

BRYN ATHYN COLLEGE

Core Skills Annual Assessment Report: 2017-18

October 31, 2018

Core Committee: Robin Cooper (Chair, Writing, Language), Marcy Latta (Co-Chair), Suzanne Bernhardt (Public Presentation), Caira Bongers (Quantitative Reasoning), Wendy Closterman (Information Literacy), Scott Frazier, Ethan King, and Laura Nash

Bryn Athyn College's Core Program: All of the degree programs rest on the Core Program, which builds the foundational skills, knowledge, and perspectives every student engages in during a Bryn Athyn College education. Every liberal arts major requires the Core Program; the Education Major, the Nursing program, and the AA degree require a significant portion of the program; and every course in the curriculum addresses Core goals directly or indirectly.

The Core Program serves students in three general ways: it helps them develop spiritual purpose; it teaches them to think broadly and critically from a variety of perspectives; and it empowers them with specific skills so that they may act effectively in society and the workplaces of the 21st century. Specifically, the Core program has the following goals:

- 1) Strengthen communication, quantitative reasoning, and information literacy skills
- 2) Develop liberal arts skills in a focused field of study
- 3) Develop critical thinking skills across disciplines
- 4) Explore the diversity and commonality of human experience and values in order to enrich understanding of what is human
- 5) Nurture an inquiring spirit in the classroom and well beyond in relation to God, society, nature, and self
- 6) Foster personal ethics and encourage responsibility for the well-being of others

This report assesses the performance of students in the skill areas listed below.

Core Skill Definitions:

Information Literacy (IL): the ability to locate, evaluate, and use information effectively

Language: the ability to read, write, speak, and listen in target languages

Public Presentation (PP): the ability to present information to an audience in a creative, coherent, structured, supported, confident, and professional manner

Quantitative Reasoning (QR): the ability to manipulate quantities, collect data, make calculations on collected data, and draw conclusions within the context of a discipline

Writing (W): the ability to present effectively in written form a clear and coherent analysis, argument, report, or composition

[Scientific reasoning—the ability to analyze and draw conclusions about scientific observations and data—is assessed in the Science Area Assessment Report.]

A. Learning Outcome Results (Student Performance in Core Skills):

Table 1 tracks student performance in core skills by percent of scores at three levels:

- Scores of 2 & 3: meets or exceeds expectations
- Score of 1: minimally passing
- Score of 0: below passing

Table 2 (next page) tracks cohort performance against performance targets defined by the Core Committee (see Section D for definitions of cohort, assessment, and performance targets).

Table 1. Student Performance in Core Skills, Reported by Percent of Scores and Three Performance Levels, 2013-14 through 2017-18.

Core Skill	<i>n</i>	Percent of scores meeting or exceeding expectations (scores of 2 & 3)	Percent of minimally passing scores (scores of 1)	Percent of failing scores (scores of 0)
Information Literacy (IL)	1111	75%	24%	4%
Capstone IL (ILC)	261	74%	27%	0%
Language (LANG)	284	82%	16%	9%
Public Presentation (PP)	587	85%	13%	2%
Capstone PP (PPC)	171	85%	14%	0%
Quantitative Reasoning (QR)	1418	78%	19%	3%
Writing (W)	1262	84%	15%	1%
Capstone Writing (WC)	222	83%	15%	2%
Standard Grammar Test (SGT)	176	70%	26%	3%

See Table 4 (pp 22-23) for a breakdown of assessment scores by year and by four performance levels. See Section B (page 4) for statements of the learning outcomes associated with each of these skills. See Section D (pp 6-10) for definitions of the cohorts, assessments, and cohort performance expectations. For cohort performance measured against targets, see Table 2 on the next page.

Table 2. Student Cohort Performance in Core Skills, Reported by Performance Targets, 2013-14 through 2017-18. (See above for definitions of scores)

	Assessment	Results					Targets
		2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	
IL LO 1							
IL Test	1	68%	12%	44%	54%	NA**	>75% pass
Core	1	73%	61%	66%	70%	75%	>50% 2 or 3
	2	5%	8%	8%	6%	4%	<10% fail
	3	6%	8%	4%	10%	3%	<20% fail 1 st yr crs
	4	78%	64%	83%	84%	74%	<10% below Core 1
Lang LO1							
Sacred	1	61%	83%	77%	100%*	80%	>70% 2 or 3
	2	22%	0%	1%	0%	10%	<10% fail
Modern	1	81%	68%	69%	77%*	80%	>70% 2 or 3
	2	3%	10%	7%	0%*	9%	<10% fail
PP LO 1							
Core	1	3%	3%	6%	1%	2%	<5% fail
	2	86%	82%	83%	92%	85%	>70% 2 or 3
	3	95%	97%	94%	83%	86%	<10% below Core 2
QR LO 1							
Core	1	6%	12%	2%	5%	0%	<15% fail
	2	4%	8%	6%	6%	4%	<10% fail
	3	74%	64%	68%	72%	78%	>70% 2 or 3
W LO 1							
Core	1	3%	4%	3%	3%	1%	<5% fail
	2	77%	72%	74%	76%	84%	>70% 2 or 3 (W)
	3	88%	73%	85%	73%	83%	<10% below Core 2
	4				59%	70%	>70% 2 or 3 (SGT)

Key: Green = meets or exceeds expectations
 Yellow = falls below expectation by no more than 5 percentage points
 Red = does not meet expectation by more than 5 percentage points

* Assessment scores were not collected in one or more course sections.

** The IL test was eliminated as an assessment tool in the spring of 2018, thus we do not have data for 2017-18.

See Appendices 2a-2e (pp 28-33) for skill scores by class section

See Section C (page 5) for a listing of the learning outcomes embedded in the curriculum.

See Section D (pp 6-10) for definitions of assessment parameters and performance targets.

See Section E (pp 11-20) for analysis and recommendations based on these results, and for follow-up on recommendations from the previous year's report.

B. Core Skill Goals and Learning Outcomes

1. Information Literacy

Goal 1: Develop the ability to locate, evaluate, and use information effectively.

LO 1: Display the ability to locate, evaluate, and use information effectively.

2. Language

Goal 1: Read and interpret authentic target language texts.

Goal 2: Create sensitivities to cultural identities and differences through the lens of language and its concepts.

Goal 3: Communicate in target language about everyday topics, including family, daily routine, shopping, traveling, recreational activities, and emotions (Modern Languages).

Goal 4: Appreciate the nature of a revealed text (Sacred Languages).

LO 1: For Sacred Languages: translate original texts accurately into English in a manner that demonstrates knowledge of vocabulary, grammar, and meaning.

For Modern Languages: read, write, speak, and listen in target language at-level, per American Council on Foreign Languages (ACTFL) proficiency guidelines. Courses are designed with guidelines in mind as reflected in course syllabi.

3. Public Presentation

Goal: Develop the ability to present information to an audience in a creative and professional manner, using coherent structure, research-supported content, effective visual aids, and competent delivery skills including confidence, eye-contact, appropriate language choices, effective body language.

LO 1: Deliver confident public presentations with well-researched content that are professional, effective, and structured for a positive audience experience.

4. Quantitative Reasoning

Goal: All students should be proficient in Quantitative Reasoning, which involves manipulating quantities within the context of a discipline to reach a conclusion.

LO 1: Students will proficiently collect data, make calculations on collected data, draw a conclusion from the calculations, and present the conclusion in a report, paper, or presentation. These skills are assessed as a whole, not individually.

5. Writing

Goal: Develop the ability to present effectively in written form a clear and coherent analysis, argument, report, or composition.

LO 1: Write clean and effective exposition, analysis, and argumentation.

C. Learning Outcomes Embedded in the Curriculum in 2017-18

IL Courses	LO1	PP Courses	LO1	QR Courses	LO1	W Courses	LO1
Bus390	IL	Bio232	PP	Bus320	QR	Anth/His211	W
Eng360	IL	Bus301	PP	Bus/Math380	QR	Bus/Writ220	W
Eng367	IL	Bus/Psyc202	PP	Chem111L	QR	Eng235	W
FA101	IL	Comm105	PP	Econ131	QR	Eng370	W
FA102	IL	Comm205	PP	Econ132	QR	Psci232	W
FA201	IL	Ed 128	PP	Math101	QR	Rel273w	W
FA202	IL	EE298	PP	Math102	QR	Rel306	W
FA210	IL	Hist257	PP	Math 115	QR	Rel310	W
FA213	IL	Hist2/398G	PP	Math120	QR	Rel311	W
FA313	IL	PSci210	PP	Math125	QR	Rel315	W
Hist114	IL	Psyc205	PP	Math130	QR	Rel335w	W
HSoc401	IL	Rel320	PP	Math140	QR	Writ101	W
ID390	IL	Bio492	PPC	Math240	QR	Writ202	W
Math205	IL	Bus/ID496	PPC	Phys180	QR	Writ211	W
Psyc305	IL	Eng491	PPC	Phys181	QR	Writ212	W
Psyc490	IL	Eng499	PPC	Phys210	QR	Writ213	W
Rel205	IL	HSoc402	PPC	Phys211	QR	Writ311	W
Rel210	IL	Pscy491	PPC			Bio495	WC
Rel380	IL	Psyc492	PPC			Bus495	WC
Rel399	IL	Rel490	PPC			Dan495	WC
Writ202	IL					Eng491	WC
Bio495	ILC					Eng499	WC
Bus493	ILC	Lang Courses	LO1			HSoc402	WC
Dan493	ILC	Germ101	LANG01			Math495	WC
Eng491	ILC	Germ102	LANG01			Psyc491	WC
Eng499	ILC	Gr110	LANG01			Psyc491	WC
FA493	ILC	Gr111	LANG01			Rel490	WC
HSoc402	ILC	Gr250	LANG01				
Math493	ILC	Gr251	LANG01				
Psyc491	ILC	Heb110	LANG01				
Psyc492	ILC	Heb111	LANG01				
Rel490	ILC	Heb250	LANG01				
		Heb251	LANG01				
		Lat110	LANG01				
		Lat111	LANG01				
		Lat250	LANG01				
		Lat251	LANG01				
		Span101	LANG01				
		Span102	LANG01				

D. Learning Outcomes Parameters

Information Literacy Learning Outcome 1: Display the ability to locate, evaluate and use information effectively.

Assessment Parameters:

IL Test	On-line, standardized CARS IL test, James Madison University			
LO designation:	IL Test Grade	Sonis symbol:	n/a	
Rubric	IL Test			
Client:	Core Program			
	Assessment 1			
Cohort:	All first year students			
Performance Expectation:	At least 75% of first year students pass the IL test by the end of their first year			
CORE SKILL	Courses in IL			
LO designation:	IL Skill Score	Sonis symbol:	IL and ILC	
Rubric:	IL Skill Rubric*			
Client:	Core Program			
	Assessment 1	Assessment 2	Assessment 3	Assessment 4
Cohort:	All students enrolled in IL courses in a given year	All students enrolled in IL courses in a given year	All students enrolled in 100-level IL courses in a given year	All students enrolled in 400-level ILC capstone courses in a given year; all students enrolled in other IL courses in a given year
Performance Expectation:	At least 50% of scores in IL courses are 2 or higher	Scores of 0 are no more than 10% overall	Score of 0 are no more than 20% in 100-level IL courses	The percentage of students earning a score of 2 or higher in 400-level ILC capstone work will be no more than 10 percentage points lower than the percentage of students earning a 2 in all other IL courses

*See Appendix 1a for IL scoring rubric

Language Learning Outcome 1:

For Sacred languages: translate original texts accurately into English in a manner that demonstrates knowledge of vocabulary, grammar, and meaning (Sacred Languages).

For Modern languages: Read, write, speak, and listen in target language at-level, per American Council on Foreign Languages (ACTFL) proficiency guidelines. Courses are designed with guidelines in mind as reflected in course syllabi (Modern Languages).

Sacred Language Assessment Parameters:

LO designation:	LANG01	Sonis symbol:	LANG01
Rubric:	Standard Conversion of test scores (out of 100%) into skill score (0-3)*		
CORE			
Client:	Core Program, Religion Major, Theological School		
	Assessment 1	Assessment 2	Assessment 3
Cohort:	All students in sacred language courses in a given year	All students in sacred language courses in a given year	
Performance Expectation:	At least 70% of students score a 2 or higher	No more than 10% of students score a 0	

Modern Language Assessment Parameters:

LO designation:	LANG01	Sonis symbol:	LANG01
Rubric:	Standard Conversion of test scores (out of 100%) into skill score (0-3)*		
CORE			
Client:	Core Program		
	Assessment 1	Assessment 2	Assessment 3
Cohort:	All students in modern language courses in a given year	All students in modern language courses in a given year	
Performance Expectation:	At least 70% of students score a 2 or higher	No more than 10% of students score a 0	

*Note: Test scores converted to assessment scores as follows:

- Below 65 = 0;
- 65 to 74.9 = 1;
- 75 to 89.9 = 2;
- 90 and above = 3.

The expectation is that no more than 25% of scores over time in any learning outcome would be 3.

Public Presentation Learning Outcome 1: Deliver confident public presentations with well-researched content that are professional, effective, and structured for a positive audience experience.

Assessment Parameters:

CORE			
LO designation:	Public Presentation Scores	Sonis symbol:	PP and PPC
Rubric:	Public Presentation Skill Rubric*		
Client:	Core Program		
	Assessment 1	Assessment 2	Assessment 3
Cohort:	All students enrolled in PP courses in a given year	All students enrolled in PP courses in a given year	All students enrolled in 400-level PP capstone courses in a given year; all students enrolled in other courses in a given year
Performance Expectation:	No more than 5% of all Public Presentation scores (PP) in a given year will be 0.	At least 70% of students will earn a Public Presentation score (PP) of 2 or higher	The performance of students earning a Public Presentation score in the Capstone (PPC) score of 2 or higher will be no more than 10% points lower than the percentage of students earning a score of 2 or higher in all other PP courses

*See Appendix 1b for PP scoring rubric

Quantitative Reasoning Learning Outcome 1: Students will proficiently collect data, make calculations on collected data, draw a conclusion from the calculations, and present the conclusion in a report, paper, or presentation. These skills are assessed as a whole, not individually.

Assessment Parameters:

CORE			
LO designation:	Quantitative Reasoning Scores	Sonis symbol:	QR
Rubric:	Quantitative Reasoning Skill Rubric*		
Client:	Core Program		
	Assessment 1	Assessment 2	Assessment 3
Cohort:	All Math101 students in a given year	All students in QR courses other than Math101 in a given year	All students in QR courses other than Math101 in a given year
Performance Expectation:	No more than 15% of QR scores in Math101 will be 0	No more than 10% of QR scores will be 0	At least 70% of students receive a QR score of 2 or higher

*See Appendix 1c for QR scoring rubric

Writing Learning Outcome 1: Write effective exposition, analysis, and argumentation.

Assessment Parameters:

CORE				
LO designation:	Writing Skill Scores	Sonis symbol:	W, WC, and SGT	
Rubric:	Writing Skill Rubric or Standard Grammar Test Rubric*			
Client:	Core Program			
	Assessment 1	Assessment 2	Assessment 3	Assessment 4
Cohort:	All students enrolled in non-capstone W courses in a given year	All students enrolled in non-capstone W courses in a given year	All students enrolled in 400-level W capstone courses in a given year; all students enrolled in other W courses in a given year	All students enrolled in Writing 101
Performance Expectation:	No more than 5% of all Writing scores (W) in a given year will be 0	At least 70% of students will earn a Writing score (W) of 2 or higher	The performance of students earning a Writing in the Capstone (WC) score of 2 or higher will be no more than 10% points lower than the percentage of students earning a score of 2 or higher in all other W courses	At least 70% of students in Writing 101 will earn a Standard Grammar Test Score (SGT) of 2 or higher

*See Appendices 1d and 1e for Writing scoring rubric and Standard Grammar Test rubric

Additional Tables

Table 3. Faculty Teaching Core Skill courses during 2017-18 Academic Year

Name	Core Skills Taught in 2016-17	Highest Degree	Rank	FT/%T/PT
Suzanne Bernhardt	PP	MA	Assistant Professor of Humanities	FT
Max Blair	QR	PhD	Assistant Professor of Math and Physics	PT
Caira Bongers	IL, QR	MS	Assistant Professor of Mathematics	%T
Fredrik Bryntesson	PP	PhD	Associate Professor of Biology	FT
Fernando Cavallo	IL	PhD	Instructor in Psychology	PT
Wendy Closterman	IL, L, PP, W	PhD	Professor of History and Greek, Dean of Faculty	FT
Robin Cooper	IL, W	MA	Assistant Professor of English and Writing	FT
Scott Frazier	L, PP	MDiv, MA	Assistant Professor of Religion, Latin, and Hebrew	FT
Sarah Gardam	IL	MA	Instructor of Writing and English	PT
Maret Genzlinger	QR	BS	Lecturer in Mathematics	PT
Thane Glenn	IL, W	MDiv, PhD	Associate Professor of English and Religion	FT
Martha Gyllenhaal	IL	PhD	Assistant Professor of Art	FT
Dana Harrison	IL, W	PhD	Instructor in Writing	PT
Ed Higgins	QR	MD	Assistant Professor of Biology and Chemistry	FT
Chandra Hoffman	IL, W	MFA	Instructor in Writing	PT
Erica Hyatt	PP, W	PhD	Assistant Professor of Psychology	FT
Bergen Junge	QR	MBA	Instructor in Business	FT
Ethan King	IL, PP, QR	MBA	Instructor of Business	PT
Kristin King	IL, W	PhD	Professor of English	FT
Marcy Latta	IL, W	PhD	Assistant Professor of Philosophy	FT
Grace McMackin	QR	BS	Instructor in Science	PT
Abbey Nash	W, IL	MA	Instructor in Writing	PT
Magdalena Nunez	L	MA	Lecturer in Spanish	PT
Grant Odhner	W	MDiv	Assistant Professor of Religion	FT
Eugene Potapov	QR	PhD	Assistant Professor of Biology	FT
Angela Rose	PP, QR	MEd	Instructor of Education and Mathematics	PT
D. Greg Rose	PP, W	PhD	Associate Professor of History and Political Science	FT
Ray Silverman	W	MDiv, PhD	Assistant Professor of Religion	%T
Neil Simonetti	QR	PhD	Professor of Computer Science and Math	FT
Christopher Waltrich	QR	MBA	Lecturer in Business	PT
Aram, Yardumian	IL	PhD	Assistant Professor of Anthropology	FT

Table 4: Student Performance in Core Skills, Reported by Percent of Scores at Four Performance Levels, 2013-14 through 2017-18.

Core Skills	Performance Level	Percent of Scores					Combined years
		2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	
Information							
Literacy	3: Exceeds expectations	19%	14%	21%	19%	28%	20%
	2: Meets expectations	55%	47%	46%	51%	47%	49%
	1: Minimally passing	23%	31%	28%	24%	20%	25%
	0: Failing	4%	8%	5%	6%	4%	5%
	<i>n</i>	270	245	190	181	225	1111
Capstone Level							
Information							
Literacy	3: Exceeds expectations	27%	21%	33%	22%	35%	28%
	2: Meets expectations	51%	43%	50%	62%	39%	49%
	1: Minimally passing	19%	28%	18%	16%	27%	22%
	0: Failing	3%	9%	0%	0%	0%	2%
	<i>n</i>	59	58	40	55	49	261
Language							
Literacy	3: Exceeds expectations	37%	18%	28%	27%	11%	24%
	2: Meets expectations	37%	52%	44%	55%	69%	51%
	1: Minimally passing	17%	21%	21%	16%	11%	17%
	0: Failing	9%	9%	7%	0%	9%	7%
	<i>n</i>	54	56	85	44	45	284
Public							
Presentation							
Presentation	3: Exceeds expectations	25%	20%	23%	34%	22%	25%
	2: Meets expectations	61%	62%	59%	58%	63%	61%
	1: Minimally passing	11%	16%	11%	7%	13%	12%
	0: Failing	3%	3%	6%	1%	2%	3%
	<i>n</i>	161	115	98	107	106	587
Capstone Level							
Public							
Presentation							
Presentation	3: Exceeds expectations	50%	24%	42%	31%	34%	36%
	2: Meets expectations	45%	72%	52%	52%	51%	54%
	1: Minimally passing	5%	3%	6%	15%	14%	9%
	0: Failing	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%
	<i>n</i>	22	29	33	52	35	171
Quantitative							
Reasoning							
Reasoning	3: Exceeds expectations	18%	24%	22%	25%	33%	24%
	2: Meets expectations	55%	39%	48%	48%	45%	47%
	1: Minimally passing	23%	27%	25%	20%	19%	23%
	0: Failing	4%	9%	5%	6%	3%	5%
	<i>n</i>	246	255	300	259	358	1418

Bryn Athyn College Core Skills Annual Assessment Report 2017-18

Core Skills	Performance Level	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	Combined
Writing	3: Exceeds expectations	17%	13%	20%	19%	18%	17%
	2: Meets expectations	60%	59%	54%	57%	66%	59%
	1: Minimally passing	21%	24%	23%	21%	15%	21%
	0: Failing	3%	4%	3%	3%	1%	3%
	<i>n</i>	213	239	275	267	268	1262
Capstone Level							
Writing	3: Exceeds expectations	43%	25%	21%	22%	25%	27%
	2: Meets expectations	45%	48%	64%	51%	58%	53%
	1: Minimally passing	7%	22%	15%	25%	15%	17%
	0: Failing	5%	5%	0%	2%	2%	3%
	<i>n</i>	42	44	33	55	48	222
Standard							
Grammar Test	3: Exceeds expectations				9%	8%	9%
	2: Meets expectations				51%	62%	57%
	1: Minimally passing				35%	26%	31%
	0: Failing				6%	3%	5%
	<i>n</i>				81	95	176

Appendices

Appendix 1a: Information Literacy Scoring Rubric

Objectives assessed	0	1	2	3
The objectives below are quoted from MSCHE, <i>Student Learning Assessment: Options and Resources 2nd ed.</i> , Philadelphia, 2007, pp. 6-7.	<i>Fail</i> Falls short of 1	<i>Minimal pass</i> A score of 1 in 3 objectives for 100-level; in 4 objectives for 200-level and above	<i>Meets college expectations for IL proficiency</i> A score of 2 in at least 2 objectives	<i>Work stands out beyond expectations. No more than 25% of scores over time.</i> A score of 3 in at least 2 objectives; no zeros
1. "Determining the nature and extent of needed information"		Articulates appropriate types of information needed to pursue research question	Correctly describes how information is produced, organized, and disseminated in different sources	Demonstrates detailed knowledge of specialized, subject-specific sources of information
2. "Accessing information effectively and efficiently"		Locates appropriate information for the research question	Uses multiple search strategies effectively to locate information that substantially advances the pursuit of the research question	Conducts a comprehensive search, locating relevant information that is not in the mainstream
3. "Evaluating critically the sources and content of the information being sought, and incorporating selected information in the learner's knowledge base and value system"		Uses appropriate sources	Evaluates appropriate sources effectively	Synthesizes information to construct new concepts or integrates new and prior information
4. "Using information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose"		Makes use of appropriate information in research product	Supports an argument and effectively integrate material from several sources	Argumentation (including use of secondary sources) is deft, compelling, and opens or refines thought
5. "Understanding the economic, legal, and social issues surrounding the use of information technology, as well as observing laws, regulations, and institutional policies related to the access and use of information"	Any plagiarism earns a score of 0	Acquires and cites information ethically	Acquires and cites information ethically and consistently implements the style guide correctly	Correctly describes many of the ethical and legal issues surrounding the use of information, such as copyright, fair use, privacy, intellectual Property, plagiarism.

Additional Scoring Notes

Course score = average of scores for all applicable categories (all categories present in assessed work)

N: Insufficient material submitted to make a judgment of proficiency level.

In addition to the score levels listed above, a score of "N" may be given occasionally. "N" stands for "not evaluated." This score should be used only when there is not evidence that the student's proficiency level merits a 0.

Appendix 1b. Public Presentation Scoring Rubric

A public presentation assignment should include at least four of the objectives listed below

Objectives assessed	0	1	2	3
	<i>Fail</i> Falls short of 1	<i>Pass (minimal pass)</i> Proficiency in at least 2 areas below for 100 level courses and in at least 3 areas for 200 level and above	<i>Meets expectations.</i> A score of 2 in at least 2 areas	<i>Work stands out beyond expectations. No more than 25% of scores over time.</i> A score of 3 in at least two areas; no zeros
1. Professionalism		Appearance mostly aligned with requirements and timeframe, some evidence of rehearsal and knowledge of audience demographics	Appearance aligned with requirements and timeframe, evidence of rehearsal and knowledge of audience demographics.	Appearance, fully aligned with requirements and timeframe without rushing, consistent evidence of rehearsal and knowledge of audience demographics.
2. Structure		Basic coherence with structure; some strategy but not always effective; occasional connectors to audience.	Effectively utilizes: openers, middles and closers; logical, ethical and emotional strategies fitting speech topic; transitions; and audience connectors.	Designs creative and original openers, middles closers, and transitions; employs compelling strategies in logos, ethos and pathos; relates consciously and dynamically to audience at all times.
3. Content		Appropriate accuracy, research, citations, critical thinking and use of visual aids	Met expectations for accuracy, research, citations, critical thinking and use of visual aids	Perfect accuracy, in-depth research and analysis, citations used correctly and creative and effective use of visual aids.
4. Verbal communication		Voice is audible to most of audience, vocal dynamics appropriate but sometimes irregular, pacing is acceptable but not used for effect, appropriate but mostly ordinary language.	Voice is audible, inflections maintained audience attention, pacing varied for expression, language effective and eloquent.	Voice is clear and audible, vocal pitch dynamic and creative to generate interest, pacing excellent to enhance the expression and emphasis, language eloquent, beautiful and powerful
5. Non-verbal communication		Some use of eye contact, movement and gesture, poise and usage of notes	Regular use of eye contact, movement and gestures intentional to support content, demonstrated good poise and minimal usage of notes	Frequent effective eye contact with whole audience, intentional and confident use of movement and gestures to support content, demonstrated excellent stance, poise and posture and did not use notes.

Additional Scoring Notes

Course score = average of scores for all applicable categories (all categories present in assessed work)

N: Insufficient material submitted to make a judgment of proficiency level.

In additional to the score levels listed above, a score of “N” may be given occasionally. “N” stands for “not evaluated.” This score should be used only when there is not evidence that the student’s proficiency level merits a 0.

Appendix 1c. Quantitative Reasoning Scoring Rubric

0	1	2	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The student shows a lack of understanding of the process or concepts. • The student incorrectly executes multiple steps in a project. • The student has not mastered basic applications, such as unit conversion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The student shows an understanding of the basic concepts. • The student mishandles one step in a multiple step process in some cases. • The student can repeat a process shown without additional help, but does not reliably generalize to similar applications. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The student shows an understanding of the basic concepts. • The student navigates all steps in a multiple step process in most cases. • The student can generalize procedures to similar applications without additional direction. 	<p>In addition to showing ability at the level of scoring 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The student is able to analyze a QR model for its strengths and weaknesses based on context. • The student can find causes or consequences of results outside the scope of the basic assignment. • The student can generalize procedures to more difficult applications without direction.

Proficiency Standards for course components:

While a QR-component course must have QR assignments equating to 10% of the course grade for a three credit course, the QR score generated may include supporting assignments or test questions which demonstrate an ability to perform on these QR assignments but are not actually part of the assignments.

Appendix 1d. Writing Scoring Rubric

Categories	0	1	2	3
Score level	<i>Fail</i>	<i>Pass (minimal pass)</i>	<i>Meets expectations</i>	<i>Stands out beyond expectations. No more than 25% of scores reported over time.</i>
Overall structure	Falls short of 1	Basic coherence.	Structure supports argument, assertion, or concept, but with periodic lapses.	Structure fluently supports argument, assertion, or concept.
Support and development of argument or concept	Falls short of 1	Argument or conceptual thread integrates some source material, evidence, or background, but lacks sufficient quantity or uses it inadequately.	Writing demonstrates ability to support an argument or concept and integrate material from sources or types of evidence.	Argumentation or conceptual development (including use of secondary sources) is deft, compelling, and opens or refines thought.
Sentence level grammar, usage, and mechanics	Falls short of 1	Multiple errors in grammar, usage, and/or syntax are distracting but do not substantially obscure meaning.	Errors in grammar, usage, or syntax are infrequent enough not to distract from meaning. Paragraph understood as a unit and as part of a larger whole.	Creative and original uses of language and structure, virtually error-free.
Documentation	Falls short of 1	Multiple errors in documentation are distracting but do not prevent reader from tracing sources.	Documentation in discipline-appropriate style is comprehensive, with few errors.	Documentation in discipline-appropriate style is virtually perfect.

Additional Scoring Notes

Course score = average of scores for all applicable categories (all categories present in assessed work)

N: Insufficient material submitted to make a judgment of proficiency level.

Appendix 1e. Standard Grammar Test Rubric

Assessment score is determined by converting the final standard grammar test grades from Writing 101 to a 0-3 scale:

Final Grammar Test Grade	Assessment Score
Below 60	0
60-74.9	1
75-89.9	2
90 or above	3