NCA Self Study

Criterion 4 Documents

Eastern Illinois University

Year~2014

Collegiate Learning Assessment Seniors 2012 CASA

This paper is posted at The Keep. $\label{eq:http://thekeep.eiu.edu/eiunca_assessment_docs/23} http://thekeep.eiu.edu/eiunca_assessment_docs/23$

CLA SP12 Senior Criterion Referenced Scores & Rubrics

Scoring Criteria: Make-an-Argument¹

| | Analytic Reasoning & Evaluation | Writing Effectiveness | Writing Mechanics |
|---|--|--|---|
| | Stating a position, providing valid resons to | Constructing an organized and logically | Facility with the conventions of standard |
| | support the writer's position, and | cohesive argument. Strengthening the writer's | written English (agreement, tense, |
| | demonstrating an understanding of the | position by elaborating on the reasons for that | capitalization, punctuation, and spelling) |
| | complexity of the issue by considering and | position (e.g., providing evidence, examples, | and control of the English language, |
| | possibly refuting alternative viewpoints. | and logical reasoning). | including syntax (sentence structure) and |
| | process game as a process | 9, | diction (word usage). |
| | *Asserts an insightful position and provides | *Organizes response in a logically cohiesive way | *Demonstrates outstanding control of |
| | multiple (at least 4) sound reasons to justify it. | that makes it very easy to follow the writer's | grammatical conventions. |
| | *Provides analysis that reflects a thorough | arguments. | *Consistently writes well-constructed, complex |
| | consideration of the complexity of the issue. | *Provides valid and comprehensive elaboration on | sentences with varied structure and length. |
| 6 | Possibly refutes major counterarguments or | facts or ideas related to each arguemtn and clearly | *Displays adept use of vocabulary that is |
| | considers contexts integral to the issue (e.g., | cites sources of information. | precise, advanced, and varied. |
| | ethical, cultural, social, political). | 00/ EUL/40/ AU | 00/ EUL/00/ AU |
| | 0% EIU / 1% AII | 0% EIU / 1% AII *Organizes response in a logically cohesive way | 0% EIU / 0% AII *Demonstrates very good control of grammatical |
| | *States a thoughtful position and provides multiple (at elast 3) sound resons to support it. | that makes it fairly easy to follow the writer's | conventions. |
| | *Provides analysis that reflects some | arguments. | *Consistently writes well-constructed sentences |
| | consideration of the complexity of the issue. | *Provides valid elaboration on facts or dieas related | with varied structure and length. |
| 5 | Possibly considers contexts integral to the issue | to each argument and cites sources of information. | *Uses varied and sometimes advanced |
| | (e.g., ethical, cultural, social, political). | | vocabulary that effectively communicates ideas. |
| | 4% EIU / 14% AII | 4% EIU / 18% AII | 7% EIU / 17% AII |
| | *States a clear position and some (2-3) sound | *Organizes response in a way that makes the | *Demonstrates good control of grammatical |
| | reasons to support it. | writer's arguments apparent but not obvious. | conventions with few errors. |
| 4 | *Provides some superficial analysis of the | *Provides valid elaboration on facts or dieas | *Writes well-constructed sentences with some |
| 4 | issues. | several times and cites sources of information. | varied structure and length. |
| | | | *Uses vocabulary that clearly communicates ideas but lacks variety. |
| | 26% EIU / 45% AII | 22% EIU / 40% AII | 48% EIU / 55% AII |
| | *States or implies a position and provides few (1- | *Provides limited or somewhat unclear arguments. | *Demonstrates fair control of grammatical |
| | 2) reasons to support it. | Presents relevant information in each response, but | conventions with frequent minor errors. |
| | *Provides some careful analysis, but it lacks | that information is not woven into arguments. | *Writes sentences that read naturally but tend to |
| | consideration of the issue's complexity. | *Provides elaboration on facts or ideas a few times, | have similar structure and length. |
| 3 | | some of which is valid. Sources of information are | *Uses vocabulary that communicates ideas |
| | | sometimes unclear. | adequately but lacks variety. |
| | 37% EIU / 30% AII | 43% EIU / 29% AII | 30% EIU / 22% AII |
| | *States or implies a position and provides vague | *Provides limited, invalid, over-stated, or very | *Demonstrates poor control of grammatical |
| | or very ffew reasons to support it. | unclear arguments. May present information in a | conventions with frequent minor errors and some |
| | *Provides little analysis, and that analysis may | disorganized fashion or undermine own points. *Any elaboration on facts or ideas tends to be | distracting errors. |
| | reflect an oversimplification of the issue. | vague, irrelevant, inaccurate, or unreliable (e.g., | *Consistently writes sentences with similar structure and length, and some may be difficult |
| _ | | based entirely on writer's opinion). Sources of | to understand. |
| 2 | | information are often unclear. | *Uses simple vocabulary and some vocabulary |
| | | and the same and t | may be used inaccurately or in a way that makes |
| | | | meaning unclear. |
| | 24% EIU / 9% AII | 22% EIU /9% AII | 9% EIU / 5% AII |
| | *States an unclear position (if any) and fails to | *Does not develop convincing arguments. Writing | *Demonstrates minimal control of grammatical |
| | provide reasons to support it. | may be disorganized and confusing. | conventions with many errors that make the |
| | *Provides very little evidence of analysis. May | *Does not provide elaboration on facts or ideas. | response difficult to read or provides insufficient |
| 1 | | | |
| 1 | not understand the issue. | | evidence to judge. |
| | not understand the issue. | | *Writes sentences that are repetitive or |
| 1 | not understand the issue. | | *Writes sentences that are repetitive or incomplete, and some are difficult to understand. |
| 1 | not understand the issue. | | *Writes sentences that are repetitive or incomplete, and some are difficult to understand. *Uses simple vocabulary, and some vocabulary |
| 1 | not understand the issue. 9% EIU / 2% All | 9% EIU / 2% AII | *Writes sentences that are repetitive or incomplete, and some are difficult to understand. |

¹ Percentages refer to the percentage of EIU seniors who received each score in Spring 2012 compared to all CLA seniors that semester. EIU % is first. Students were tested in their senior seminar course, and 100 senior students participated.

Scoring Criteria: Critique-an-Argument

| | Analytic Reasoning & Evaluation | Writing Effectiveness | Writing Mechanics |
|---|---|--|--|
| | Interpreting, analyzing, and evaluating the | Constructing organized and logically cohesive | Facility with the conventions of standard |
| | quality of information. This entails | arguments. Strengthening the writer's position | written English (agreement, tense, |
| | highlighting conflicting information, | by elaborating on deficiencies in the arguemtn | capitalization, punctuation, and spelling) |
| | detecting flaws in logic and questionable | (e.g., providing explanations and examples). | and control of the English language, |
| | assumptions, and explaining why | | including syntax (sentence structure) and |
| | information is credible, unreliable, or limited. | | diction (word choice and usage). |
| | *Demonstrates accurate understanding of | *Organizes response in a logically cohiesive | *Demonstrates outstanding control of |
| | the complete argument. | way that makes it very easy to follow the | grammatical conventions. |
| | *Identifies many (at elast 5) deficiencies in | writer's critique. | *Consistently writes well-constructed, |
| 6 | the argument and provides analysis that | *Provides valid and comprehensive | complex sentences with varied structure |
| 0 | goes beyond the obvious. | elaboration for each identified deficiency. | and length. |
| | | | *Displays adept use of vocabulary that is |
| | | | precise, advanced, and varied. |
| | 0% EIU / 1% AII | 0% EIU / 1% AII | 0% EIU / 0% AII |
| | *Demonstrates accurate understanding of | *Organizes response in a logically cohesive | *Demonstrates very good control of |
| | much of the argument. | way that makes it fairly easy to follow the | grammatical conventions. |
| | *Identifies many (at least 4) deficiencies in | writer's critique. | *Consistently writes well-constructed |
| _ | the argument. | *Provides valid elaboration for each identified | sentences with varied structure and length. |
| 5 | | deficiency. | *Uses varied and sometimes advanced |
| | | | vocabulary that effectively communicates |
| | 4% EIU / 13% AII | 0% EIU / 12% AII | ideas. 4% EIU / 20% AII |
| | *Demonstrates accurate understanding of | *Organizes response in a way that makes the | *Demonstrates good control of grammatical |
| | several aspects of the argument, but | writer's critique and its logica apparent but not | conventions with few errors. |
| 4 | disregards a few. | obvious. | *Writes well-constructed sentences with |
| 4 | *Identifies several (at least 3) deficiencies in | *Provides valid elaboration on identified | some varied structure and length. |
| | the argument. | deficiencies several times. | *Uses vocabulary that clearly |
| | | | communicates ideas but lacks variety. |
| | 28% EIU / 34% AII | 37% EIU / 37% AII | 65% EIU / 54% AII |
| | *Disregards several aspects of the | *Provides a limited or somewhat unclear | *Demonstrates fair control of grammatical |
| | argument or makes minor misinterpretations of the argument. | critique. Presents relevant information, but that information is not woven into an | conventions with frequent minor errors. *Writes sentences that read naturally but |
| | *Identifies a few (2-3) deficiencies in the | argument. | tend to have similar structure and length. |
| 3 | argument and may accept unreliable | *Provides valid elaboration on identified | *Uses vocabulary that communicates ideas |
| | evidence as credible. | deficiencies a few times. | adequately but lacks variety. |
| | 0.130.100 0.00.131.01 | | |
| | 41% EIU / 34% AII | 39% EIU / 34% AII | 26% EIU / 21% AII |
| | *Disregards or misinterprets much of the | *Provides limited, invalid, over-stated, or very | *Demonstrates poor control of grammatical |
| | information in the argument. | unclear critique. May present information in a | conventions with frequent minor errors and |
| | *Identifies very few (1-2) deficiencies in the argument and may accept unreliable | disorganized fashion or undermine own points. | some distracting errors. *Consistently writes sentences with similar |
| | evidence as credible. | *Any elaboration on identified deficiencies | structure and length, and some may be |
| 2 | ovidende de dicalbie. | tends to be vague, irrelevant, inaccurate, or | difficult to understand. |
| | | unreliable (e.g., based entirely on writer's | *Uses simple vocabulary and some |
| | | opinion). | vocabulary may be used inaccurately or in a |
| | | ' | way that makes meaning unclear. |
| | 17% EIU / 14% AII | 22% EIU / 13% AII | 4% EIU / 4% AII |
| | *Disregards or severely misinterprets | *Fails to develop a convincing critique or | *Demonstrates minimal control of |
| | important information in the argument. | agrees entirely with the flawed argument. The | grammatical conventions with many errors |
| | *Fails to identify deficiencies in the | writing may be disorganized and confusing. *Fails to provide elaboration on identified | that make the response difficult to read or provides insufficient evidence to judge. |
| | argument or provides no evidence of critical analysis. | deficiencies. | *Writes sentences that are repetitive or |
| 1 | anarysis. | denoterotes. | incomplete, and some are difficult to |
| ' | | | understand. |
| | | | *Uses simple vocabulary, and some |
| | | | vocabulary is used inaccurately or in a way |
| | | | that makes meaning unclear. |
| | 9% EIU / 5% AII | 2% EIU / 3% AII | 0% EIU / 1% AII |
| | | | |

Scoring Criteria: Performance Task

| | Scoring Criteria: Performance Task | | | | | |
|------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| | Analytic Reasoning & Evaluation | Writing Effectiveness | Writing Mechanics | Problem Solving | | |
| | Interpreting, analyzing, and evaluating the | Constructing organized and logically | Facility with the conventions of standard | Considering and weighing information from | | |
| | quality of information. This entails | cohesive arguments. Strengthening the | written English (agreement, tense, | discrete sources to make decisions (draw a | | |
| | identifying information that is relevant to a | writer's position by providing elaboration | capitalization, punctuation, and spelling) | conclusion and/or propose a course of action) | | |
| | problem, highlighting connected and | on facts or ideas (e.g., explaining how | and control of the English language, | that logically follow from valid arguments, | | |
| | conflicting information, detecting flows in | evidence bears on the problem, | including syntax (sentence structure) | evidence, and examples. Considering the | | |
| | logic and questionable assumptions, and | providing examples, and emphasizing | and diction (word choice and usage). | implications of decisions and suggesting | | |
| | explaining why information is credible, | especially convincing evidence). | | additional research when appropriate. | | |
| | unreliable, or limited. | | | 1 - | | |
| | *Identifies most facts or ideas that support of | *Organizes response in a logically | *Demonstrates outstanding control of | *Provides a decision and a solid rationale | | |
| | refute all major arguments (or saliant | cohiesive way that makes it very easy | grammatical conventions. | based on credible evidence from a variety of | | |
| | features of all objects to be classified) | to follow the writer's arguments. | *Consistently writes well-constructed, | sources. Weighs other options, but presents | | |
| _ | presented in the Document Library. | *Provides valid and comprehensive | complex sentences with varied structure | the decision as best given the available | | |
| 6 | Provides analysis that goes beyond the | elaboration on facts or ideas related to | and length. | evidence. | | |
| | obvious. *Demonstrates accurate understanding of a | each arguemtn and clearly cites sources of information. | *Displays adept use of vocabulary that is precise, advanced, and varied. | When applicable: *Proposes a coruse of action that follows logically from the | | |
| | large body of information from the DL. | Sources of information. | is precise, advanced, and varied. | conclusion. Considers implications. | | |
| | *Makes several accurate claims about the | | | *Recognizes the need for additional research. | | |
| | quality of information. | | | Recommends specific research that would | | |
| | quality of information. | | | address most unanswered questions. | | |
| | 0% EIU / 1% AII | 0% EIU / 1% AII | 0% EIU / 1% AII | 0% EIU / 1% AII | | |
| | *Identifies several facts or ideas that support | *Organizes response in a logically | *Demonstrates very good control of | *Provides a decision and a solid rationale | | |
| | or refute all major arguments (or salient | cohesive way that makes it fairly easy | grammatical conventions. | based largely on credible evidence from | | |
| | features of all objects to be classified) | to follow the writer's arguments. | *Consistently writes well-constructed | multiple sources and discounts alternatives. | | |
| | presented in the DL. | *Provides valid elaboration on facts or | sentences with varied structure and | When applicable: *Proposes a course of | | |
| 5 | *Demonstrates accurate understanding of | dieas related to each argument and | length. | action that follows logically from the | | |
| | much of the DL content. | cites sources of information. | *Uses varied and sometimes advanced | conclusion. May consider implications. | | |
| | *Makes a few accurate claims about the | | vocabulary that effectively | *Recognizes the need for additional research. | | |
| | quality of information. | | communicates ideas. | Suggests research that would address some | | |
| | 00/ 5111/400/ 411 | 00/ EUL/400/ AU | 20/ 511 / 420/ 41 | unanswered questions. | | |
| | 0% EIU / 12% AII | 2% EIU / 12% AII | 2% EIU / 13% AII | 2% EIU / 9% AII | | |
| | *Identifies a few facts or ideas that support | *Organizes response in a way that | *Demonstrates good control of | *Provides a decision and credible evidence to | | |
| | or refute all major arguments (or salient features of all objects to be classified) | makes the writer's arguments apparent but not obvious. | grammatical conventions with few errors. | back it up. Possibly does not account for credible, contradictory evidence. May | | |
| | presented in the DL. | *Provides valid elaboration on facts or | *Writes well-constructed sentences with | attempt to discount alternatives. | | |
| 4 | *Briefly demonstrates accurate | dieas several times and cites sources of | some varied structure and length. | When applicable: *Proposes a course of | | |
| , , | understanding of important DL content.but | information. | *Uses vocabulary that clearly | action that follows logically from the | | |
| | disregards some information. | inomason. | communicates ideas but lacks variety. | conclusion. May briefly consider implications. | | |
| | *Makes a very few accurate claims about | | , | 8Recognizes the need for additional | | |
| | the quality of information. | | | research. Suggests research that would | | |
| | | | | address an unanswered question. | | |
| | 21% EIU / 36% AII | 21% EIU / 38% AII | 25% EIU / 51% AII | 15% EIU / 34% AII | | |
| | *Identifies a few facts or ideas that support | *Provides limited or somewhat unclear | *Demonstrates fair control of | *Provides or implies a decision and some | | |
| | or refute several arguments (or salient | arguments. Presents relevant | grammatical conventions with frequent | reason to favor it, but the rationale may be | | |
| | features of all objects to be classified) | information in each response, but that | minor errors. *Writes sentences that read naturally | contradicted by unaccounted for evidence. When applicable: *Briefly proposes a source | | |
| | presented in the DL. *Disregards important information or makes | information is not woven into arguments. | but tend to have similar structure and | of action, but some aspects may not follow | | |
| | minor misinterpretations of information. May | *Provides elaboration on facts or ideas | length. | logically from the conclusion. | | |
| 3 | restate information "as is." | a few times, some of which is valid. | *Uses vocabulary that communicates | *May recognize the need for additional | | |
| | *Rarely, if ever, makes claims about the | Sources of information are sometimes | ideas adequately but lacks variety. | research. Any suggested research tends to | | |
| | quality of information and may present some | unclear. | | be vague or would not adequately address | | |
| | unreliable evidence as credible. | | | unanswered questions. | | |
| | 33% EIU / 34% AII | 40% EIU / 33% AII | 42% EIU / 28% AII | 35% EIU / 36% AII | | |
| | *Identifies very few facts or ideas that | *Provides limited, invalid, over-stated, | *Demonstrates poor control of | *Provides or impliues a decision, but very little | | |
| | support or refute arguments (or salient | or very unclear arguments. May | grammatical conventions with frequent | rationale is provided or it si based heavily on | | |
| | features of all objects to be classified) | present information in a disorganized | minor errors and some distracting | unreliable evidence. | | |
| 0 | presented in the DL. | fashion or undermine own points. | errors. | When applicable: *Briefly proposes a course | | |
| 2 | *Disregards or misinterprets much of the DL. | *Any elaboration on facts or ideas tends | *Consistently writes sentences with | of action, but some aspects do not follow | | |
| | May restate information "as is." *Does not make claims about the quality of | to be vague, irrelevant, inaccurate, or unreliable (e.g., based entirely on | similar structure and length, and some may be difficult to understand. | logically from the conclusion. *May recognize the need for additional | | |
| | information and presents some reliable | writer's opinion). Sources of | *Uses simple vocabulary and some | research. Any suggested research is vague | | |
| | information and presents some reliable information as credible. | information are often unclear. | vocabulary may be used inaccurately or | or would not adequately address unanswered | | |
| | | | in a way that makes meaning unclear. | questions. | | |
| | 38% EIU / 14% AII | 27% EIU / 12% AII | 29% EIU / 6% AII | 44% EIU / 17% AII | | |
| | *Does not identify facts or ideas that support | *Does not develop convincing | *Demonstrates minimal control of | *Provides no clear decision or no valid | | |
| | or refute arguments (or saliant features of all | arguments. Writing may be | grammatical conventions with many | rationale for the decision. | | |
| | objects to be classified). | disorganized and confusing. | errors that make the response difficult | When applicable: *Does not propose a | | |
| , | *Disregards or severely misinterprets | *Does not provide elaboration on facts | to read or provides insufficient evidence | course of action that follows logically from the | | |
| 1 | important information. | or ideas. | to judge. | conclusion. | | |
| | *Does not make claims about the quality of | | *Writes sentences that are repetitive or | *Does not recognize the need for additional | | |
| | evidence and bases response on unreliable information. | | incomplete, and some are difficult to understand. | research or does not suggest research that | | |
| | iniomation. | | *Uses simple vocabulary, and some | would address unanswered questions. | | |
| | | | vocabulary is used inaccurately or in a | | | |
| | | | way that makes meaning unclear. | | | |
| | 8% EIU / 3% AII | 10% EIU / 3% AII | 2% EIU / 2% AII | 4% EIU / 3% AII | | |
| | <u> </u> | | | | | |

Senior Summary Subscore Statistics

Analytic Reasoning & Evaluation

| Task | Statistics | EIU Scores | All Scores |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------|------------|
| Performance Task | Mean | 2.7 | 3.4 |
| | Standard Deviation | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| Make-an-Argument | Mean | 2.9 | 3.6 |
| | Standard Deviation | 1.0 | 0.8 |
| Critique-an-argument | Mean | 3.0 | 3.4 |
| | Standard Deviation | 1.0 | 0.9 |

Writing Effectiveness

| Task | Statistics | EIU Scores | All Scores |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------|------------|
| Performance Task | Mean | 2.8 | 3.5 |
| | Standard Deviation | 1.0 | 0.9 |
| Make-an-Argument | Mean | 2.9 | 3.7 |
| | Standard Deviation | 1.0 | 0.9 |
| Critique-an-argument | Mean | 3.1 | 3.5 |
| | Standard Deviation | 0.8 | 0.9 |

Writing Mechanics

| Task | Statistics | EIU Scores | All Scores |
|----------------------|--------------------|------------|------------|
| Performance Task | Mean | 3.0 | 3.7 |
| | Standard Deviation | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| Make-an-Argument | Mean | 3.4 | 3.8 |
| | Standard Deviation | 1.0 | 0.7 |
| Critique-an-argument | Mean | 3.7 | 3.9 |
| | Standard Deviation | 0.6 | 0.7 |

Problem Solving

| Task | Statistics | EIU Scores | All Scores |
|------------------|--------------------|------------|------------|
| Performance Task | Mean | 2.7 | 3.3 |
| | Standard Deviation | 0.9 | 0.9 |