

**Sociology, Social Work, and Family Sciences**  
**PLO Data for Child Development (CDV) – Adult Degree Completion**  
**FA2019-SP2020**

**Learning Outcome PLO 1:**

Identify and describe normative similarities and differences of intellectual, emotional, social and physical theories at each development stage from prenatal through adolescence.

**Outcome Measure:**

CDV4060: ADM Final Project Development Center: Students create a philosophy for an Early Childhood Program explaining why school should exist and describing the teaching styles and/or roles that fit in with their philosophy about children and learning.

**Criteria for Success (if applicable):**

Beginning summer 2018: 80% of students will score a three or higher on each criteria of the four-point AAC&U Critical Thinking Value Rubric (Historical criteria for success: 80% of students will score a three or higher on each criteria of each four-point AAC&U Civic Engagement and Written Communication Value Rubrics used.)

**Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):**

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

**Longitudinal Data:**

Began assessing CDV program with first cohort in Spring 2017.

CDV Program Learning Outcome 1: Percentages of student scores using the Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric.

Critical Thinking Value Rubric (Green highlighted section denotes benchmark was met for that criteria. Pink highlighted section denotes that the benchmark was not met for that criteria.):

| Rubric Criteria       | CDV4060  |    | Mastery  | Proficiency | Developing | Beginning |
|-----------------------|----------|----|----------|-------------|------------|-----------|
|                       | Semester | N  | (4)<br>% | (3)<br>%    | (2)<br>%   | (1)<br>%  |
| Explanation of Issues | SP 2017  | 9  | 13       | 75          | 13         | 0         |
|                       | SU 2018  | 52 | 40       | 42          | 16         | 2         |
|                       | FA 2018  | 70 | 25       | 55          | 16         | 3         |
|                       | SP 2019  | 42 | 28       | 51          | 18         | 3         |
|                       | SU 2019  | 12 | 17       | 57          | 26         | 0         |
|                       | FA 2019  | 31 | 32       | 47          | 21         | 0         |
|                       | SP 2020  | 30 | 18       | 71          | 12         | 0         |
| Evidence              | SP 2017  | 9  | 0        | 88          | 13         | 0         |
|                       | SU 2018  | 52 | 24       | 54          | 22         | 0         |

|                             |         |    |    |    |    |   |
|-----------------------------|---------|----|----|----|----|---|
|                             | FA 2018 | 70 | 21 | 57 | 21 | 1 |
|                             | SP 2019 | 42 | 23 | 56 | 21 | 0 |
|                             | SU 2019 | 12 | 4  | 57 | 35 | 4 |
|                             | FA 2019 | 31 | 23 | 53 | 21 | 3 |
|                             | SP 2020 | 30 | 35 | 35 | 29 | 0 |
| <b>Influence of context</b> | SP 2017 | 9  | 0  | 50 | 50 | 0 |
|                             | SU 2018 | 52 | 12 | 74 | 14 | 0 |
|                             | FA 2018 | 70 | 12 | 61 | 27 | 0 |
|                             | SP 2019 | 42 | 10 | 62 | 28 | 0 |
|                             | SU 2019 | 12 | 4  | 61 | 35 | 0 |
|                             | FA 2019 | 31 | 26 | 45 | 26 | 3 |
|                             | SP 2020 | 30 | 12 | 59 | 29 | 0 |
| <b>Student position</b>     | SP 2017 | 9  | 0  | 38 | 63 | 0 |
|                             | SU 2018 | 52 | 10 | 66 | 24 | 0 |
|                             | FA 2018 | 70 | 10 | 54 | 34 | 1 |
|                             | SP 2019 | 42 | 5  | 64 | 31 | 0 |
|                             | SU 2019 | 12 | 9  | 65 | 26 | 0 |
|                             | FA 2019 | 31 | 29 | 53 | 18 | 0 |
|                             | SP 2020 | 30 | 12 | 65 | 24 | 0 |
| <b>Conclusions/outcomes</b> | SP 2017 | 9  | 0  | 63 | 38 | 0 |
|                             | SU 2018 | 52 | 10 | 68 | 22 | 0 |
|                             | FA 2018 | 70 | 12 | 60 | 28 | 0 |
|                             | SP 2019 | 42 | 3  | 62 | 36 | 0 |
|                             | SU 2019 | 12 | 13 | 57 | 30 | 0 |
|                             | FA 2019 | 31 | 21 | 60 | 16 | 3 |
|                             | SP 2020 | 30 | 12 | 76 | 12 | 0 |

**Civic Engagement Value Rubric (used prior to summer 2018)**

| Rubric Criteria                                | CDV460 Semester | N  | Mastery  | Proficiency | Developing | Beginning |
|--|-----------------|----|----------|-------------|------------|-----------|
|  |                 |    | (4)<br>% | (3)<br>%    | (2)<br>%   | (1)<br>%  |
| <b>Diversity of Communities &amp; Cultures</b> | SU 2017         | 20 | 11       | 61          | 17         | 11        |
|  | FA 2017         | 49 | 14       | 28          | 40         | 19        |
|  | SP 2018         | 16 | 19       | 56          | 25         | 0         |
| <b>Analysis of Knowledge</b>                   | SU 2017         | 20 | 11       | 28          | 44         | 17        |
|  | FA 2017         | 49 | 7        | 33          | 35         | 26        |
|  | SP 2018         | 16 | 6        | 56          | 38         | 0         |
| <b>Civic Identity and Commitment</b>           | SU 2017         | 20 | 11       | 39          | 33         | 17        |
|  | FA 2017         | 49 | 7        | 23          | 42         | 28        |
|  | SP 2018         | 16 | 13       | 69          | 19         | 0         |
| <b>Civic Communication</b>                     |                 |    | NA       | NA          | NA         | NA        |
| <b>Civic Action</b>                            |                 |    | NA       | NA          | NA         | NA        |
| <b>Civic Context/Structure</b>                 |                 |    | NA       | NA          | NA         | NA        |

**Written Communication Value Rubric (used prior to summer 2018)**

| Rubric Criteria      | CDV460 Semester | N | Mastery<br>(4)<br>% | Proficiency<br>(3)<br>% | Developing<br>(2)<br>% | Beginning<br>(1)<br>% |
|----------------------|-----------------|---|---------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Context and purpose  | SP 2017         | 9 | 0                   | 63                      | 38                     | 0                     |
| Content Development  | SP 2017         | 9 | 0                   | 63                      | 38                     | 0                     |
| Genre/Disciplinary   | SP 2017         | 9 | 0                   | 63                      | 38                     | 0                     |
| Sources and Evidence | SP 2017         | 9 | 0                   | 25                      | 75                     | 0                     |
| Syntax and Mechanics | SP 2017         | 9 | 0                   | 50                      | 50                     | 0                     |

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

80.67% reached the benchmark for “explanation of issues”, 69% for “evidence”, 65.3% on “influence of context”, 78% on communication of “student position”, and 79.7% on “conclusion and outcomes”. This improvement shows that alignment of rubric understanding and scaffolding of assignment expectations with faculty was beneficial. An added guest lecture with the Department Chair was incorporated into the course to support students on developing a program philosophy. Rubric and assignment prompt were not changed as suggested in previous assessment notes.

While scores are showing some improvement, the benchmark has not been achieved in all terms or in all areas evaluated by the rubric. The current rubric should be evaluated for clear alignment to the PLO for this assignment.

Note: For 2018-2019 removed Civic Engagement Rubric and Written Communication Value Rubric (used in 2017-2018 assessment) for this assignment and retained the Critical Thinking Value Rubric to better align with the learning outcome for this assignment.

The signature assignment was assessed by the Program Director and the Department Chair.

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

Assessment rubric will be evaluated and necessary adjustments to provide clear alignment of assessment rubric with PLO1. Updates are being made to CDV3010 to scaffold learning and understanding of educational philosophy in child development before students take this course and complete this assignment. Training on curriculum changes will be done with faculty for CDV3010 and CDV4060, by the Department Chair, to provide context and understanding about how assignments are scaffolded for students to meet expectations for PLO1. Assignment grading rubric and prompt for students will be evaluated to clearly communicate goals of the assignment and ensure better alignment with PLO1. Professors will be scaffolded in alignment of rubrics and understanding of how this assignment is evaluated against PLO1. The focus will be clarity of assignment goals and consistent alignment of rubrics throughout the cohorts. This will be done through faculty training.

Rubric Used

**CRITICAL THINKING VALUE RUBRIC**  
*for more information, please contact [value@aacu.org](mailto:value@aacu.org)*



|   | <b>Capstone</b><br>4  | <b>Milestones</b>   |   | <b>Benchmark</b><br>1   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|   |   | 3   | 2   |   |
| <b>Explanation of issues</b>  | Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding.  | Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions.  | Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.                                 | Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description.   |
| <b>Evidence: Selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion</b> | Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly.  | Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning.                      | Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning. | Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/evaluation. Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question.                         |
| <b>Influence of context and assumptions</b>   | Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.   | Identifies own and others' assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.  | Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa).   | Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions). Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position. |
| <b>Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis)</b>                                    | Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) are acknowledged. Others' points of view are synthesized within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis). | Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue. Others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis). | Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue.  | Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious.  |
| <b>Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences)</b>                       | Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical and reflect student's informed   | Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related  | Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired   | Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes  |

|  |  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|
|  | evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order. | outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly. | conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly. | (consequences and implications) are oversimplified. |
|--|--|--|--|---|

**Rubric Used**

**CIVIC ENGAGEMENT VALUE RUBRIC**  
for more information, please contact [value@aacu.org](mailto:value@aacu.org)



|  | <b>Capstone</b><br>4   | <b>Milestones</b>   |  | <b>Benchmark</b><br>1  |
|--|--|---|--|--|
|  |  | 3   | 2  |  |
| <b>Diversity of Communities and Cultures</b> | Demonstrates evidence of adjustment in own attitudes and beliefs because of working within and learning from diversity of communities and cultures. Promotes others' engagement with diversity.  | Reflects on how own attitudes and beliefs are different from those of other cultures and communities. Exhibits curiosity about what can be learned from diversity of communities and cultures.                    | Has awareness that own attitudes and beliefs are different from those of other cultures and communities. Exhibits little curiosity about what can be learned from diversity of communities and cultures. | Expresses attitudes and beliefs as an individual, from a one-sided view. Is indifferent or resistant to what can be learned from diversity of communities and cultures.  |
| <b>Analysis of Knowledge</b>                 | Connects and extends knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.  | Analyzes knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline making relevant connections to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government. | Begins to connect knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.           | Begins to identify knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline that is relevant to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government. |
| <b>Civic Identity and Commitment</b>         | Provides evidence of experience in civic-engagement activities and describes what she/he has learned about her or himself as it relates to a reinforced and clarified sense of civic identity and continued commitment to public action. | Provides evidence of experience in civic-engagement activities and describes what she/he has learned about her or himself as it relates to a growing sense of civic identity and commitment.                      | Evidence suggests involvement in civic-engagement activities is generated from expectations or course requirements rather than from a sense of civic identity.   | Provides little evidence of her/his experience in civic-engagement activities and does not connect experiences to civic identity.  |
| <b>Civic Communication</b>                   | Tailors communication strategies to effectively express, listen, and adapt to others to establish relationships to further civic action.   | Effectively communicates in civic context, showing ability to do all of the following: express, listen, and adapt ideas and messages based on others' perspectives.   | Communicates in civic context, showing ability to do more than one of the following: express, listen, and adapt ideas and messages based on others' perspectives.  | Communicates in civic context, showing ability to do one of the following: express, listen, and adapt ideas and messages based on others' perspectives.  |
| <b>Civic Action and Reflection</b>           | Demonstrates independent experience and shows initiative in team leadership of complex or multiple civic engagement activities, accompanied by reflective insights or analysis about the aims and accomplishments of one's actions.      | Demonstrates independent experience and team leadership of civic action, with reflective insights or analysis about the aims and accomplishments of one's actions.  | Has clearly participated in civically focused actions and begins to reflect or describe how these actions may benefit individual(s) or communities.  | Has experimented with some civic activities but shows little internalized understanding of their aims or effects and little commitment to future action.   |

|                                  |   |   |   |   |
|----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| <b>Civic Contexts/Structures</b> | Demonstrates ability and commitment to collaboratively work across and within community contexts and structures to achieve a civic aim. | Demonstrates ability and commitment to work actively within community contexts and structures to achieve a civic aim. | Demonstrates experience identifying intentional ways to participate in civic contexts and structures. | Experiments with civic contexts and structures, tries out a few to see what fits. |
|----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|

## PLO Data for CDV (ADC) - FA2019-SP2020

### **Learning Outcome PLO 2:**

Evaluate the effects of family systems on the development of children and adolescents.

### **Outcome Measure:**

CDV4085: Article Critique: Students read a current article about any topic in child development of interest a non-professional magazine, newspaper or online. Students write a summary of the article including facts, findings and any opinions/advice of the author. Students give their own opinion based on a thorough, critical analysis of the article. Address the advice given, the opinions and any research given as support for the original article. In their critical evaluation, they must use and cite at least one other article from a professional, peer-edited journal that supports or discredits the article with documented research.

Spring 2017-Summer 2018: CDV 485 Critical Paper: Students read an article about a topic in child development in a non-professional magazine or newspaper, and wrote a summary. They then provided an opinion based on a thorough, critical analysis of the article. [Outcome measured using the AAC&U Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric.]

### **Criteria for Success (if applicable):**

80% of students will score a three or higher on each criteria of the four-point AAC&U Critical Thinking Value Rubric

### **Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):**

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

### **Longitudinal Data:**

Began assessing CDV program with first cohort in Spring 2017.

Program Learning Outcome 2: Percentages of student scores using the Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric:

Critical Thinking Value Rubric (Green highlighted section denotes benchmark was met for that criteria. Pink highlighted section denotes that the benchmark was not met for that criteria.):

| Rubric Criteria       | CDV4085 Semester | N  | Mastery  | Proficiency | Developing | Beginning |
|-----------------------|------------------|----|----------|-------------|------------|-----------|
|                       |                  |    | (4)<br>% | (3)<br>%    | (2)<br>%   | (1)<br>%  |
| Explanation of Issues | SU 2018          | 52 | 13       | 77          | 8          | 2         |
|                       | FA 2018          | 68 | 15       | 65          | 20         | 0         |
|                       | SP 2019          | 42 | 13       | 65          | 18         | 5         |
|                       | SU 2019          | 13 | 23       | 62          | 15         | 0         |
|                       | FA 2019          | 35 | 14       | 70          | 16         | 0         |
|                       | SP 2020          | 11 | 23       | 59          | 18         | 0         |
| Evidence              | SU 2018          | 52 | 15       | 60          | 25         | 0         |
|                       | FA 2018          | 68 | 12       | 68          | 20         | 0         |
|                       | SP 2019          | 42 | 18       | 55          | 23         | 5         |
|                       | SU 2019          | 13 | 19       | 38          | 38         | 4         |
|                       | FA 2019          | 35 | 33       | 53          | 10         | 4         |
|                       | SP 2020          | 11 | 18       | 55          | 18         | 9         |
| Influence of context  | SU 2018          | 52 | 13       | 69          | 19         | 0         |
|                       | FA 2018          | 68 | 20       | 57          | 23         | 0         |
|                       | SP 2019          | 42 | 18       | 63          | 15         | 5         |
|                       | SU 2019          | 13 | 8        | 54          | 35         | 4         |
|                       | FA 2019          | 35 | 13       | 73          | 11         | 3         |
|                       | SP 2020          | 11 | 0        | 64          | 32         | 5         |
| Student position      | SU 2018          | 52 | 8        | 60          | 31         | 0         |
|                       | FA 2018          | 68 | 17       | 51          | 32         | 0         |
|                       | SP 2019          | 42 | 8        | 50          | 35         | 8         |
|                       | SU 2019          | 13 | 15       | 58          | 23         | 4         |
|                       | FA 2019          | 35 | 14       | 70          | 13         | 3         |
|                       | SP 2020          | 11 | 5        | 64          | 23         | 9         |
| Conclusions/outcomes  | SU 2018          | 52 | 8        | 54          | 33         | 0         |
|                       | FA 2018          | 68 | 9        | 40          | 46         | 5         |
|                       | SP 2019          | 42 | 10       | 35          | 43         | 13        |
|                       | SU 2019          | 13 | 8        | 62          | 27         | 4         |
|                       | FA 2019          | 35 | 16       | 63          | 21         | 0         |
|                       | SP 2020          | 11 | 5        | 68          | 18         | 9         |

## Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric:

| Rubric Criteria        | CDV485 Semester | N  | 4            | 3                | 2               | 1              |
|------------------------|-----------------|----|--------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|
|                        |                 |    | Mastery<br>% | Proficiency<br>% | Developing<br>% | Beginning<br>% |
| Ethical Self-Awareness | SP 2017         | 9  | 0            | 67               | 33              | 0              |
|                        | SU 2017         | 20 | 42           | 26               | 26              | 5              |
|                        | FA 2017         | 39 | 41           | 34               | 21              | 3              |
|                        | SP 2018         | 16 | 6            | 81               | 13              | 0              |
|                        | SP 2017         | 9  | 11           | 78               | 11              | 0              |

|  |         |    |    |    |    |    |
|--|---------|----|----|----|----|----|
| <b>Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives</b>            | SU 2017 | 20 | 26 | 53 | 11 | 11 |
|  | FA 2017 | 39 | 34 | 28 | 38 | 0  |
|  | SP 2018 | 16 | 13 | 50 | 38 | 0  |
| <b>Ethical Issue Recognition</b>                               | SP 2017 | 9  | 0  | 67 | 33 | 0  |
|  | SU 2017 | 20 | 21 | 42 | 32 | 5  |
|  | FA 2017 | 39 | 24 | 38 | 38 | 0  |
|  | SP 2018 | 16 | 6  | 69 | 25 | 0  |
| <b>Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts</b>            | SP 2017 | 9  | 0  | 67 | 33 | 0  |
|  | SU 2017 | 20 | 32 | 47 | 11 | 11 |
|  | FA 2017 | 39 | 34 | 41 | 14 | 10 |
|  | SP 2018 | 16 | 6  | 75 | 19 | 0  |
| <b>Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives / Concepts</b> | SP 2017 | 18 | 0  | 56 | 44 | 0  |
|  | SU 2017 | 20 | 17 | 33 | 44 | 6  |
|  | FA 2017 | 39 | 28 | 31 | 34 | 7  |
|  | SP 2018 | 16 | 0  | 44 | 56 | 0  |

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

Overall, the criteria 80% was not achieved for this learning outcome. 83.67% was achieved for explanation of issues, 72% was achieved for evidence, 70.67% was achieved for influence of context, 75.3% was achieved for student position, and 74% was achieved for conclusions/outcomes.

Assignment grading rubric and prompt was evaluated and updated to clearly communicate goals of the assignment and ensure alignment with PLO2 and depth of family systems understanding. An online discussion was not added to the beginning of the course, however in-class activities and explanation of this assignment were added to scaffold students' ability to communicate a family systems understanding in this assignment.

Note: For 2018-2019 removed Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric and replaced with Critical Thinking Value Rubric to better align with the learning outcome for this assignment.

The signature assignment was assessed by the Program Director and the Department Chair.

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

The Program Director and Department Chair will evaluate the new grading rubric for this assignment and ensure that the assessment rubric is also evaluated for clear alignment to the PLO for this assignment.

Additional training will be provided for faculty on the expectations and goals for this assignment along with suggestions on scaffolding understanding for students.

Rubric Used

**CRITICAL THINKING VALUE RUBRIC**  
*for more information, please contact [value@aacu.org](mailto:value@aacu.org)*



|   | <b>Capstone</b><br>4  | <b>Milestones</b>   |   | <b>Benchmark</b><br>1   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|   |   | 3   | 2   |   |
| <b>Explanation of issues</b>  | Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding.  | Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions.  | Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.                                 | Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description.   |
| <b>Evidence: Selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion</b> | Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly.  | Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning.                      | Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning. | Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/evaluation. Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question.                         |
| <b>Influence of context and assumptions</b>   | Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.   | Identifies own and others' assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.  | Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa).   | Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions). Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position. |
| <b>Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis)</b>                                    | Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) are acknowledged. Others' points of view are synthesized within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis). | Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue. Others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis). | Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue.  | Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious.  |
| <b>Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences)</b>                       | Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical and reflect student's informed   | Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related  | Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired   | Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes  |

|  |  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|
|  | evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order. | outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly. | conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly. | (consequences and implications) are oversimplified. |
|--|--|--|--|---|

**Rubric Used**

**ETHICAL REASONING VALUE RUBRIC**  
*for more information, please contact [value@aacu.org](mailto:value@aacu.org)*



|  | <b>Capstone (4)</b>   | <b>Milestones (3)</b>  | <b>Milestones (3)</b>  | <b>Benchmark (1)</b>  |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| <b>Ethical Self-Awareness</b>                                | Student discusses in detail/analyzes both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs and discussion has greater depth and clarity.  | Student discusses in detail/analyzes both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs.  | Student states both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs.  | Student states either their core beliefs or articulates the origins of the core beliefs but not both.   |
| <b>Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts</b> | Student names the theory or theories, can present the gist of said theory or theories, and accurately explains the details of the theory or theories used.  | Student can name the major theory or theories she/he uses, can present the gist of said theory or theories, and attempts to explain the details of the theory or theories used, but has some inaccuracies.                                       | Student can name the major theory she/he uses, and is only able to present the gist of the named theory.   | Student only names the major theory she/he uses.  |
| <b>Ethical Issue Recognition</b>                             | Student can recognize ethical issues when presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context AND can recognize cross-relationships among the issues.   | Student can recognize ethical issues when issues are presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context OR can grasp cross-relationships among the issues.  | Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues and grasp (incompletely) the complexities or interrelationships among the issues.   | Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues but fails to grasp complexity or interrelationships.   |
| <b>Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts</b>          | Student can independently apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, accurately, and is able to consider full implications of the application.   | Student can independently (to a new example) apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, accurately, but does not consider the specific implications of the application.   | Student can apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, independently (to a new example) and the application is inaccurate.  | Student can apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question with support (using examples, in a class, in a group, or a fixed-choice setting) but is unable to apply ethical perspectives/concepts independently (to a new example.). |
| <b>Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts</b> | Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of and can reasonably defend against the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/concepts, and the student's defense is adequate and effective. | Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of, and respond to the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/concepts, but the student's response is inadequate. | Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/concepts but does not respond to them (and ultimately objections, assumptions, and implications are compartmentalized by | Student states a position but cannot state the objections to and assumptions and limitations of the different perspectives/concepts.  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  | student and do not affect student's position.) |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|

### PLO Data for CDV (ADC) - FA2019-SP2020

**Learning Outcome PLO 3:**

Identify and discuss scientific research in understanding different philosophical views of growth and development – both historic and current.

**Outcome Measure:**

CDV3055: Research Paper: A question formulated to address an issue that affects children or families of children with special needs. Students will research and find a minimum of five peer reviewed articles published in the last three years (books can be used as well), then summarize findings and address the question asked – supporting findings with evidence from articles. Students will complete an annotated bibliography of all research materials found.

**Criteria for Success (if applicable):**

80% of students will score a three or higher on each criteria of the four-point AAC&U Information Literacy, Written Communication and Problem Solving Value Rubrics

**Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):**

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

**Longitudinal Data:**

Began assessing CDV program with the first cohort in spring 2017.

Program Learning Outcome 3: Percentages of student scores using the AAC&U Information Literacy, Problem Solving and Written Communication Value Rubric:

Information Literacy Value Rubric (Green highlighted section denotes benchmark was met for that criteria. Pink highlighted section denotes that the benchmark was not met for that criteria.):

| Rubric Criteria                 | CDV3055 Semester | N  | 4         | 3             | 2            | 1           |
|---------------------------------|------------------|----|-----------|---------------|--------------|-------------|
|                                 |                  |    | Mastery % | Proficiency % | Developing % | Beginning % |
| Determine Extent of Information | SP 2017          | 9  | 22        | 56            | 22           | 0           |
|                                 | SU 2017          | 49 | 22        | 37            | 22           | 18          |
|                                 | FA 2017          | 16 | 21        | 57            | 21           | 0           |
|                                 | SP 2018          | 47 | 19        | 26            | 40           | 15          |
|                                 | SU 2018          | 69 | 26        | 58            | 17           | 0           |
|                                 | FA 2018          | 42 | 18        | 53            | 24           | 5           |
|                                 | SP 2019          |    |           |               |              |             |
|                                 | SU 2019          | 35 | 54        | 37            | 9            | 0           |
|                                 | FA 2019          | 9  | 31        | 56            | 13           | 0           |
|                                 | SP 2020          | 10 | 25        | 65            | 10           | 0           |

|                                       |         |    |    |    |    |    |
|---------------------------------------|---------|----|----|----|----|----|
| <b>Access Needed Information</b>      | SP 2017 | 9  | 0  | 67 | 33 | 0  |
|                                       | SU 2017 | 49 | 39 | 41 | 14 | 6  |
|                                       | FA 2017 | 16 | 0  | 79 | 21 | 0  |
|                                       | SP 2018 | 47 | 34 | 51 | 13 | 2  |
|                                       | SU 2018 | 69 | 26 | 59 | 15 | 0  |
|                                       | FA 2018 | 42 | 18 | 50 | 29 | 3  |
|                                       | SP 2019 |    |    |    |    |    |
|                                       | SU 2019 | 35 | 29 | 56 | 15 | 0  |
|                                       | FA 2019 | 9  | 31 | 63 | 0  | 6  |
|                                       | SP 2020 | 10 | 25 | 65 | 5  | 5  |
| <b>Evaluate Information / Sources</b> | SP 2017 | 9  | 11 | 67 | 22 | 0  |
|                                       | SU 2017 | 49 | 24 | 51 | 20 | 4  |
|                                       | FA 2017 | 16 | 0  | 79 | 21 | 0  |
|                                       | SP 2018 | 47 | 28 | 55 | 17 | 0  |
|                                       | SU 2018 | 69 | 27 | 50 | 23 | 0  |
|                                       | FA 2018 | 42 | 16 | 63 | 18 | 3  |
|                                       | SP 2019 |    |    |    |    |    |
|                                       | SU 2019 | 35 | 28 | 56 | 16 | 0  |
|                                       | FA 2019 | 9  | 25 | 63 | 13 | 0  |
|                                       | SP 2020 | 10 | 20 | 75 | 5  | 0  |
| <b>Use Information Effectively</b>    | SP 2017 | 0  | 67 | 33 | 0  | 0  |
|                                       | SU 2017 | 49 | 8  | 47 | 37 | 8  |
|                                       | FA 2017 | 16 | 7  | 57 | 36 | 0  |
|                                       | SP 2018 | 47 | 6  | 49 | 38 | 6  |
|                                       | SU 2018 | 69 | 20 | 50 | 24 | 6  |
|                                       | FA 2018 | 42 | 11 | 63 | 24 | 3  |
|                                       | SP 2019 |    |    |    |    |    |
|                                       | SU 2019 | 35 | 28 | 63 | 9  | 0  |
|                                       | FA 2019 | 9  | 35 | 50 | 13 | 0  |
|                                       | SP 2020 | 10 | 30 | 60 | 10 | 0  |
| <b>Access and Use Information</b>     | SP 2017 | 9  | 11 | 33 | 56 | 0  |
|                                       | SU 2017 | 49 | 0  | 15 | 33 | 52 |
|                                       | FA 2017 | 16 | 0  | 29 | 57 | 14 |
|                                       | SP 2018 | 47 | 2  | 27 | 38 | 33 |
|                                       | SU 2018 | 69 | 5  | 58 | 27 | 11 |
|                                       | FA 2018 | 42 | 3  | 50 | 42 | 5  |
|                                       | SP 2019 |    |    |    |    |    |
|                                       | SU 2019 | 35 | 4  | 75 | 18 | 3  |
|                                       | FA 2019 | 9  | 0  | 75 | 13 | 13 |
|                                       | SP 2020 | 10 | 10 | 75 | 15 | 0  |

**AAC&U Problem Solving Value Rubric** (Green highlighted section denotes benchmark was met for that criteria. Pink highlighted section denotes that the benchmark was not met for that criteria.):

| Rubric Criteria                | CDV3055 Semester | N  | 4         | 3             | 2            | 1           |
|--------------------------------|------------------|----|-----------|---------------|--------------|-------------|
|                                |                  |    | Mastery % | Proficiency % | Developing % | Beginning % |
| Define Problem                 | SU 2017          | 49 | 27        | 29            | 35           | 10          |
|                                | FA 2017          | 16 | 21        | 50            | 29           | 0           |
|                                | SP 2018          | 47 | 19        | 34            | 36           | 11          |
|                                | SU 2018          | 69 | 24        | 58            | 15           | 3           |
|                                | FA 2018          | 42 | 21        | 58            | 18           | 3           |
|                                | SP 2019          |    |           |               |              |             |
|                                | SU 2019          | 35 | 29        | 58            | 13           | 0           |
|                                | FA 2019          | 9  | 6         | 59            | 29           | 6           |
|                                | SP 2020          | 10 | 40        | 30            | 30           | 0           |
| Identify Strategies            | SU 2017          | 49 | 27        | 51            | 16           | 6           |
|                                | FA 2017          | 16 | 0         | 100           | 0            | 0           |
|                                | SP 2018          | 47 | 26        | 49            | 26           | 0           |
|                                | SU 2018          | 69 | 20        | 68            | 11           | 2           |
|                                | FA 2018          | 42 | 24        | 50            | 24           | 3           |
|                                | SP 2019          |    |           |               |              |             |
|                                | SU 2019          | 35 | 28        | 49            | 20           | 3           |
|                                | FA 2019          | 9  | 18        | 71            | 6            | 6           |
|                                | SP 2020          | 10 | 40        | 60            | 0            | 0           |
| Propose Solutions / Hypotheses | SU 2017          | 49 | 14        | 63            | 16           | 6           |
|                                | FA 2017          | 16 | 21        | 57            | 21           | 0           |
|                                | SP 2018          | 47 | 15        | 66            | 13           | 6           |
|                                | SU 2018          | 69 | 17        | 62            | 18           | 3           |
|                                | FA 2018          | 42 | 21        | 50            | 26           | 3           |
|                                | SP 2019          |    |           |               |              |             |
|                                | SU 2019          | 35 | 29        | 49            | 14           | 7           |
|                                | FA 2019          | 9  | 12        | 65            | 18           | 6           |
|                                | SP 2020          | 10 | 30        | 50            | 20           | 0           |
| Evaluate Potential Solutions   | SU 2017          | 49 | 13        | 42            | 25           | 21          |
|                                | FA 2017          | 16 | 0         | 57            | 43           | 0           |
|                                | SP 2018          | 47 | 11        | 54            | 13           | 22          |
|                                | SU 2018          | 69 | 14        | 61            | 23           | 3           |
|                                | FA 2018          | 42 | 16        | 53            | 29           | 3           |
|                                | SP 2019          |    |           |               |              |             |
|                                | SU 2019          | 35 | 17        | 59            | 17           | 6           |
|                                | FA 2019          | 9  | 6         | 59            | 29           | 6           |
|                                | SP 2020          | 10 | 21        | 58            | 21           | 0           |

**AAC&U Written Communication Value Rubric** (Green highlighted section denotes benchmark was met for that criteria. Pink highlighted section denotes that the benchmark was not met for that criteria.):

| Rubric Criteria                    | Semester | N  | 4            | 3                | 2               | 1              |
|------------------------------------|----------|----|--------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|
|                                    |          |    | Mastery<br>% | Proficiency<br>% | Developing<br>% | Beginning<br>% |
| Context and Purpose                | SP 2017  | 9  | 11           | 67               | 22              | 0              |
|                                    | SU 2018  | 69 | 24           | 48               | 24              | 3              |
|                                    | FA 2018  | 42 | 11           | 63               | 24              | 3              |
|                                    | SP 2019  |    |              |                  |                 |                |
|                                    | SU 2019  | 35 | 12           | 64               | 23              | 1              |
|                                    | FA 2019  | 9  | 6            | 65               | 24              | 6              |
|                                    | SP 2020  | 10 | 25           | 40               | 35              | 0              |
| Content Development                | SP 2017  | 9  | 11           | 33               | 56              | 0              |
|                                    | SU 2018  | 69 | 20           | 56               | 20              | 5              |
|                                    | FA 2018  | 42 | 11           | 63               | 24              | 3              |
|                                    | SP 2019  |    |              |                  |                 |                |
|                                    | SU 2019  | 35 | 13           | 68               | 17              | 1              |
|                                    | FA 2019  | 9  | 12           | 71               | 0               | 18             |
|                                    | SP 2020  | 10 | 30           | 45               | 20              | 5              |
| Genre and Disciplinary Conventions | SP 2017  | 9  | 0            | 56               | 44              | 0              |
|                                    | SU 2018  | 69 | 9            | 58               | 24              | 9              |
|                                    | FA 2018  | 42 | 3            | 58               | 34              | 5              |
|                                    | SP 2019  |    |              |                  |                 |                |
|                                    | SU 2019  | 35 | 4            | 75               | 17              | 3              |
|                                    | FA 2019  | 9  | 0            | 76               | 18              | 6              |
|                                    | SP 2020  | 10 | 20           | 55               | 20              | 5              |
| Sources and Evidence               | SP 2017  | 9  | 0            | 56               | 44              | 0              |
|                                    | SU 2018  | 69 | 11           | 64               | 23              | 3              |
|                                    | FA 2018  | 42 | 8            | 61               | 29              | 3              |
|                                    | SP 2019  |    |              |                  |                 |                |
|                                    | SU 2019  | 35 | 25           | 67               | 9               | 0              |
|                                    | FA 2019  | 9  | 29           | 59               | 12              | 0              |
|                                    | SP 2020  | 10 | 20           | 70               | 0               | 10             |
| Control of Syntax/Mechanics        | SP 2017  | 9  | 11           | 78               | 11              | 0              |
|                                    | SU 2018  | 69 | 15           | 59               | 21              | 5              |
|                                    | FA 2018  | 42 | 3            | 74               | 21              | 3              |
|                                    | SP 2019  |    |              |                  |                 |                |
|                                    | SU 2019  | 35 | 7            | 74               | 17              | 1              |
|                                    | FA 2019  | 9  | 6            | 71               | 24              | 0              |
|                                    | SP 2020  | 10 | 20           | 50               | 30              | 0              |

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

Overall, the criteria 80% was achieved and exceeded for this learning outcome using the Informational Literacy Value Rubric. 89% was achieved for determining the extent of information, 89.67% was achieved for accessing needed information, 89% was achieved for evaluating information/sources, 88.67% was achieved for effective use of information, and 79.67% was achieved for access and use of information.

Not all measures were met the criteria on the Problem Solving Value Rubric. 74% was achieved for defining the problem, 88.67% was achieved for identifying strategies, 78.33% was achieved for proposing solutions/hypotheses, and 73.33% was achieved for evaluating potential solutions.

The AAC&U Written Communication Value Rubric was also used on this assignment to evaluate upper division writing level for these students (It was not removed as previously stated in the 2018-2019 reporting cycle). See ETS Proficiency Profile scores and reports.

Students were provided exemplar examples of assignments, faculty was scaffolded on alignment of rubrics. Increase in scores and success may be attributed to the WRT3001, upper division writing course that was added to the program. This is the first full group of student assignments to be assessed after having completed the new writing course in the beginning of the program.

Missing data for SP2019 is due to a transition from LiveText to Portfolium for assessment collection and reporting. Some files were not able to be retrieved to provide data for this time frame.

Note: Written Communication Value Rubric should have been removed in the 2018-2019 assessment cycle but was not and data was still collected through this SP2020.

The signature assignment was assessed by the Program Director and the Department Chair.

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

The number of criteria added to this assessment was burdensome and not necessary for the evaluation of PLO3. The Program Director and Department Chair will work together to evaluate and update the assessment rubrics to make sure they still meet the criteria for PLO3. Updated resources from the Ryan Library are being added to the course along with a recorded video from the Librarian about the resources and available to students as they complete this research assignment.

Professors will be scaffolded in alignment of rubrics and understanding of how this assignment is evaluated against PLO3. The focus will be depth of research and understanding of different philosophical viewpoints of growth and development, clarity of assignment goals and consistent alignment of rubrics throughout the cohorts. This will be done through faculty training and the addition of library resources to this course and assignment.

While overall improvement and success was shown, the current rubric should be evaluated for clear alignment to the PLO for this assignment and a reduction of assessment criteria.

Rubric Used

**INFORMATION LITERACY VALUE RUBRIC**

for more information, please contact [value@aacu.org](mailto:value@aacu.org)



|   | <b>Capstone (4)</b>   | <b>Milestones (3)</b>   | <b>Milestones (2)</b>   | <b>Benchmark (1)</b>   |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| <b>Determine the Extent of Information Needed</b>   | Effectively defines the scope of the research question or thesis. Effectively determines key concepts. Types of information (sources) selected directly relate to concepts or answer research question.   | Defines the scope of the research question or thesis completely. Can determine key concepts. Types of information (sources) selected relate to concepts or answer research question.                                      | Defines the scope of the research question or thesis incompletely (parts are missing, remains too broad or too narrow, etc.). Can determine key concepts. Types of information (sources) selected partially relate to concepts or answer research question. | Has difficulty defining the scope of the research question or thesis. Has difficulty determining key concepts. Types of information (sources) selected do not relate to concepts or answer research question.  |
| <b>Access the Needed Information</b>  | Accesses information using effective, well-designed search strategies and most appropriate information sources.   | Accesses information using variety of search strategies and some relevant information sources. Demonstrates ability to refine search.   | Accesses information using simple search strategies, retrieves information from limited and similar sources.  | Accesses information randomly, retrieves information that lacks relevance and quality.   |
| <b>Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically*</b><br><br>*Corrected Dimension 3: Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically in July 2013 | Chooses a variety of information sources appropriate to the scope and discipline of the research question. Selects sources after considering the importance (to the researched topic) of the multiple criteria used (such as relevance to the research question, currency, authority, audience, and bias or point of view.) | Chooses a variety of information sources appropriate to the scope and discipline of the research question. Selects sources using multiple criteria (such as relevance to the research question, currency, and authority.) | Chooses a variety of information sources. Selects sources using basic criteria (such as relevance to the research question and currency.)   | Chooses a few information sources. Selects sources using limited criteria (such as relevance to the research question.)  |
| <b>Use Information Effectively to Accomplish a Specific Purpose</b>   | Communicates, organizes and synthesizes information from sources to fully achieve a specific purpose, with clarity and depth  | Communicates, organizes and synthesizes information from sources. Intended purpose is achieved.   | Communicates and organizes information from sources. The information is not yet synthesized, so the intended purpose is not fully achieved.   | Communicates information from sources. The information is fragmented and/or used inappropriately (misquoted, taken out of context, or incorrectly paraphrased, etc.), so the intended purpose is not achieved. |

|   |  |   |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| <p><b>Access and Use Information Ethically and Legally*</b></p> | <p>Students use correctly all of the following information use strategies (use of citations and references; choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; using information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution) and demonstrate a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.</p> | <p>Students use correctly three of the following information use strategies (use of citations and references; choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; using information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution) and demonstrates a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.</p> | <p>Students use correctly two of the following information use strategies (use of citations and references; choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; using information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution) and demonstrates a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.</p> | <p>Students use correctly one of the following information use strategies (use of citations and references; choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; using information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution) and demonstrates a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.</p> |
|---|--|---|---|---|

**Rubric Used**

**Problem Solving VALUE RUBRIC**

for more information, please contact [value@aacu.org](mailto:value@aacu.org)



|                                     | <b>Capstone (4)</b>  | <b>Milestones (3)</b>   | <b>Milestones (3)</b>  | <b>Benchmark (1)</b>  |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| <b>Define Problem</b>               | Demonstrates the ability to construct a clear and insightful problem statement with evidence of all relevant contextual factors.   | Demonstrates the ability to construct a problem statement with evidence of most relevant contextual factors, and problem statement is adequately detailed.  | Begins to demonstrate the ability to construct a problem statement with evidence of most relevant contextual factors, but problem statement is superficial.  | Demonstrates a limited ability in identifying a problem statement or related contextual factors   |
| <b>Identify Strategies</b>          | Identifies multiple approaches for solving the problem that apply within a specific context.   | Identifies multiple approaches for solving the problem, only some of which apply within a specific context.   | Identifies only a single approach for solving the problem that does apply within a specific context.   | Identifies one or more approaches for solving the problem that do not apply within a specific context.  |
| <b>Propose Solutions/Hypotheses</b> | Proposes one or more solutions/hypotheses that indicates a deep comprehension of the problem. Solution/hypotheses are sensitive to contextual factors as well as all of the following: ethical, logical, and cultural dimensions of the problem. | Proposes one or more solutions/hypotheses that indicates comprehension of the problem. Solutions/hypotheses are sensitive to contextual factors as well as the one of the following: ethical, logical, or cultural dimensions of the problem. | Proposes one solution/hypothesis that is “off the shelf” rather than individually designed to address the specific contextual factors of the problem.  | Proposes a solution/hypothesis that is difficult to evaluate because it is vague or only indirectly addresses the problem statement.  |
| <b>Evaluate Potential Solutions</b> | Evaluation of solutions is deep and elegant (for example, contains thorough and insightful explanation) and includes, deeply and thoroughly, all of the following: considers history of problem, reviews logic/reasoning, examines               | Evaluation of solutions is adequate (for example, contains thorough explanation) and includes the following: considers history of problem, reviews logic/reasoning, examines feasibility of solution, and weighs impacts of solution.         | Evaluation of solutions is brief (for example, explanation lacks depth) and includes the following: considers history of problem, reviews logic/reasoning, examines feasibility of solution, and weighs impacts of solution. | Evaluation of solutions is superficial (for example, contains cursory, surface level explanation) and includes the following: considers history of problem, reviews logic/reasoning, examines feasibility of solution, and weighs impacts of solution |

|                           |  |  |   |  |
|---------------------------|--|--|---|--|
|                           | feasibility of solution, and weighs impacts of solution.   |  |   |  |
| <b>Implement Solution</b> | Implements the solution in a manner that addresses thoroughly and deeply multiple contextual factors of the problem. | Implements the solution in a manner that addresses multiple contextual factors of the problem in a surface manner. | Implements the solution in a manner that addresses the problem statement but ignores relevant contextual factors. | Implements the solution in a manner that does not directly address the problem statement.                    |
| <b>Evaluate Outcomes</b>  | Reviews results relative to the problem defined with thorough, specific considerations of need for further work.     | Reviews results relative to the problem defined with some consideration of need for further work.                  | Reviews results in terms of the problem defined with little, if any, consideration of need for further work.      | Reviews results superficially in terms of the problem defined with no consideration of need for further work |

**Rubric Used**

**WRITTEN COMMUNICATION VALUE RUBRIC**

*for more information, please contact [value@aacu.org](mailto:value@aacu.org)*



**Definition:** Written communication is the development and expression of ideas in writing. Written communication involves learning to work in many genres and styles. It can involve working with many different writing technologies, and mixing texts, data, and images. Written communication abilities develop through iterative experiences across the curriculum.

*Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.*

|  | <b>Capstone<br/>4</b>   | <b>Milestones</b>   |  | <b>Benchmark<br/>1</b>  |
|--|---|---|--|---|
|  |   | 3   | 2  |   |
| <b>Context of and Purpose for Writing</b><br><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><br><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. |
|--|---|--|---|--|

### PLO Data for CDV (ADC) - FA2019-SP2020

#### **Learning Outcome PLO 4:**

Assess research of theoretical and appropriate practical elements of parenting to facilitate discussions for a healthy environment for children and adolescents.

#### **Outcome Measure:**

CDV3055: Research Paper: A question formulated to address an issue that affects children or families of children with special needs. Students will research and find a minimum of five peer reviewed articles published in the last three years (books can be used as well), then summarize findings and address the question asked – supporting findings with evidence from articles. Students will complete an annotated bibliography of all research materials found.

Spring 2017-Spring 2018: CDV485: Media Project (part 2): Students will choose a book or movie that influenced (positively or negatively) the way they view(ed) gender, race, religion, etc. and write a 2-3 page paper delineating how exactly that media did so.

#### **Criteria for Success (if applicable):**

80% of students will score a three or higher on each criteria of the four-point AAC&U Critical Thinking Value Rubric.

#### **Longitudinal Data:**

Began assessing CDV program 2017. Cohort 1 was assessed in Spring 2017.

Program Learning Outcome 4: Percentages of student scores using the Critical Thinking AAC&U Value Rubric:

Critical Thinking Value Rubric (Green highlighted section denotes benchmark was met for that criteria. Pink highlighted section denotes that the benchmark was not met for that criteria.):

| Rubric Criteria              | Course          | Semester | N       | 4         | 3             | 2            | 1           |   |
|------------------------------|-----------------|----------|---------|-----------|---------------|--------------|-------------|---|
|                              |                 |          |         | Mastery % | Proficiency % | Developing % | Beginning % |   |
| <b>Explanation of Issues</b> | CDV485          | SP 2017  | 9       | 0         | 78            | 22           | 0           |   |
|                              | CDV485          | SU 2017  | 20      | 53        | 47            | 0            | 0           |   |
|                              | CDV485          | FA 2017  | 39      | 61        | 23            | 16           | 0           |   |
|                              | CDV485          | SP 2018  | 16      | 25        | 63            | 13           | 0           |   |
|                              | CDV355          | SU 2018  | 69      | 27        | 56            | 15           | 2           |   |
|                              | CDV355          | FA 2018  | 42      | 21        | 66            | 11           | 3           |   |
|                              | CDV355          | SP 2019  |         |           |               |              |             |   |
|                              | CDV3055         | SU 2019  | 35      | 19        | 61            | 20           | 0           |   |
|                              | CDV3055         | FA 2019  | 9       | 0         | 76            | 24           | 0           |   |
|                              | CDV3055         | SP 2020  | 10      | 20        | 65            | 15           | 0           |   |
|                              | <b>Evidence</b> | CDV485   | SP 2017 | 9         | 33            | 33           | 33          | 0 |
|                              |                 | CDV485   | SU 2017 | 20        | 47            | 42           | 11          | 0 |
| CDV485                       |                 | FA 2017  | 39      | 48        | 39            | 10           | 3           |   |
| CDV485                       |                 | SP 2018  | 16      | 25        | 44            | 31           | 0           |   |

|   |         |         |    |    |    |    |    |
|---|---------|---------|----|----|----|----|----|
|   | CDV355  | SU 2018 | 69 | 17 | 55 | 24 | 5  |
|   | CDV355  | FA 2018 | 42 | 8  | 58 | 32 | 3  |
|   | CDV355  | SP 2019 |    |    |    |    |    |
|   | CDV3055 | SU 2019 | 35 | 19 | 67 | 14 | 0  |
|   | CDV3055 | FA 2019 | 9  | 12 | 59 | 29 | 0  |
|   | CDV3055 | SP 2020 | 10 | 20 | 65 | 10 | 5  |
| <b>Influence of context and assumptions</b> | CDV485  | SP 2017 | 9  | 11 | 78 | 11 | 0  |
|   | CDV485  | SU 2017 | 20 | 47 | 42 | 11 | 0  |
|   | CDV485  | FA 2017 | 39 | 52 | 23 | 26 | 0  |
|   | CDV485  | SP 2018 | 16 | 25 | 50 | 25 | 0  |
|   | CDV355  | SU 2018 | 69 | 18 | 50 | 24 | 8  |
|   | CDV355  | FA 2018 | 42 | 8  | 53 | 37 | 3  |
|   | CDV355  | SP 2019 |    |    |    |    |    |
|   | CDV3055 | SU 2019 | 35 | 22 | 67 | 9  | 3  |
|   | CDV3055 | FA 2019 | 9  | 6  | 41 | 53 | 0  |
|   | CDV3055 | SP 2020 | 10 | 20 | 65 | 10 | 5  |
| <b>Student position</b>                     | CDV485  | SP 2017 | 9  | 22 | 67 | 11 | 0  |
|   | CDV485  | SU 2017 | 20 | 42 | 42 | 16 | 0  |
|   | CDV485  | FA 2017 | 39 | 45 | 26 | 26 | 3  |
|   | CDV485  | SP 2018 | 16 | 19 | 75 | 6  | 0  |
|   | CDV355  | SU 2018 | 69 | 11 | 68 | 15 | 6  |
|   | CDV355  | FA 2018 | 41 | 8  | 63 | 24 | 5  |
|   | CDV355  | SP 2019 |    |    |    |    |    |
|   | CDV3055 | SU 2019 | 35 | 19 | 70 | 7  | 4  |
|   | CDV3055 | FA 2019 | 9  | 24 | 53 | 24 | 0  |
|   | CDV3055 | SP 2020 | 10 | 30 | 60 | 0  | 10 |

**Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric:**

| Rubric Criteria           | CDV485 Semester | N | 4         | 3             | 2            | 1           |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-----------|---------------|--------------|-------------|
|                           |                 |   | Mastery % | Proficiency % | Developing % | Beginning % |
| Ethical Self-Awareness    | SP 2017         | 9 | 0         | 89            | 11           | 0           |
| Understanding Different   | SP 2017         | 9 | 0         | 56            | 44           | 0           |
| Ethical Issue Recognition | SP 2017         | 9 | 0         | 89            | 11           | 0           |
| Application of Ethical    | SP 2017         | 9 | 0         | 67            | 33           | 0           |
| Evaluation of Ethical ... | SP 2017         | 9 | 0         | 89            | 11           | 0           |

**Intercultural Knowledge and Competence Value Rubric:**

| Rubric Criteria         | CDV485 Semester | N | 4         | 3             | 2            | 1           |
|-------------------------|-----------------|---|-----------|---------------|--------------|-------------|
|                         |                 |   | Mastery % | Proficiency % | Developing % | Beginning % |
| Cultural Self-Awareness | SP 2017         | 9 | 11        | 67            | 22           | 0           |
| Worldview Framework     | SP 2017         | 9 | 0         | 78            | 22           | 0           |
| Empathy                 | SP 2017         | 9 | 0         | 44            | 56           | 0           |

|                       |         |   |   |    |    |   |
|-----------------------|---------|---|---|----|----|---|
| Verbal/NonVerbal Comm | SP 2017 | 9 | 0 | 67 | 33 | 0 |
| Curiosity             | SP 2017 | 9 | 0 | 56 | 44 | 0 |
| Openness              | SP 2017 | 9 | 0 | 67 | 33 | 0 |

**Global Learning Value Rubric:**

| Rubric Criteria           | CDV485 Semester | N | 4         | 3             | 2            | 1           |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---|-----------|---------------|--------------|-------------|
|                           |                 |   | Mastery % | Proficiency % | Developing % | Beginning % |
| Global Self-Awareness     | SP 2017         | 9 | 0         | 78            | 22           | 0           |
| Perspective Taking        | SP 2017         | 9 | 0         | 56            | 44           | 0           |
| Cultural Diversity        | SP 2017         | 9 | 0         | 22            | 78           | 0           |
| Personal/Social Respon... | SP 2017         | 9 | 0         | 56            | 44           | 0           |
| Understanding Global      | SP 2017         | 9 | 11        | 33            | 56           | 0           |
| Applying Knowledge        | SP 2017         | 9 | 11        | 67            | 22           | 0           |

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

Overall, the criteria 80% or higher for success was achieved for three areas of the rubric showing an improvement over the previous year's assessment. 80.33% was achieved for explanation of the issues, 80.67% was achieved for evidence, 73.67% was achieved for influence of context and assumptions, and 85.67% was achieved for student position.

A new assignment was not chosen as suggested in the previous assessment cycle. Additional review needs to be done on assignments for this PLO and an updated plan created for training faculty on alignment of assignment expectations to the PLO.

Missing data for SP2019 is due to a transition from LiveText to Portfolium for assessment collection and reporting. Some files were not able to be retrieved to provide data for this time frame.

The signature assignment was assessed by the Program Director and the Department Chair.

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

Review of the assignment choice and alignment for PLO4 will be done and a different assignment will be chosen. An assignment from CDV4085 (potentially the Final Essay or Media Project 2) will be chosen for assessment of this PLO, beginning in SP21. CDV4085 course content better aligns with student learning of practical elements of parenting and healthy environments for children and adolescents (PLO4). Assignment grading rubric and prompt for students will be evaluated to clearly communicate goals of the assignment and ensure alignment with PLO4. Exemplar examples of assignment will be added into the assignment prompt and faculty resources.

Professors will be scaffolded in alignment of rubrics and understanding of how this assignment is evaluated against PLO4. The focus will be communication of practical elements of parenting and healthy environments for children and adolescents, clarity of assignment goals and consistent alignment of rubrics throughout the cohorts. This will be done through faculty training and student assignment clearly aligned to the PLO.

The current rubric should also be evaluated for clear alignment to the PLO for this assignment.

Rubric Used

**CRITICAL THINKING VALUE RUBRIC**  
*for more information, please contact [value@aacu.org](mailto:value@aacu.org)*



|   | <b>Capstone</b><br>4  | <b>Milestones</b>   |   | <b>Benchmark</b><br>1   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|   |   | 3   | 2   |   |
| <b>Explanation of issues</b>  | Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding.  | Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions.  | Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.                                 | Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description.   |
| <b>Evidence: Selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion</b> | Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly.  | Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning.                      | Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning. | Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/evaluation. Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question.                         |
| <b>Influence of context and assumptions</b>   | Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.   | Identifies own and others' assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.  | Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa).   | Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions). Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position. |
| <b>Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis)</b>                                    | Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) are acknowledged. Others' points of view are synthesized within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis). | Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue. Others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis). | Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue.  | Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious.  |
| <b>Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences)</b>                       | Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical and reflect student's informed evaluation and ability to place evidence  | Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and   | Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); some related   | Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes  |

|  |   |                                       |  |   |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|---|
|  | and perspectives discussed in priority order. | implications) are identified clearly. | outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly. | (consequences and implications) are oversimplified. |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|---|

## PLO Data for CDV (ADC) - FA2019-SP2020

### **Learning Outcome PLO 5:**

Evaluate the effects of society and culture upon the family microsystems, family types and the subsequent macrosystems with which they co-exist.

### **Outcome Measure:**

CDV4085 (formerly CDV485): Media Project (part 2): Students will choose a book or movie that influenced (positively or negatively) the way they view(ed) gender, race, religion, etc. and write a 2-3 page paper delineating how exactly that media did so.

Spring 2017 - CDV485: Agency Visit Report: Students will find two advertisements in a magazine, commercial, etc. that depicts children and /or families in a stereotypical or biased way, and two advertisements that are aimed at children, then will discuss all four articles in class. Media Paper: Students will then choose a book or movie that influenced (positively or negatively) the way they view(ed) gender, race, religion, etc. and write a 1 to 2-page paper delineating how exactly that media did so.

### **Criteria for Success (if applicable):**

80% of students will score a three or higher on each criteria of the four-point AAC&U Critical Thinking Value Rubric

### **Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):**

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

### **Longitudinal Data:**

Began assessing CDV program 2017.

Program Learning Outcome 5: percentages of student scores using the **Critical Thinking Value Rubric:**

Critical Thinking Value Rubric (Green highlighted section denotes benchmark was met for that criteria. Pink highlighted section denotes that the benchmark was not met for that criteria.):

| Rubric Criteria       | CDV4085        |           | 4         | 3             | 2            | 1           |
|-----------------------|----------------|-----------|-----------|---------------|--------------|-------------|
|                       | Semester       | N         | Mastery % | Proficiency % | Developing % | Beginning % |
| Explanation of Issues | SU 2017        | 20        | 11        | 61            | 17           | 11          |
|                       | FA 2017        | 41        | 69        | 22            | 6            | 3           |
|                       | SP 2018        | 16        | 19        | 63            | 19           | 0           |
|                       | SU 2018        | 52        | 33        | 52            | 15           | 0           |
|                       | FA 2018        | 68        | 15        | 62            | 23           | 0           |
|                       | SP 2019        | 42        | 15        | 54            | 24           | 7           |
|                       | SU 2019        | 13        | 50        | 46            | 4            | 0           |
|                       | FA 2019        | 35        | 36        | 61            | 3            | 0           |
|                       | SP 2020        | 11        | 14        | 86            | 0            | 0           |
| Evidence              | <b>SU 2017</b> | <b>20</b> | <b>17</b> | <b>50</b>     | <b>33</b>    | <b>0</b>    |
|                       | FA 2017        | 41        | 41        | 34            | 22           | 3           |
|                       | SP 2018        | 16        | 0         | 63            | 38           | 0           |
|                       | SU 2018        | 52        | 21        | 58            | 19           | 2           |
|                       | FA 2018        | 68        | 13        | 56            | 31           | 0           |
|                       | SP 2019        | 42        | 17        | 59            | 20           | 5           |
|                       | SU 2019        | 13        | 21        | 71            | 8            | 0           |
|                       | FA 2019        | 35        | 32        | 59            | 9            | 0           |
|                       | SP 2020        | 11        | 14        | 55            | 27           | 5           |
| Influence of context  | SU 2017        | 20        | 11        | 44            | 44           | 0           |
|                       | FA 2017        | 41        | 59        | 25            | 13           | 3           |
|                       | SP 2018        | 16        | 0         | 69            | 25           | 6           |
|                       | SU 2018        | 52        | 21        | 60            | 19           | 0           |
|                       | FA 2018        | 68        | 15        | 49            | 34           | 2           |
|                       | SP 2019        | 42        | 29        | 29            | 37           | 5           |
|                       | SU 2019        | 13        | 17        | 75            | 8            | 0           |
|                       | FA 2019        | 35        | 35        | 59            | 6            | 0           |
|                       | SP 2020        | 11        | 18        | 77            | 5            | 0           |
| Student position      | NA             | NA        | NA        | NA            | NA           | NA          |
| Conclusions/Outcomes  | NA             | NA        | NA        | NA            | NA           | NA          |

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

Overall, the criteria 80% or higher for success was achieved and exceeded. 97.67% was achieved for explanation of the issues, 84% was achieved for evidence, and 93.67% was achieved for influence of context.

This was a significant improvement from the previous year's assessment. Exemplar examples were not added to this assignment, however alignment of rubric and prompt was ensured, faculty training was conducted, and additional student scaffolding took place through the Media Project 1 (discussion) and the explanation of how this assignment aligns with PLO5.

The signature assignment was assessed by the Program Director and the Department Chair.

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

Changes made for this assessment cycle will be maintained in the on-going courses. Faculty reminders will be made on the expectations of this assignment and its connection to PLO5. The Program Director and Department Chair will evaluate the assessment rubric to confirm it is the best for evaluating PLO5.

Rubric Used

**CRITICAL THINKING VALUE RUBRIC**  
*for more information, please contact [value@aacu.org](mailto:value@aacu.org)*



|   | <b>Capstone</b><br>4  | <b>Milestones</b>   |   | <b>Benchmark</b><br>1   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|   |   | 3   | 2   |   |
| <b>Explanation of issues</b>  | Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding.  | Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions.  | Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.                                 | Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description.   |
| <b>Evidence: Selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion</b> | Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly.  | Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning.                      | Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning. | Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/evaluation. Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question.                         |
| <b>Influence of context and assumptions</b>   | Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.   | Identifies own and others' assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.  | Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa).   | Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions). Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position. |
| <b>Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis)</b>                                    | Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) are acknowledged. Others' points of view are synthesized within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis). | Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue. Others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis). | Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue.  | Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious.  |
| <b>Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences)</b>                       | Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical and reflect student's informed   | Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related  | Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired   | Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes  |

|  |  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|
|  | evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order. | outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly. | conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly. | (consequences and implications) are oversimplified. |
|--|--|--|--|---|

### PLO Data for CDV (ADC) - FA2019-SP2020

**Learning Outcome PLO 6:**

Develop and articulate professional philosophy, personal code of ethics and professional areas of service within the child and adolescent profession.

**Outcome Measure:**

CDV4095: Preparation of professional statements and portfolio. Students will write and present their portfolios including: Professional Philosophy.

**NOTE:** Students are expected to master articulation of content in a professional voice through both written communication and oral presentation.

**Criteria for Success (if applicable):**

80% of students will score a three or higher on each criteria of a four-point AAC&U Written Communication and Oral Communication Value Rubrics

**Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):**

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

**Longitudinal Data:**

Began assessing CDV program 2017 using both the AAC&U Written Communication and Oral Communications Value Rubrics.

AAC&U Written Communication Value Rubric (Green highlighted section denotes benchmark was met for that criteria. Pink highlighted section denotes that the benchmark was not met for that criteria.):

| Rubric Criteria     | Course  | Semester | N  | 4         | 3             | 2            | 1           |
|---------------------|---------|----------|----|-----------|---------------|--------------|-------------|
|                     |         |          |    | Mastery % | Proficiency % | Developing % | Beginning % |
| Context and Purpose | CDV495  | SP 2017  | 7  | 29        | 57            | 14           | 0           |
|                     | CDV495  | SU 2017  | 8  | 25        | 38            | 38           | 0           |
|                     | CDV495  | FA 2017  | 44 | 36        | 36            | 25           | 2           |
|                     | CDV495  | SP 2018  | 15 | 20        | 60            | 20           | 0           |
|                     | CDV495  | SU 2018  | 48 | 23        | 60            | 17           | 0           |
|                     | CDV495  | FA 2018  | 67 | 18        | 57            | 25           | 0           |
|                     | CDV495  | SP 2019  | 39 | 26        | 56            | 18           | 0           |
|                     | CDV4095 | SU 2019  |    |           |               |              |             |
|                     | CDV4095 | FA 2019  | 35 | 76        | 18            | 6            | 0           |
|                     | CDV4095 | SP 2020  | 10 | 80        | 20            | 0            | 0           |
| Content Development | CDV495  | SP 2017  | 7  | 14        | 57            | 29           | 0           |
|                     | CDV495  | SU 2017  | 8  | 25        | 25            | 25           | 25          |

|   |         |         |    |    |    |    |   |
|---|---------|---------|----|----|----|----|---|
|   | CDV495  | FA 2017 | 44 | 23 | 41 | 36 | 0 |
|   | CDV495  | SP 2018 | 15 | 13 | 40 | 47 | 0 |
|   | CDV495  | SU 2018 | 48 | 27 | 60 | 13 | 0 |
|   | CDV495  | FA 2018 | 67 | 31 | 49 | 19 | 0 |
|   | CDV495  | SP 2019 | 39 | 33 | 46 | 21 | 0 |
|   | CDV4095 | SU 2019 |    |    |    |    |   |
|   | CDV4095 | FA 2019 | 35 | 59 | 26 | 15 | 0 |
|   | CDV4095 | SP 2020 | 10 | 60 | 30 | 10 | 0 |
| <b>Genre and Disciplinary Conventions</b> | CDV495  | SP 2017 | 7  | 0  | 57 | 43 | 0 |
|   | CDV495  | SU 2018 | 48 | 8  | 73 | 19 | 0 |
|   | CDV4095 | SU 2019 |    |    |    |    |   |
|   | CDV4095 | FA 2019 | 35 | 68 | 29 | 3  | 0 |
|   | CDV4095 | SP 2020 | 10 | 50 | 50 | 0  | 0 |
| <b>Sources and Evidence</b>               | CDV495  | SP 2017 | 7  | 14 | 86 | 0  | 0 |
|   | CDV495  | SU 2018 | 48 | 6  | 75 | 19 | 0 |
|   | CDV4095 | SU 2019 |    |    |    |    |   |
|   | CDV4095 | FA 2019 | 35 | 71 | 24 | 6  | 0 |
|   | CDV4095 | SP 2020 | 10 | 80 | 20 | 0  | 0 |
| <b>Control of Syntax and Mechanics</b>    | CDV495  | SP 2017 | 7  | 14 | 43 | 43 | 0 |
|   | CDV495  | SU 2017 | 8  | 13 | 50 | 38 | 0 |
|   | CDV495  | FA 2017 | 44 | 14 | 47 | 40 | 0 |
|   | CDV495  | SP 2018 | 15 | 6  | 73 | 20 | 0 |
|   | CDV495  | SU 2018 | 48 | 21 | 69 | 10 | 0 |
|   | CDV495  | FA 2018 | 67 | 27 | 54 | 15 | 4 |
|   | CDV495  | SP 2019 | 39 | 28 | 64 | 8  | 0 |
|   | CDV4095 | SU 2019 |    |    |    |    |   |
|   | CDV4095 | FA 2019 | 35 | 53 | 41 | 6  | 0 |
|   | CDV4095 | SP 2020 | 10 | 40 | 60 | 0  | 0 |

**Oral Communication Value Rubric:**

| Rubric Criteria     | Course  | Semester | N  | 4         | 3             | 2            | 1           |
|---------------------|---------|----------|----|-----------|---------------|--------------|-------------|
|                     |         |          |    | Mastery % | Proficiency % | Developing % | Beginning % |
| <b>Organization</b> | CDV495  | SP 2017  | 7  | 86        | 14            | 0            | 0           |
|                     | CDV495  | SU 2017  | 10 | NA        | NA            | NA           | NA          |
|                     | CDV495  | FA 2017  | 21 | 43        | 43            | 14           | 0           |
|                     | CDV495  | SP 2018  | 16 | 44        | 44            | 13           | 0           |
|                     | CDV495  | SU 2018  | 25 | 52        | 44            | 4            | 0           |
|                     | CDV495  | FA 2018  | 34 | 71        | 29            | 0            | 0           |
|                     | CDV495  | SP 2019  | 20 | 65        | 35            | 0            | 0           |
|                     | CDV4095 | SU 2019  | 14 | 64        | 36            | 0            | 0           |
|                     | CDV4095 | FA 2019  | 29 | 83        | 17            | 0            | 0           |

|                     |         |         |    |    |    |    |    |
|---------------------|---------|---------|----|----|----|----|----|
|                     | CDV4095 | SP 2020 |    |    |    |    |    |
| Language            | CDV495  | SP 2017 | 7  | 86 | 14 | 0  | 0  |
|                     | CDV495  | SU 2017 | 10 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
|                     | CDV495  | FA 2017 | 21 | 38 | 33 | 29 | 0  |
|                     | CDV495  | SP 2018 | 16 | 31 | 56 | 13 | 0  |
|                     | CDV495  | SU 2018 | 25 | 48 | 52 | 0  | 0  |
|                     | CDV495  | FA 2018 | 34 | 76 | 24 | 0  | 0  |
|                     | CDV495  | SP 2019 | 20 | 60 | 40 | 0  | 0  |
|                     | CDV4095 | SU 2019 | 14 | 86 | 14 | 0  | 0  |
|                     | CDV4095 | FA 2019 | 29 | 79 | 17 | 3  | 0  |
|                     | CDV4095 | SP 2020 |    |    |    |    |    |
| Delivery            | CDV495  | SP 2017 | 7  | 43 | 57 | 0  | 0  |
|                     | CDV495  | SU 2017 | 10 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
|                     | CDV495  | FA 2017 | 21 | 60 | 30 | 10 | 0  |
|                     | CDV495  | SP 2018 | 16 | 38 | 31 | 25 | 6  |
|                     | CDV495  | SU 2018 | 25 | 44 | 52 | 4  | 0  |
|                     | CDV495  | FA 2018 | 34 | 74 | 24 | 3  | 0  |
|                     | CDV495  | SP 2019 | 20 | 30 | 60 | 10 | 0  |
|                     | CDV4095 | SU 2019 | 14 | 50 | 50 | 0  | 0  |
|                     | CDV4095 | FA 2019 | 29 | 48 | 48 | 3  | 0  |
|                     | CDV4095 | SP 2020 |    |    |    |    |    |
| Supporting Material | CDV495  | SP 2017 | 7  | 43 | 57 | 0  | 0  |
|                     | CDV495  | SU 2018 | 25 | 52 | 48 | 0  | 0  |
|                     | CDV495  | FA 2018 | 34 | 88 | 12 | 0  | 0  |
|                     | CDV495  | SP 2019 | 20 | 85 | 10 | 0  | 0  |
|                     | CDV4095 | SU 2019 | 14 | 93 | 7  | 0  | 0  |
|                     | CDV4095 | FA 2019 | 29 | 83 | 17 | 0  | 0  |
|                     | CDV4095 | SP 2020 |    |    |    |    |    |
| Central Message     | CDV495  | SP 2017 | 7  | 57 | 43 | 0  | 0  |
|                     | CDV495  | SU 2018 | 25 | 36 | 64 | 0  | 0  |
|                     | CDV495  | FA 2018 | 34 | 62 | 38 | 0  | 0  |
|                     | CDV495  | SP 2019 | 20 | 30 | 65 | 5  | 0  |
|                     | CDV4095 | SU 2019 | 14 | 71 | 29 | 0  | 0  |
|                     | CDV4095 | FA 2019 | 29 | 59 | 41 | 0  | 0  |
|                     | CDV4095 | SP 2020 |    |    |    |    |    |

### Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Written Communication: Overall, the criteria of 80% or higher for success was met throughout the cohorts. 93% was achieved for context and purpose, 87.5% was achieved for content development, and 97% was achieved for control of syntax and mechanics. Additional criteria were also evaluated: 98.5% for genre and disciplinary conventions, 98.5% for sources and evidence.

The overall percentage increased significantly from 2018-2019. Student population continues to be a large percentage of English as a second language learners in the makeup of each cohort. All but one of these courses were taught by the program director and mandatory student consultations were required for support and scaffolding of this assignment and writing expectations. Additional referrals for writing support was made to the CEL writing center and Brainfuse.

A writing course has been added to the program to help improve competencies in written word and results show a significant increase in assessment scores starting with the Summer 2019 cohorts.

The signature assignment was assessed by the Program Director and the Department Chair.

Missing data for SU2019 is due to a transition from LiveText to Portfolium for assessment collection and reporting. Some files were not able to be retrieved to provide data for this time frame.

Oral Communication: Overall, the criteria of 80% or higher was met and exceeded. 100% was achieved for organization, 98.5% was achieved for language, 98.5% was achieved for delivery, 100% was achieved for supporting material, and 100% was achieved for central message.

This outcome was assessed by multiple faculty members in Summer 2019 Fall 2019. Scores were averaged. The Department Chair and Program Director were included in this assessment both terms.

The oral communication rubric was added to the presentation assignment on Canvas so that students know how their presentations will be scored by faculty. Students are encouraged to orally practice in front of friends and family before giving their formal presentation on the main campus. A workshop was offered during the course by Student Success to learn best practices for presenting in front of an audience.

Missing data for SP2020 is due to a change in format of presentations as a result of the COVID crisis.

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

Written Communication: The Program Director will continue to work as the primary faculty for capstone courses and will work closely with other professors assigned to this course to scaffold the alignment of rubrics and understanding of how this assignment is evaluated against PLO6. The focus will be consistent alignment of rubrics throughout the cohorts. A mandatory student consultation or workshop with the Program Director for Professional Philosophy will remain in the first seven weeks of the capstone course. Additional writing support will be encouraged by faculty for those students scoring low on writing competencies. Referrals will continue to be made to the GPS Writing Center as well as the Tutor.com tool (new FA20) on Canvas.

Oral Communication: All cohorts present together on the main campus, dressed in professional attire at the conclusion of their program. They present in front of an audience of faculty, administration, and their peers. Each student is given four minutes to present professional philosophy, code of ethics, and work samples from their ePortfolio. Adjustments have been made to provide students the opportunity to create a video cover letter to be added to their ePortfolio. This option is being used in place of in-person presentations during the COVID crisis. Faculty are invited to view the video cover letters and assess students' oral communication skills as they would have in person.

**Rubric Used:**

AAC&U Written Communication Value Rubric and AAC&U Oral Communication Value Rubric

**Rubric Used**

**WRITTEN COMMUNICATION VALUE RUBRIC**

*for more information, please contact [value@aacu.org](mailto:value@aacu.org)*



**Definition:** Written communication is the development and expression of ideas in writing. Written communication involves learning to work in many genres and styles. It can involve working with many different writing technologies, and mixing texts, data, and images. Written communication abilities develop through iterative experiences across the curriculum.

*Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.*

|  | <b>Capstone<br/>4</b>   | <b>Milestones</b>   |  | <b>Benchmark<br/>1</b>  |
|--|---|---|--|---|
|  |   | 3   | 2  |   |
| <b>Context of and Purpose for Writing</b><br><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><br><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. |
|--|---|--|---|--|

**Rubric Used**

**ORAL COMMUNICATION VALUE RUBRIC**

*for more information, please contact [value@aacu.org](mailto:value@aacu.org)*



**Definition:** Oral communication is a prepared, purposeful presentation designed to increase knowledge, to foster understanding, or to promote change in the listeners' attitudes, values, beliefs, or behaviors. *Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.*

|                            | <b>Capstone (4)</b>   | <b>Milestones (3)</b>   | <b>Milestones (3)</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                    | Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that generally supports the | Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that partially supports the | Insufficient supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make reference to information or analysis that |

|                        |  |   |   |  |
|------------------------|--|---|---|--|
|                        | significantly supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.   | presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic. | presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.             | 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.                      |