Mathematical, Information and Computer Sciences**

**Learning Outcome:** Students will be able to write about their work with precision, clarity and organization (Written Communication).

### **Outcome Measure:**

Annual: Each student will be required to write a paper on a topic in their field as a part of their participation in the Senior Seminar. The audience for this talk will include department faculty, fellow students and possibly some alumni. The students will be given the evaluation criteria in advance of their presentation and will be rated by the faculty using a rubric with a scale of 4 (outstanding) to 1 (unsatisfactory) in the following areas:

- Bibliography and other supporting documentation
- Organization
- Grammar and spelling
- Depth of information
- Clarity of writing

Note that the department has a mapping between its rubric and the AAC&U Written Communication Value Rubric.

Annual: ETS Proficiency Profile.

**Criteria for Success:** 80% of the students should have an average score of at least 2.5 in each of the major areas in the department rubric. This translates to 80% of the students being above a 3.5 in the AAC&U rubric.

ETS: 85% of our students will be marginal or proficient on the Level 2 Writing test.

Our translation from our data to the AAC&U is included. Our department continues to provide the students with our departmental rubric because it has been developed over many years and works effectively with our majors

### **Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):**

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

## Longitudinal Data:

<b>Written Report</b>	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Bibliography and support	69%	75%	88%	55%	93%	100%	100%	100%	89%	100%
Organization	100%	88%	63%	65%	93%	100%	100%	100%	100%	92%
Grammar and Spelling	94%	75%	81%	60%	79%	100%	92%	89%	84%	100%
Depth of Information	81%	88%	88%	50%	93%	91%	77%	78%	89%	85%
Clarity of Writing	94%	69%	81%	70%	79%	91%	77%	78%	89%	85%

AAC&U “translation” (we have only done this for the years that PLNU has been making use of the DQP)

<b>Written AAC&amp;U</b>	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Organization	100%	100%	100%	89%	92%
Language	100%	92%	100%	89%	85%
Delivery	100%	92%	100%	100%	85%
Supporting Material	100%	100%	100%	89%	100%
Central Message	100%	100%	89%	84%	85%

	Percentage of Students Marginal or Proficient				
	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
ETS Proficiency Profile Level 2 Writing	60.0%	84.6%	100.0%	89.5%	83.3%



**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

In general, the students have been performing reasonably well in writing technical reports. We still have some weaknesses in the quality of their writing and the use of their source material. The sample size for ETS in the first year was extremely small so we are not particularly concerned about the fact that the score was below the benchmark. The balance of the ETS scores are at or near benchmark (due to small sample sizes, the difference can often be a single person).

**Changes to be Made Based on Data:**

Over time we have increased our standards and expanded the rubric to increase clarity for students and to push them to speak at a professional level. Looking at the scores, it is possible to see the times when alterations have been made:

- 2008-09 Standards tightened
- 2009-10 Rubric expanded to include more detailed instructions
- In 2014-15 we instituted a literature review assignment to strengthen the students' capacity for using resources and identifying why the resources are relevant. This assignment needs to be adjusted, but seems to have helped students to understand their work.

In addition, the university has just changed general education requirements so that students will take an upper division literature class. We hope that this further exposure to formal writing later in their academic career will help to strengthen our students' writing.

### MICS Written Presentation Rubric

Criteria	Outstanding	High Satisfactory	Low Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Bibliography and supporting documents	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple references from distinct reputable sources  <input type="checkbox"/> References cited in the body of the document	<input type="checkbox"/> Most references from distinct reputable sources  <input type="checkbox"/> Some citation of references in the body of the document	<input type="checkbox"/> Some references from reputable sources  <input type="checkbox"/> Limited citation of references in the body of the document	<input type="checkbox"/> No bibliography or all references from untrusted sites on the internet  <input type="checkbox"/> No citation of references in the body of the document
Organization	<input type="checkbox"/> Conveys a central theme with all ideas connected, arrangement of ideas clearly related to topic  <input type="checkbox"/> Clear introduction, body (with sections), and conclusion includes summary and closure  <input type="checkbox"/> Includes both an abstract and table of contents	<input type="checkbox"/> Conveys a central idea or topic with some ideas connected to the topic  <input type="checkbox"/> Includes introduction, body and conclusion  <input type="checkbox"/> Includes abstract and table of contents (one partial and one complete)	<input type="checkbox"/> Attempts to focus on an idea or topic with many ideas not connected to the topic  <input type="checkbox"/> Introduction, body, conclusion detectable but not clear  <input type="checkbox"/> Includes partial abstract and partial table of contents	<input type="checkbox"/> Has little or no focus on central idea or topic  <input type="checkbox"/> Introduction, body or conclusion absent  <input type="checkbox"/> No abstract or table of contents
Grammar and spelling	<input type="checkbox"/> No use of first- person tense  <input type="checkbox"/> No grammatical or spelling errors	<input type="checkbox"/> Few uses of the first-person tense  <input type="checkbox"/> Few grammatical and spelling errors	<input type="checkbox"/> Several uses of the first- person tense  <input type="checkbox"/> Some grammatical and spelling errors	<input type="checkbox"/> Written in first-person tense  <input type="checkbox"/> Many grammatical and spelling errors
Depth of information	<input type="checkbox"/> Appropriately synthesizes information from multiple distinct sources  <input type="checkbox"/> Draws conclusions and personal insights from synthesis  <input type="checkbox"/> Has the minimum number of pages including penalty pages; subject coverage is excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Synthesis of information from at least three distinct sources  <input type="checkbox"/> At least two personal insights or conclusions stated  <input type="checkbox"/> Has the minimum number of pages including penalty pages; subject coverage is good	<input type="checkbox"/> Synthesis of information from at least two distinct sources  <input type="checkbox"/> At least one personal insight or conclusion stated  <input type="checkbox"/> Has the minimum number of pages including penalty pages; subject coverage is adequate	<input type="checkbox"/> Summary reporting of information without synthesis  <input type="checkbox"/> No personal insights  <input type="checkbox"/> Does not have the minimum number of pages including penalty pages
Clarity of writing	<input type="checkbox"/> Sentences flow  <input type="checkbox"/> Smooth transitions between paragraphs  <input type="checkbox"/> Any and all terms and acronyms are defined  <input type="checkbox"/> Provides evidence to support points	<input type="checkbox"/> Good sentence structure  <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate transitions between paragraphs  <input type="checkbox"/> Most terms and acronyms are defined  <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks support for some points	<input type="checkbox"/> Occasional poor sentence structure  <input type="checkbox"/> Transitions between paragraphs unclear  <input type="checkbox"/> Some terms and acronyms are defined  <input type="checkbox"/> Provides minimal support for points	<input type="checkbox"/> Frequent poor sentence structure  <input type="checkbox"/> Lacked transitions between paragraphs  <input type="checkbox"/> Many terms and acronyms are undefined  <input type="checkbox"/> Ideas not supported

## Translation between MICS and AAC&U Rubric

MICS Category	MICS Item Position in Rubric	AAC&U Category
Conveys a central theme with all ideas connected, arrangement of ideas clearly related to topic	3	Purpose
Appropriately synthesizes information from multiple distinct sources	8	Development
Draws conclusions and personal insights from synthesis	9	Development
Has the minimum number of pages including penalty pages; subject coverage is excellent	10	Development
Provides evidence to support points	14	Development
Clear introduction, body (with sections), and conclusion includes summary and closure	4	Genre
Includes both an abstract and table of contents	5	Genre
Multiple references from distinct reputable sources	1	Source
References cited in the body of the document	2	Source
No use of first- person tense	6	Syntax
No grammatical or spelling errors	7	Syntax
Sentences flow	11	Syntax
Smooth transitions between paragraphs	12	Syntax
Any and all terms and acronyms are defined	13	Syntax

**AAC&U Written Communication Value Rubric**

	<b>Capstone 4</b>	<b>Milestones 3</b>	<b>Milestones 2</b>	<b>Benchmark 1</b>
<b>Context of and Purpose for Writing</b> <i>Includes considerations of audience, purpose, and the circumstances surrounding the writing task(s).</i>	Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.	Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus on the assigned task(s) (e.g., the task aligns with audience, purpose, and context).	Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).	Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).
<b>Content Development</b>	Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work.	Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work.	Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work.	Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work.
<b>Genre and Disciplinary Conventions</b> <i>Formal and informal rules inherent in the expectations for writing in particular forms and/or academic fields (please see glossary).</i>	Demonstrates detailed attention to and successful execution of a wide range of conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task (s) including organization, content, presentation, formatting, and stylistic choices	Demonstrates consistent use of important conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s), including organization, content, presentation, and stylistic choices	Follows expectations appropriate to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) for basic organization, content, and presentation	Attempts to use a consistent system for basic organization and presentation.
<b>Sources and Evidence</b>	Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing	Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are situated within the discipline and genre of the writing.	Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing.	Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the writing.
<b>Control of Syntax and Mechanics</b>	Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free.	Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the portfolio has few errors.	Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors.	Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.

## Assessment Data Mathematical, Information and Computer Sciences

**Learning Outcome:** Students will be able to identify, locate, evaluate, and effectively and responsibly use and cite information for the task at hand (Information Literacy).

**Outcome Measure:** Annual: Each student will be required to write a paper on a topic in their field as a part of their participation in the Senior Seminar. The audience for this talk will include department faculty, fellow students and possibly some alumni. The students will be given the evaluation criteria in advance and their paper will be rated by the faculty using a rubric with a scale of 4 (capstone) to 1 (benchmark) in the following areas:

- References: Multiple references from distinct reputable sources
- Citation: References cited in the body of the document
- Synthesis: Appropriately synthesizes information from multiple distinct sources.

**Criteria for Success:** 80% of the students should have an average score of at least 3 in each of the major areas.

**Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):**

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

### Longitudinal Data:

	Percentage of Students at 2.5 or Higher				
Information Literacy	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
References				95%	100%
Citation				84%	92%
Synthesis				84%	85%
Determine the Extent of Information Needed	100%	62%	78%		
Access the Needed Information	91%	69%	100%		
Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically (carefully explains the reasons for the choice of source) (added 2014-15)			33%		
Use Information Effectively to Accomplish a Specific Purpose	91%	85%	89%		
Access and Use Information Ethically and Legally	91%	77%	100%		

Note that in 2015-16 we returned to gathering information literacy data from our writing rubric. The AAC&U rubric was not working well for our purposes.

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

The students are meeting our expectations. For the first two years we applied the AAC&U rubric to the student's final senior paper to measure their use of information. The quality of the use of information was uneven and we had not made our expectations clear. The students much more clearly understand the expectations regarding information literacy that are embedded in our writing rubric.

**Changes to be Made Based on Data:**

We have tried a variety of approaches, using the AAC&U IL rubric and expanding on that rubric. After looking at the AAC&U results in parallel with the departmental writing rubric, it was clear that the difference in results were insignificant. It is a great deal less work for the department and clearer for the students to simply use the departmental writing rubrics IL components to assess students' IL.

**Rubric**

Next Page

Bibliography and supporting documents	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple references from distinct reputable sources <input type="checkbox"/> References cited in the body of the document	<input type="checkbox"/> Most references from distinct reputable sources <input type="checkbox"/> Some citation of references in the body of the document	<input type="checkbox"/> Some references from reputable sources <input type="checkbox"/> Limited citation of references in the body of the document	<input type="checkbox"/> No bibliography or all references from untrusted sites on the internet <input type="checkbox"/> No citation of references in the body of the document
Organization	<input type="checkbox"/> Conveys a central theme with all ideas connected, arrangement of ideas clearly related to topic <input type="checkbox"/> Clear introduction, body (with sections), and conclusion includes summary and closure <input type="checkbox"/> Includes both an abstract and table of contents	<input type="checkbox"/> Conveys a central idea or topic with some ideas connected to the topic <input type="checkbox"/> Includes introduction, body and conclusion <input type="checkbox"/> Includes abstract and table of contents (one partial and one complete)	<input type="checkbox"/> Attempts to focus on an idea or topic with many ideas not connected to the topic <input type="checkbox"/> Introduction, body, conclusion detectable but not clear <input type="checkbox"/> Includes partial abstract and partial table of contents	<input type="checkbox"/> Has little or no focus on central idea or topic <input type="checkbox"/> Introduction, body or conclusion absent <input type="checkbox"/> No abstract or table of contents
Grammar and spelling	<input type="checkbox"/> No use of first- person tense <input type="checkbox"/> No grammatical or spelling errors	<input type="checkbox"/> Few uses of the first-person tense <input type="checkbox"/> Few grammatical and spelling errors	<input type="checkbox"/> Several uses of the first- person tense <input type="checkbox"/> Some grammatical and spelling errors	<input type="checkbox"/> Written in first-person tense <input type="checkbox"/> Many grammatical and spelling errors
Depth of information	<input type="checkbox"/> Appropriately synthesizes information from multiple distinct sources <input type="checkbox"/> Draws conclusions and personal insights from synthesis <input type="checkbox"/> Has the minimum number of pages including penalty pages; subject coverage is excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Synthesis of information from at least three distinct sources <input type="checkbox"/> At least two personal insights or conclusions stated <input type="checkbox"/> Has the minimum number of pages including penalty pages; subject coverage is good	<input type="checkbox"/> Synthesis of information from at least two distinct sources <input type="checkbox"/> At least one personal insight or conclusion stated <input type="checkbox"/> Has the minimum number of pages including penalty pages; subject coverage is adequate	<input type="checkbox"/> Summary reporting of information without synthesis <input type="checkbox"/> No personal insights <input type="checkbox"/> Does not have the minimum number of pages including penalty pages
Clarity of writing	<input type="checkbox"/> Sentences flow <input type="checkbox"/> Smooth transitions between paragraphs <input type="checkbox"/> Any and all terms and acronyms are defined <input type="checkbox"/> Provides evidence to support points	<input type="checkbox"/> Good sentence structure <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate transitions between paragraphs <input type="checkbox"/> Most terms and acronyms are defined <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks support for some points	<input type="checkbox"/> Occasional poor sentence structure <input type="checkbox"/> Transitions between paragraphs unclear <input type="checkbox"/> Some terms and acronyms are defined <input type="checkbox"/> Provides minimal support for points	<input type="checkbox"/> Frequent poor sentence structure <input type="checkbox"/> Lacked transitions between paragraphs <input type="checkbox"/> Many terms and acronyms are undefined <input type="checkbox"/> Ideas not supported

## Assessment Data Mathematical, Information and Computer Sciences

**Learning Outcome:** Students will be able to understand and create arguments supported by quantitative evidence, and they can clearly communicate those arguments in a variety of formats (Quantitative Reasoning).

**Outcome Measure:** Annual: Each student will participate in the ETS Proficiency Profile exam.

**Criteria for Success:** 90% of the students will be Marginal or Proficient at Level 2. Note that we dropped the criteria of success so that it is possible for the department to pass even if a single student misses the criteria.

**Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):**

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

**Longitudinal Data:**

	Percentage of Students Marginal or Proficient				
	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
ETS Proficiency Profile Level 2 Math	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	91.7%

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

Students are in general meeting our criteria.

**Changes to be Made Based on Data:**

None at this time. We will continue to monitor the results.

**Rubrics**

ETS Proficiency Profile (no rubric involved)