NCA Self Study

Criterion 4 Documents

Collegiate Learning Assessment Seniors 2012

CASA

CLA SP12 Senior Criterion Referenced Scores & Rubrics

Scoring Criteria: Make-an-Argument[1]

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

Scoring Criteria: Critique-an-Argument

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

Scoring Criteria: Performance Task

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

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