

**Sociology, Social Work, and Family Sciences**  
**Child Development – Adult Degree Completion**  
**2017-2018**

**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 adulthood.

**Outcome Measure:**

CDV460: 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):**

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

**Longitudinal Data:**

Began assessing CDV program 2017. Recommendation of 2017 was to change rubric from written communication and problem solving to Civic Engagement rubric.

**Program Learning Outcome 1: Percentages of student scores using the Civic Engagement VALUE Rubric:**

Rubric Criteria	Course	Semester	N	Capstone	Milestone	Milestone	Benchmark
				(mastery)	(proficiency)	(developing)	(beginning)
				4	3	2	1
Diversity of Communities and Cultures	CDV460_2	SU 2017	20	11	61	17	11
	CDV460_3	FA 2017	16	8	42	25	25
	CDV460_4	FA 2017	20	11	26	47	16
	CDV460_5	FA 2017	13	25	17	42	17
	CDV460_6	SP 2018	16	19	56	25	0
Analysis of Knowledge	CDV460_2	SU 2017	20	11	28	44	17
	CDV460_3	FA 2017	16	17	25	8	50
	CDV460_4	FA 2017	20	0	26	58	16
	CDV460_5	FA 2017	13	8	50	25	17
	CDV460_6	SP 2018	16	6	56	38	0
Civic Identity and Commitment	CDV460_2	SU 2017	20	11	39	33	17
	CDV460_3	FA 2017	16	17	17	42	25
	CDV460_4	FA 2017	20	5	11	47	37
	CDV460_5	FA 2017	13	0	50	33	17
	CDV460_6	SP 2018	16	13	69	19	0
Civic Communication	CDV460			NA	NA	NA	NA
Civic Action	CDV460			NA	NA	NA	NA
Civic Context/Structure	CDV460			NA	NA	NA	NA

### Critical Thinking Value Rubric

Rubric Criteria	Course	Semester	N	Capstone	Milestone	Milestone	Benchmark
				(mastery)	(proficiency)	(developing)	(beginning)
				4	3	2	1
Explanation of Issues	CDV460_1	SP 2017	9	13	75	13	0
Evidence	CDV460_1	SP 2017	9	0	88	13	0
Influence of context	CDV460_1	SP 2017	9	0	50	50	0
Student position	CDV460_1	SP 2017	9	0	38	63	0
Conclusions/outcomes	CDV460_1	SP 2017	9	0	63	38	0

### Written Communication Value Rubric

Rubric Criteria	Course	Semester	N	Capstone	Milestone	Milestone	Benchmark
				(mastery)	(proficiency)	(developing)	(beginning)
				4	3	2	1
Context and purpose	CDV460_1	SP 2017	9	0	63	38	0
Content Development	CDV460_1	SP 2017	9	0	63	38	0
Genre/Disciplinary Conventions	CDV460_1	SP 2017	9	0	63	38	0
Sources and Evidence	CDV460_1	SP 2017	9	0	25	75	0
Syntax and Mechanics	CDV460_1	SP 2017	9	0	50	50	0

#### Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Overall, the criteria of 80% was not achieved for this learning outcome. Diversity of Communities and Culture, students scored from 75% to 37%. Analysis of Knowledge, students scored from 75% to 26%. Civic Identity and Commitment, students scored from 82% to 16%. This signature assignment

This was assessed by the Program Director and the Department Chair; careful alignment was done with rubric.

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

Students would benefit from seeing exemplar examples of assignments. Professors will be scaffolded in alignment of rubrics and understanding of how this assignment is evaluated against PLO1. The focus will be consistent alignment of rubrics throughout the cohorts. This will be done through faculty training. An added guest lecture for students will be made by the Department Chair, about developing philosophy. This will include an understanding of how philosophy influences the role of the learner, the role of the environment, and the role of the teacher.

**Rubric Used**

**CIVIC ENGAGEMENT VALUE RUBRIC**

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

	<b>Capstone</b> 4	3	<b>Milestones</b> 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.
<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 own academic study/field/discipline 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 generated from expectations of course requirements rather than from a sense of 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.
<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 these actions may benefit individual(s) or community.
<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 in identifying intentional ways to participate in civic contexts and structures.

**Sociology, Social Work, and Family Sciences**  
**Child Development – Adult Degree Completion**  
**2017-2018**

**Learning Outcome:**

PLO 2. Evaluate the effects of family systems on the development of children and adolescents.

**Outcome Measure:**

CDV485: Critical Paper: Students will read an article about any topic in child development in a non-professional magazine or newspaper. They will then write a summary of the article including facts, findings and any opinions / advice of the author. Then provide an opinion based on a thorough, critical analysis of the article.

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

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

**Longitudinal Data:**

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

**Program Learning Outcome 2: Percentages of student scores using the Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric:**

Rubric Criteria	Course	Semester	N	Capstone	Milestone	Milestone	Benchmark
				(mastery)	(proficiency)	(developing)	(beginning)
				4	3	2	1
Ethical Self-Awareness	CDV485_1	SP 2017	18	0	78	22	0
	CDV485_2	SU 2017	20	42	26	26	5
	CDV485_3	FA 2017	16	29	57	14	0
	CDV485_4	FA 2017	9	38	38	25	0
	CDV485_5	FA 2017	14	50	21	21	7
	CDV485_6	SP 2018	16	6	81	13	0
Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives and Concepts	CDV485_1	SP 2017	18	6	67	28	0
	CDV485_2	SU 2017	20	26	53	11	11
	CDV485_3	FA 2017	16	29	29	43	0
	CDV485_4	FA 2017	9	38	38	25	0
	CDV485_5	FA 2017	14	36	21	43	0
	CDV485_6	SP 2018	16	13	50	38	0
Ethical Issue Recognition	CDV485_1	SP 2017	18	0	78	22	0
	CDV485_2	SU 2017	20	21	42	32	5
	CDV485_3	FA 2017	16	14	43	43	0
	CDV485_4	FA 2017	9	38	25	38	0
	CDV485_5	FA 2017	14	21	43	36	0
	CDV485_6	SP 2018	16	6	69	25	0

Rubric Criteria	Course	Semester	N	Capstone	Milestone	Milestone	Benchmark
				(mastery)	(proficiency)	(developing)	(beginning)
				4	3	2	1
Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	CDV485_1	SP 2017	18	0	67	33	0
	CDV485_2	SU 2017	20	32	47	11	11
	CDV485_3	FA 2017	16	57	43	0	0
	CDV485_4	FA 2017	9	38	38	13	13
	CDV485_5	FA 2017	14	21	43	21	14
	CDV485_6	SP 2018	16	6	75	19	0
Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives / Concepts	CDV485_1	SP 2017	18	0	72	28	0
	CDV485_2	SU 2017	20	17	33	44	6
	CDV485_3	FA 2017	16	29	57	14	0
	CDV485_4	FA 2017	9	38	25	38	0
	CDV485_5	FA 2017	14	21	21	43	14
	CDV485_6	SP 2018	16	0	44	56	0

### Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Overall, the criteria of 80% was not achieved for this learning outcome. This Critical Thinking paper, students compared and contrasted and critically analyzed articles. Ethical self-awareness, students scored from 87% to 68%. Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives and Concepts, students scored from 79% to 56%. Ethical Issue Recognition, students scored from 78% to 57%. Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts, students scored from 100% to 64%. Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives / Concepts, students scored from 86% to 44 & 42%.

This was assessed by the Program Director and the Department Chair; careful alignment was done with rubric.

### Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Students would benefit from seeing exemplar examples of assignments. Professors will be scaffolded in alignment of rubrics and understanding of how this assignment is evaluated against PLO2. The focus will be consistent alignment of rubrics throughout the cohorts. This will be done through faculty training. PLO2 is being assessed through student writing and their ability to critically analyze an article. A writing course is being added to the program to help improve competencies in written word and critical evaluation of peer reviewed articles.

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 and do not affect student's position.)	Student states a position but cannot state the objections to and assumptions and limitations of the different perspectives/concepts.

**Sociology, Social Work, and Family Sciences  
Child Development – Adult Degree Completion  
2017-2018**

**Learning Outcome:**

PLO 3. Identify and discuss scientific research in understanding different philosophical views of growth and development – both historic and current.

**Outcome Measure:**

CDV355: 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% if students will score a three or higher on each criteria of the four-point AAC&U Information Literacy Value Rubric and Problem Solving Value Rubric

**Longitudinal Data:**

Began assessing CDV program 2017. Cohort 1 & 2 were assessed in Spring 2017. Recommendation of 2017 was to change rubric from written communication to problem solving.

**Program Learning Outcome 3:** Percentages of student scores using the:

**AAC&U Problem Solving Value Rubric**

Rubric Criteria	Course	Semester	N	Capstone	Milestone	Milestone	Benchmark
				(mastery)	(proficiency)	(developing)	(beginning)
				4	3	2	1
Define Problem	CDV355_3	SU 2017	16	6	19	63	13
	CDV355_4	SU 2017	20	30	40	20	10
	CDV355_5	SU 2017	13	46	23	23	8
	CDV355_6	FA 2017	14	21	50	29	0
	CDV355_7	SP 2018	17	12	35	41	12
	CDV355_8	SP 2018	30	23	33	33	10
Identify Strategies	CDV355_3	SU 2017	16	13	56	19	13
	CDV355_4	SU 2017	20	40	50	5	5
	CDV355_5	SU 2017	14	23	46	31	0
	CDV355_6	FA 2017	16	0	100	0	0
	CDV355_7	SP 2018	17	24	59	18	0
	CDV355_8	SP 2018	30	27	43	30	0
Propose Solutions / Hypotheses	CDV355_3	SU 2017	16	0	69	19	13
	CDV355_4	SU 2017	20	25	65	10	0
	CDV355_5	SU 2017	13	15	54	23	8
	CDV355_6	SP 2018	14	21	57	21	0

Rubric Criteria	Course	Semester	N	Capstone	Milestone	Milestone	Benchmark
				(mastery)	(proficiency)	(developing)	(beginning)
				4	3	2	1
	CDV355_7	SP 2018	17	18	71	6	6
	CDV355_8	SP 2018	30	13	63	17	7
Evaluate Potential Solutions	CDV355_3	SU 2017	16	13	19	44	25
	CDV355_4	SU 2017	20	16	58	11	16
	CDV355_5	SU 2017	13	8	46	23	23
	CDV355_6	SP 2018	14	0	57	43	0
	CDV355_7	SP 2018	17	13	56	19	13
	CDV355_8	SP 2018	30	10	53	10	27
Implement Solution	CDV355			NA	NA	NA	NA
Evaluate Outcomes	CDV355			NA	NA	NA	NA

#### AAC&U Written Communication Value Rubric:

Rubric Criteria	Course	Semester	N	Capstone	Milestone	Milestone	Benchmark
				(mastery)	(proficiency)	(developing)	(beginning)
				4	3	2	1
Context and Purpose	CDV355_1	SU 2016	11	9%	55	36	0
	CDV355_2	SP 2017	9	11	67	22	0
Content Development	CDV355_1	SU 2016	11	0	73	27	0
	CDV355_2	SP 2017	9	11	33	56	0
Genre and Disciplinary Conventions	CDV355_1	SU 2016	11	0	73	27	0
	CDV355_2	SP 2017	9	0	56	44	0
Sources and Evidence	CDV355_1	SU 2016	11	0%	91%	9%	0%
	CDV355_2	SP 2017	9	0%	56%	44%	0%
Control of Syntax and Mechanics	CDV355_1	SU 2016	11	9%	55%	36%	0%
	CDV355_2	SP 2017	9	11%	78%	11%	0%

#### Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Overall, the criteria of 80% or higher for success was sporadically made throughout the cohorts. Define problem, students scored from 71% to 25%. Identify strategies, students scored from 100% to 69%. Proposed Solutions/Hypothesis, students scored from 90% to 69%. Evaluate Potential Solutions, students scored from 74% to 32%. It is apparent that cohorts that are struggling have predominant English as a second language learners in the make up of the cohort.

This was assessed by the Program Director and the Department Chair; careful alignment was done with rubric.

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

Students would benefit from seeing exemplar examples of assignments. A writing course is being added to the program to help improve competencies in written word and research. Professors will be scaffolded in alignment of rubrics and understanding of how this assignment is evaluated against PLO3. The focus will be consistent alignment of rubrics throughout the cohorts. This will be done through faculty training. Continued writing instruction will be offered in CDV355 by a librarian or the CEL Director of Writing. Additional writing support will be encouraged by faculty for those students scoring low on writing competencies. Referrals will be made to the GPS Writing Center as well as the Brainfuse tool on Canvas.

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

**Sociology, Social Work, and Family Sciences  
Child Development – Adult Degree Completion  
2017-2018**

**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:**

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:**

Rubric Criteria	Course	Semester	N	Capstone (mastery)	Milestone (proficiency)	Milestone (developing)	Benchmark (beginning)
				4	3	2	1
Explanation of Issues	CDV485_1	SP 2017	8	0	78	22	0
	CDV485_2	SU 2017	20	53	47	0	0
	CDV485_3	FA 2017	16	88	0	13	0
	CDV485_4	FA 2017	9	67	22	11	0
	CDV485_5	FA 2017	14	43	36	21	0
	CDV485_6	SP 2018	16	25	63	13	0
Evidence	CDV485_1	SP 2017	8	33%	33%	33%	0%
	CDV485_2	SU 2017	20	47	42	11	0
	CDV485_3	FA 2017	16	63	25	0	13
	CDV485_4	FA 2017	9	37	22	11	0
	CDV485_5	FA 2017	14	29	57	14	0
	CDV485_6	SP 2018	16	25	44	31	0
Influence of context and assumptions	CDV485_1	SP 2017	8	11%	78%	11%	0%
	CDV485_2	SU 2017	20	47	42	11	0
	CDV485_3	FA 2017	16	63	13	25	0
	CDV485_4	FA 2017	9	67	11	22	0
	CDV485_5	FA 2017	14	36	36	29	0
	CDV485_6	SP 2018	16	25	50	25	0
Student position	CDV485_1	SP 2017	8	22%	67%	11%	0%
	CDV485_2	SU 2017	20	42	42	16	0

	CDV485_3	FA 2017	16	38	25	38	0
	CDV485_4	FA 2017	9	67	11	11	11
	CDV485_5	FA 2017	14	36	36	29	0
	CDV485_6	SP 2018	16	19	75	6	0
<b>Conclusions and outcomes</b>	CDV485_1	SP 2017	8	0%	67%	22%	0%
	CDV485_2	SU 2017	20	71	14	14	0
	CDV485_3	FA 2017	16	NA	NA	NA	NA
	CDV485_4	FA 2017	9	NA	NA	NA	NA
	CDV485_5	FA 2017	14	57	14	29	0
	CDV485_6	SP 2018	16	NA	NA	NA	NA

### **Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

Overall, the criteria of 80% or higher for success was sporadically made throughout the cohorts.

Explanation of Issues, students scored from 100% to 79%. Evidence, students scored from 89% to 66%.

Influence of context and assumptions, students scored from 89% to 33%. Student position, students scored from 94% to 63%. One particular cohort scored low in all areas. Training on this assignment will be done with the professor individually.

This was assessed by the Program Director and the Department Chair; careful alignment was done with rubric.

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

Students would benefit from seeing exemplar examples of assignments. Points will be added to this assignment to motivate the learner in the importance of this signature assignment. Additional clarification will be added to the assignment prompt for writing expectations. Students will be scaffolded in how to analyze their own and others' assumptions and how to present it in a compare and contrast position.

Rubric Used

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



	<b>Capstone</b> 4	<b>Milestones</b>		<b>Benchmark</b> 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 and perspectives discussed in priority order.	Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified.

**Sociology, Social Work, and Family Sciences  
Child Development – Adult Degree Completion  
2017-2018**

**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:**

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: Student 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

**Longitudinal Data:**

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

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

Rubric Criteria	Course	Semester	N	Capstone	Milestone	Milestone	Benchmark
				(mastery) 4	(proficiency) 3	(developing) 2	(beginning) 1
Explanation of Issues	CDV485_1	SP 2017	9	0	78	22	0
	CDV485_2	SU 2017	20	11	61	17	11
	CDV485_3	FA 2017	16	75	13	13	0
	CDV485_4	FA 2017	10	89	11	0	0
	CDV485_5	FA 2017	15	53	33	7	7
	CDV485_6	SP 2018	16	19	63	19	0
Evidence	CDV485_1	SP 2017	9	33	33	33	0
	CDV485_2	SU 2017	20	17	50	33	0
	CDV485_3	FA 2017	16	50	38	13	0
	CDV485_4	FA 2017	10	56	33	11	0
	CDV485_5	FA 2017	15	27	33	33	7
	CDV485_6	SP 2018	16	0	63	38	0
Influence of context and assumptions	CDV485_1	SP 2017	9	11	78	11	0
	CDV485_2	SU 2017	20	11	44	44	0
	CDV485_3	FA 2017	16	63	25	13	0
	CDV485_4	FA 2017	10	67	22	11	0
	CDV485_5	FA 2017	15	53	27	13	7
	CDV485_6	SP 2018	16	0	69	25	6
Student position	CDV485_1	SP 2017	9	22	67	11	0

Rubric Criteria	Course	Semester	N	Capstone	Milestone	Milestone	Benchmark
				(mastery)	(proficiency)	(developing)	(beginning)
				4	3	2	1
	CDV485_2	SU 2017	20	NA	NA	NA	NA
	CDV485_3	FA 2017	16	NA	NA	NA	NA
	CDV485_4	FA 2017	10	NA	NA	NA	NA
	CDV485_5	FA 2017	14	NA	NA	NA	NA
	CDV485_6	SP 2018	16	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Conclusions and outcomes</b>	CDV485_1	SP 2017	9	11	67	22	0
	CDV485_2	SU 2017	20	NA	NA	NA	NA
	CDV485_3	FA 2017	16	NA	NA	NA	NA
	CDV485_4	FA 2017	9	NA	NA	NA	NA
	CDV485_5	FA 2017	14	NA	NA	NA	NA
	CDV485_6	SP 2018	16	NA	NA	NA	NA

**Conclusions Drawn from Data:**

Overall, the criteria of 80% or higher for success was sporadically made throughout the cohorts. Explanation of issues, with the exception of one cohort, criteria was met. Evidence, students scored from 89% to 67%. Influence of context and assumptions, students scored from 89% to 55%.

This was assessed by the Program Director and the Department Chair; careful alignment was done with rubric.

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

Students would benefit from seeing exemplar examples of assignments. Professors will be scaffolded in alignment of rubrics and understanding of how this assignment is evaluated PLO5. The focus will be consistent alignment of rubrics throughout the cohorts. This will be done through faculty training. A focus of this training will be helping students to use information to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis of expert viewpoints.

Rubric Used

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



	<b>Capstone</b> 4	<b>Milestones</b>		<b>Benchmark</b> 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 and perspectives discussed in priority order.	Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified.

**Sociology, Social Work, and Family Sciences**  
**Child Development – Adult Degree Completion**  
**2017-2018**

**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:**

CDV495: Preparation of a professional statements and portfolio. Students will write and present their portfolios including: Professional Philosophy.

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

80% of students will score a three or higher on each criteria of a four-point rubric

**Longitudinal Data:**

Began assessing CDV program 2017. Cohort 1 was assessed in Spring 2017. Both AAC&U Written Communication and AAC&U Oral Communications are used.

**AAC&U Written Communication Value Rubric:**

Rubric Criteria	Course	Semester	N	Capstone	Milestone	Milestone	Benchmark
				(mastery) 4	(proficiency) 3	(developing) 2	(beginning) 1
Context and Purpose	CDV495_1	SP 2017	7	29	57	14	0
	CDV495_2	SU 2017	10	25	38	38	0
	CDV495_3	FA 2017	14	21	36	36	7
	CDV495_4	FA 2017	20	40	45	15	0
	CDV495_5	FA 2017	11	50	20	30	0
	CDV495_6	SP 2018	15	20	60	20	0
Content Development	CDV495_1	SP 2017	7	14%	57%	29%	0%
	CDV495_2	SU 2017	10	25	25	25	25
	CDV495_3	FA 2017	14	7	29	64	0
	CDV495_4	FA 2017	20	35	40	25	0
	CDV495_5	FA 2017	11	50	20	30	0
	CDV495_6	SP 2018	15	13	40	47	0
Genre and Disciplinary Conventions	CDV495_1	SP 2017	7	0%	57%	43%	0%
	CDV495_2	SU 2017	10	NA	NA	NA	NA
	CDV495_3	FA 2017	14	NA	NA	NA	NA
	CDV495_4	FA 2017	20	NA	NA	NA	NA
	CDV495_5	FA 2017	11	NA	NA	NA	NA
	CDV495_6	SP 2018	15	NA	NA	NA	NA

Rubric Criteria	Course	Semester	N	Capstone	Milestone	Milestone	Benchmark
				(mastery)	(proficiency)	(developing)	(beginning)
				4	3	2	1
Sources and Evidence	CDV495_1	SP 2017	7	14%	86%	0%	0%
	CDV495_2	SU 2017	10	NA	NA	NA	NA
	CDV495_3	FA 2017	14	NA	NA	NA	NA
	CDV495_4	FA 2017	20	NA	NA	NA	NA
	CDV495_5	FA 2017	11	NA	NA	NA	NA
	CDV495_6	SP 2018	15	NA	NA	NA	NA
Control of Syntax and Mechanics	CDV495_1	SP 2017	7	14%	43%	43%	0%
	CDV495_2	SU 2017	10	13	50	38	0
	CDV495_3	FA 2017	14	0	36	64	0
	CDV495_4	FA 2017	20	21	47	32	0
	CDV495_5	FA 2017	11	20	60	20	0
	CDV495_6	SP 2018	15	6	73	20	0

**Oral Communication Value Rubric:**

Rubric Criteria	Course	Semester	N	Capstone	Milestone	Milestone	Benchmark
				(mastery)	(proficiency)	(developing)	(beginning)
				4	3	2	1
Organization	CDV495_1	SP 2017	7	86%	14%	0%	0%
	CDV495_2	SU 2017	10	NA	NA	NA	NA
	CDV495_3	FA 2017	9	67	33	0	0
	CDV495_4	FA 2017	10	40	50	10	0
	CDV495_5	FA 2017	5	20	40	40	0
	CDV495_6	SP 2018	15	44	44	12	0
Language	CDV495_1	SP 2017	7	86%	14%	0%	0%
	CDV495_2	SU 2017	10	NA	NA	NA	NA
	CDV495_3	FA 2017	9	50	33	17	0
	CDV495_4	FA 2017	10	30	30	40	0
	CDV495_5	FA 2017	5	40	40	20	0
	CDV495_6	SP 2018	15	31	56	13	0
Delivery	CDV495_1	SP 2017	7	43%	57%	0%	0%
	CDV495_2	SU 2017	10	NA	NA	NA	NA
	CDV495_3	FA 2017	9	67	33	0	0
	CDV495_4	FA 2017	10	50	30	20	0

Rubric Criteria	Course	Semester	N	Capstone	Milestone	Milestone	Benchmark
				(mastery)	(proficiency)	(developing)	(beginning)
				4	3	2	1
	CDV495_5	FA 2017	5	75	25	0	0
	CDV495_6	SP 2018	15	38	31	25	6
Supporting Material	CDV495_1	SP 2017	7	43%	57%	0%	0%
	CDV495_2	SU 2017	10	NA	NA	NA	NA
	CDV495_3	FA 2017	9	NA	NA	NA	NA
	CDV495_4	FA 2017	10	NA	NA	NA	NA
	CDV495_5	FA 2017	5	NA	NA	NA	NA
	CDV495_6	SP 2018	15	NA	NA	NA	NA
Central Message	CDV495_1	SP 2017	7	57	43	0	0
	CDV495_2	SU 2017	10	NA	NA	NA	NA
	CDV495_3	FA 2017	9	NA	NA	NA	NA
	CDV495_4	FA 2017	10	NA	NA	NA	NA
	CDV495_5	FA 2017	5	NA	NA	NA	NA
	CDV495_6	SP 2018	15	NA	NA	NA	NA

### Conclusions Drawn from Data:

#### Written Communication:

Overall, the criteria of 80% or higher for success was sporadically made throughout the cohorts. Context and purpose, students scored from 85% to 57%. Content development, students scored from 75% to 36%. Control of syntax & mechanics, students scored from 80% to 34%. It is apparent that cohorts that are struggling have predominant English as a second language learners in the makeup of the cohort.

This was assessed by the Program Director and the Department Chair; careful alignment was done with rubric.

#### Oral Communication:

Overall, the criteria of 80% or higher was met with a few exceptions. Organization, students scored from 100% to 60%. Language, students scored from 100% to 60%. Delivery, students scored from 100% to 69%.

This outcome was assessed by four faculty members including the Department Chair; scores were averaged.

### Changes to be Made Based on Data:

#### Written Communication:

A writing course is being added to the program to help improve competencies in written word. Professors will be scaffolded in alignment of rubrics and understanding of how this assignment is evaluated against PLO6. The focus will be consistent alignment of rubrics throughout the cohorts. This will be done through faculty training. Additional writing support will be encouraged by faculty for those students scoring low on writing competencies. Referrals will be made to the GPS Writing Center as well as the Brainfuse tool on Canvas. Special training will be made available to faculty on meeting the needs of English as a second

language learners. A focus on control of syntax and mechanics will be addressed, scaffolding students to use professional, graceful language throughout professional philosophy.

**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.

Students will be given the oral communication rubric to know how their presentations were scored by faculty. Students will be encouraged to orally practice in front of friends and family before giving their formal presentation on main campus.

**Rubric Used:**

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

**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 significantly supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that generally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that partially supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	Insufficient supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make reference to information or analysis that minimally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.
<b>Central Message</b>	Central message is compelling (precisely stated, appropriately repeated, memorable, and strongly supported.)	Central message is clear and consistent with the supporting material.	Central message is basically understandable but is not often repeated and is not memorable.	Central message can be deduced, but is not explicitly stated in the presentation.

## 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</b> 4	<b>Milestones</b>	
		3	2
<b>Context of and Purpose for Writing</b> <i>Includes considerations of audience, purpose, and the circumstances surrounding the writing task(s).</i>	Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.	Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus on the assigned task(s) (e.g., the task aligns with audience, purpose, and context).	Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).
<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.
<b>Genre and Disciplinary Conventions</b> <i>Formal and informal rules inherent in the expectations for writing in particular forms and/or academic fields (please see glossary).</i>	Demonstrates detailed attention to and successful execution of a wide range of conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task (s) including organization, content, presentation, formatting, and stylistic choices	Demonstrates consistent use of important conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s), including organization, content, presentation, and stylistic choices	Follows expectations appropriate to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) for basic organization, content, and presentation
<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.
<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.