📄 2013-2014 Assessment Annual Report

👥 Public for this Department and lower

Title:	2013-2014 Assessment Annual Report
Start:	7/1/2013
End:	6/30/2014
Progress:	
Providing Department:	BA/BS/BGS

1. What are your current degree-level learning outcomes? Have the learning outcomes been modified over the last year? :

Our program faculty met on Nov 12. 2014 specifically to discuss our degree-level assessment. We reviewed our learning outcomes and decided they require no update.

After graduation, students will be able to

1. Analyze environmental systems using interdisciplinary approaches and methods.

2. Demonstrate disciplinary and/or thematic depth of training.

3. Use environmental knowledge in being an active, engaged citizen/professional.

4. Communicate effectively orally and in writing for diverse audiences, including scientists, policy makers, and fellow citizens.

2. What evidence of student learning was collected in the past year? Which learning outcomes does the evidence address? :

Faculty collected written assignments in the following courses that are the backbone of our major (core courses): Global Environment I and II, Environmental Law, Environmental Policy Analysis, Field Ecology, and the Capstone course. This was in anticipation of a discussion about how well students were meeting outcome 4 (4. Communicate effectively orally and in writing for diverse audiences, including scientists, policy makers, and fellow citizens.). It's important to mention as well that the University assisted the program in collecting writing assessment data from fall 2011 and fall 2012 from our Environmental Law (EVRN 332) and Field Ecology (EVRN 460) courses. The Capstone course instructor put all final projects of the course available on a website.

⊞ 📁 early University-led writing assessments

3. What have you learned from the evidence you collected? :

For all the courses in question, we learned through our discussion that we need to develop a system to measure precisely how many of our students in the courses are meeting outcome 4, which was the focus of this year's assessment. Moreover, it became clear that while all of the courses involve some form of oral demonstration of knowledge, these are not regularly assigned in courses formally. Our discussion, thus, focused on sharing what is done in each course in which written and oral work to assess student learning, and what techniques professors were using as of late to help improve the overall quality of student work.

1. Global Environment I and II - In this year-long freshman course, which meets all of Goal 3 of the KU Core, students are now given an opportunity for extre-credit if they give a short oral presentation to the entire class of 80+ students on their experience taking part in one of the required campus engagement activities that are part of the course, or by simply bringing in a recent article from research or news that was related to course topics. Over the course of the semester, the quality of the presentations increased dramatically. The professors sensed that students took it as a challenge, or a competition, to "out do" each other, in a friendly way, by having a stronger structure to their presentation and providing deeper levels of reflection and reaction to the experience they were sharing. From this we learned that there was a positive impact on learning to present orally, but the drawback was that not all students presented, since it was offered only as extra-credit. Nevertheless, the professors saw an advantage to keeping this a part of the course, because it likely helps prepare students for presenting orally in future classes in the major.

As far as written work, the Global Environment I and II exams are all essay exams, with questions that test fundamental knowledge of tools and concepts in the humanities, social sciences and natural sciences in studies of the environment and environmental change. As a KU core course, faculty will be conducting an assessment of meeting those goals as a course in the core. Our discussion focused on ways in which we can use these examinations as a way to prepare students for success in later years when they take Law, Policy, Field Ecology and Capstone. One way suggested was to help students focus their writing with questions with clear parts and sections that train students to get to the point and share relevant information concisely and in an organized fashion. Instructors use rubrics for grading of exam questions, and professors have recently become more engaged in grading calibration to ensure student work is properly assessed.

2. Environmental Law - The discussion about the environmental law course brought up the importance of using scaffolding in writing projects. Rather than give students one big assignment due at the end of the semester, students show elements of progress toward completion of the final project, for example, turning in an outline early on, then a first drat for comments, then the final paper at the end.

3. Environmental policy analysis - In this course, the instructor has experimented with giving students greater choice in topics to address in their writing, which has allowed for students to express better the main principles they have learned about policy analysis. Similar to the Global Environment courses, the instructor has worked to provide a clear structure within which students do their writing, which has helped raise the quality of student work. All exams in this course as well are take-home exams, which gives students the time to think, reflect, and organize their thoughts. Assessment of scores for these exams has been improved recently by developing robust grading rubrics that are discussed with the GTAs to ensure fair grading. Such work is facilitated by having at least 2, ideally 3 GTAs for this writing-intensive course.

4. Field ecology - The instructor has recently worked to scaffold writing assignments, and in this course, this should allow students to produce a more comprehensive set of reports, including data they collected in the field, and data from secondary literature on an environmental topic.

5. Capstone course - Written work is fairly extensive. Students write a series of assignments on blackboard related to their Capstone projects or course content. The capstone project is a group project in which research is conducted on a KU sustainability theme, that is also a service learning project. Topics in Spring 2014 included; Prairie restoration plans for the prairie Acre; Plans for putting more solar installations on campus, and etc. For each project drafts were submitted to the Instructors and 2 talented GTAs for review, also draft presentations were made and final projects were presented (from 20-50 pages long) in both oral and written form. With last round of editing, all reports have been presented to both the EVRN program and the Center for Sustainability and are now posted at: http://sustain.ku.edu/evrn-capstone-projects. The instructor estimates that 95% of our students are achieving the goals of the course, and given the scaffolding in this course, the final products often exceed expectations for achieving goal 4 of our degree.

4. What recommendations have been generated from discussions of assessment results among the faculty? : In sum, the discussion resulted in an overall sense that in the coming 2015 year, we should continue to focus on scaffolding writing assignments, provide opportunities for oral presentations in all of these core classes, and we should also ensure that students are provided guidance as to what are the essential elements of an excellent oral presentation. Instructors agreed to share examples of student work from all of their classes and to provide each other with examples of guides to use for helping students know the essential elements of excellent oral presentations. Developing a system to share those examples of work is a work in progress, though the capstone projects are listed in the website: http://sustain.ku.edu/evrn-capstone-projects. The Director will collect other student work and ensure that all faculty have access to them. It was suggested that for the EVRN 332 and 460 courses that the rubric for writing assessments used back in the 2011 and 2012 University-led writing assessments could be used again to assess where we are in 2015 compared to then to help us think more specifically about how to improve student writing and oral presentation. We also agreed to continue focusing our efforts on goal 4 of our learning outcomes for 2015.

5. What changes did you make as a result of these assessments in the past year? :
a. Please provide your candid feedback on the degree-level assessment process for the Provost's Office and The University Assessment Committee to help make the process more efficient and useful for academic units. (Optional): This was the first year that our program has formally assessed one of our learning outcomes, so the only changes we can report are those mentioned above, where instructors shared what they were doing in their own particular classes that was new in order to improve student learning in the area of writing and oral presentations.

b. Would you like to receive peer feedback on your report? (Optional): Feedback from the Assessment Specialist

c. Reviewers' feedback on the report upon request (available for units to view in the following spring semester): This report was selected as the winner of the 2015 Assessment Award and featured at the assessment website: http://assessment.ku.edu/2015-degree-level-assessment-winner

EVRN 332 Fall 2011 Learner Outcomes Report

Context and Purpose of Writing

	Primary Reader				Secondary Reader			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.	6	32%			5	28%		
3 - 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).	6	32%			7	39%		
2 - Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).	3	16%	2.74		5	28%	2.89	
1 - Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).	4	21%			1	6%		
Total	19	100%			18	100%		

	Overall			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.	11	30%		
3 - 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).	13	35%		
2 - Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).	8	22%	2.81	1.02
1 - Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).	5	14%		
Total	37	100%		

2/2/2012
For internal use only
1
For internal use only

EVRN 332 Fall 2011 Learner Outcomes Report

Content Development

	Primary Reader				Secondary Reader			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work.	4	21%			3	17%		
3 - Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work.	5	26%	2.53		4	22%	2.44	
2 - Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work.	7	37%			9	50%		
1 - Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work.	3	16%			2	11%		
Total	19	100%			18	100%		

	Overall			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work.	7	19%		
3 - Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work.	9	24%	2.49	0.96
2 - Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work.	16	43%		
1 - Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work.	5	14%		
Total	37	100%		

Genre and Conventions

	Primary Reader				Secondary Reader			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Builds a cogent, persuasive, and high quality argument that supports an issue(s) driven by clearly delineated values.	3	16%			4	22%		
3 - Builds a compelling, credible, and convincing argument that supports an issue(s) driven by clear and focused values.	3	16%			2	11%		
2 - Builds an average argument that gives some support for an issue(s) based upon relevant values.	12	63%	2.42		10	56%	2.44	
1 - Builds an ordinary argument with marginal support for an issue(s) giving some attention to values.	1	5%			2	11%		
Total	19	100%			18	100%		

	Overall			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Builds a cogent, persuasive, and high quality argument that supports an issue(s) driven by clearly delineated values.	7	19%		
3 - Builds a compelling, credible, and convincing argument that supports an issue(s) driven by clear and focused values.	5	14%		
2 - Builds an average argument that gives some support for an issue(s) based upon relevant values.	22	59%	2.43	0.90
1 - Builds an ordinary argument with marginal support for an issue(s) giving some attention to values.	3	8%		
Total	37	100%		

Sources and Evidence

	Primary Reader				Secondary Reader			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the assignment	3	16%			3	17%		
3 - Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the assignment.	6	32%	2.58		4	22%	2.39	
2 - Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the assignment.	9	47%			8	44%		
1 - Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the assignment.	1	5%			3	17%		
Total	19	100%			18	100%		

	Overall			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the assignment	6	16%		
3 - Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the assignment.	10	27%	2.49	0.90
2 - Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the assignment.	17	46%		
1 - Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the assignment.	4	11%		
Total	37	100%		

Control of Syntax and Mechanics

	Primary Reader				Secondary Reader			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free.	4	21%	2.47		4	22%	2.50	
3 - Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the assignment has few errors.	3	16%			2	11%		
2 - Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors.	10	53%			11	61%		
1 - Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.	2	11%			1	6%		
Total	19	100%			18	100%		

	Overall			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free.	8	22%	2.49	0.93
3 - Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the assignment has few errors.	5	14%		
2 - Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors.	21	57%		
1 - Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.	3	8%		
Total	37	100%		

EVRN 332 Fall 2012 Learner Outcomes Report

Context and Purpose of Writing

	Primary Reader				Secondary Reader			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.	4	18%			4	19%		
3 - 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).	5	23%			6	29%		
2 - Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).	13	59%	2.59		11	52%	2.67	
1 - Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).	0	0%			0	0%		
Total	22	100%			21	100%		

	Overall			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.	8	19%		
3 - 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).	11	26%		
2 - Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).	24	56%	2.63	0.79
1 - Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).	0	0%		
Total	43	100%		

1/7/2013
For internal use only
1
For internal use only

EVRN 332 Fall 2012 Learner Outcomes Report

Content Development

	Primary Reader				Secondary Reader			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work.	4	18%	2.68		4	19%	2.81	
3 - Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work.	8	36%			9	43%		
2 - Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work.	9	41%			8	38%		
1 - Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work.	1	5%			0	0%		
Total	22	100%			21	100%		

	Overall			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work.	8	19%	2.74	0.79
3 - Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work.	17	40%		
2 - Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work.	17	40%		
1 - Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work.	1	2%		
Total	43	100%		

1/7/2013
For internal use only
2
For internal use only

Genre and Conventions

	Primary Reader				Secondary Reader			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Builds a cogent, persuasive, and high quality argument that supports an issue(s) driven by clearly delineated values.	2	9%			5	24%		
3 - Builds a compelling, credible, and convincing argument that supports an issue(s) driven by clear and focused values.	10	45%	2.64		9	43%	2.86	
2 - Builds an average argument that gives some support for an issue(s) based upon relevant values.	10	45%			6	29%		
1 - Builds an ordinary argument with marginal support for an issue(s) giving some attention to values.	0	0%			1	5%		
Total	22	100%			21	100%		

	Overall			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Builds a cogent, persuasive, and high quality argument that supports an issue(s) driven by clearly delineated values.	7	16%		
3 - Builds a compelling, credible, and convincing argument that supports an issue(s) driven by clear and focused values.	19	44%	2.74	0.76
2 - Builds an average argument that gives some support for an issue(s) based upon relevant values.	16	37%		
1 - Builds an ordinary argument with marginal support for an issue(s) giving some attention to values.	1	2%		
Total	43	100%		

EVRN 332 Fall 2012 Learner Outcomes Report

Sources and Evidence

	Primary Reader				Secondary Reader			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the assignment	5	23%			7	33%		
3 - Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the assignment.	7	32%	2.77		9	43%	3.10	
2 - Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the assignment.	10	45%			5	24%		
1 - Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the assignment.	0	0%			0	0%		
Total	22	100%			21	100%		

	Overall			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the assignment	12	28%		
3 - Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the assignment.	16	37%	2.93	0.80
2 - Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the assignment.	15	35%		
1 - Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the assignment.	0	0%		
Total	43	100%		

Control of Syntax and Mechanics

	Primary Reader				Secondary Reader			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free.	3	14%	2.64		4	19%	2.86	
3 - Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the assignment has few errors.	8	36%			10	48%		
2 - Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors.	11	50%			7	33%		
1 - Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.	0	0%			0	0%		
Total	22	100%			21	100%		

	Overall			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free.	7	16%	2.74	0.73
3 - Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the assignment has few errors.	18	42%		
2 - Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors.	18	42%		
1 - Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.	0	0%		
Total	43	100%		

EVRN 460 Fall 2012 Learner Outcomes Report

Context and Purpose of Writing

	Primary Reader				Secondary Reader			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.	4	22%			0	0%		
3 - 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).	8	44%	2.72		6	35%	2.18	
2 - Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).	3	17%			8	47%		
1 - Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).	3	17%			3	18%		
Total	18	100%			17	100%		

	Overall			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.	4	11%		
3 - 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).	14	40%	2.46	0.92
2 - Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).	11	31%		
1 - Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).	6	17%		
Total	35	100%		

1/7/2013
For internal use only
1
For internal use only

EVRN 460 Fall 2012 Learner Outcomes Report

Content Development

	Primary Reader				Secondary Reader			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work.	3	17%	2.28		1	6%	2.00	
3 - Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work.	3	17%			4	24%		
2 - Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work.	8	44%			6	35%		
1 - Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work.	4	22%			6	35%		
Total	18	100%			17	100%		

	Overall			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work.	4	11%	2.14	0.97
3 - Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work.	7	20%		
2 - Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work.	14	40%		
1 - Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work.	10	29%		
Total	35	100%		

1/7/2013
For internal use only
2
For internal use only

Genre and Conventions

	Primary Reader				Secondary Reader			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Builds a cogent, persuasive, and high quality argument that supports an issue(s) driven by clearly delineated values.	3	17%	2.17		1	6%	1.76	
3 - Builds a compelling, credible, and convincing argument that supports an issue(s) driven by clear and focused values.	3	17%			2	12%		
2 - Builds an average argument that gives some support for an issue(s) based upon relevant values.	6	33%			6	35%		
1 - Builds an ordinary argument with marginal support for an issue(s) giving some attention to values.	6	33%			8	47%		
Total	18	100%			17	100%		

	Overall			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Builds a cogent, persuasive, and high quality argument that supports an issue(s) driven by clearly delineated values.	4	11%	1.97	1.01
3 - Builds a compelling, credible, and convincing argument that supports an issue(s) driven by clear and focused values.	5	14%		
2 - Builds an average argument that gives some support for an issue(s) based upon relevant values.	12	34%		
1 - Builds an ordinary argument with marginal support for an issue(s) giving some attention to values.	14	40%		
Total	35	100%		

Sources and Evidence

	Primary Reader				Secondary Reader			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the assignment	3	17%			0	0%		
3 - Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the assignment.	3	17%	2.22		4	24%	1.82	
2 - Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the assignment.	7	39%			6	35%		
1 - Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the assignment.	5	28%			7	41%		
Total	18	100%			17	100%		

	Overall			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the assignment	3	9%		
3 - Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the assignment.	7	20%	2.03	0.95
2 - Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the assignment.	13	37%		
1 - Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the assignment.	12	34%		
Total	35	100%		

Control of Syntax and Mechanics

	Primary Reader				Secondary Reader			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free.	1	6%	2.22		0	0%	2.18	
3 - Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the assignment has few errors.	6	33%			6	35%		
2 - Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors.	7	39%			8	47%		
1 - Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.	4	22%			3	18%		
Total	18	100%			17	100%		

	Overall			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free.	1	3%	2.20	0.80
3 - Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the assignment has few errors.	12	34%		
2 - Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors.	15	43%		
1 - Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.	7	20%		
Total	35	100%		

1/7/2013
For internal use only
5
For internal use only

Context and Purpose of Writing

	Primary Reader				Secondary Reader			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.	4	20%			2	10%		
3 - 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).	11	55%	2.95		9	45%	2.65	
2 - Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).	5	25%			9	45%		
1 - Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).	0	0%			0	0%		
Total	20	100%			20	100%		

	Overall			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.	6	15%		
3 - 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).	20	50%	2.80	0.69
2 - Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).	14	35%		
1 - Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).	0	0%		
Total	40	100%		

Content Development

	Primary Reader				Secondary Reader			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work.	4	20%	2.80		1	5%	2.20	
3 - Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work.	10	50%			5	25%		
2 - Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work.	4	20%			11	55%		
1 - Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work.	2	10%			3	15%		
Total	20	100%			20	100%		

	Overall			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work.	5	13%	2.50	0.88
3 - Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work.	15	38%		
2 - Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work.	15	38%		
1 - Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work.	5	13%		
Total	40	100%		

Genre and Conventions

	Primary Reader				Secondary Reader			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Builds a cogent, persuasive, and high quality argument that supports an issue(s) driven by clearly delineated values.	1	5%	2.30		1	5%	2.15	
3 - Builds a compelling, credible, and convincing argument that supports an issue(s) driven by clear and focused values.	6	30%			5	25%		
2 - Builds an average argument that gives some support for an issue(s) based upon relevant values.	11	55%			10	50%		
1 - Builds an ordinary argument with marginal support for an issue(s) giving some attention to values.	2	10%			4	20%		
Total	20	100%			20	100%		

	Overall			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Builds a cogent, persuasive, and high quality argument that supports an issue(s) driven by clearly delineated values.	2	5%	2.23	0.77
3 - Builds a compelling, credible, and convincing argument that supports an issue(s) driven by clear and focused values.	11	28%		
2 - Builds an average argument that gives some support for an issue(s) based upon relevant values.	21	53%		
1 - Builds an ordinary argument with marginal support for an issue(s) giving some attention to values.	6	15%		
Total	40	100%		

Sources and Evidence

	Primary Reader				Secondary Reader			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the assignment	4	20%	2.80		1	5%	2.05	
3 - Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the assignment.	8	40%			3	15%		
2 - Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the assignment.	8	40%			12	60%		
1 - Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the assignment.	0	0%			4	20%		
Total	20	100%			20	100%		

	Overall			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the assignment	5	13%	2.43	0.84
3 - Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the assignment.	11	28%		
2 - Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the assignment.	20	50%		
1 - Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the assignment.	4	10%		
Total	40	100%		

EVRN 460 Fall 2011 Learner Outcomes Report

Control of Syntax and Mechanics

	Primary Reader				Secondary Reader			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free.	3	15%	2.60		4	20%	2.65	
3 - Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the assignment has few errors.	9	45%			8	40%		
2 - Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors.	5	25%			5	25%		
1 - Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.	3	15%			3	15%		
Total	20	100%			20	100%		

	Overall			
	Count	%	Mean	Std. Dev.
4 - Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free.	7	18%	2.63	0.95
3 - Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the assignment has few errors.	17	43%		
2 - Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors.	10	25%		
1 - Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.	6	15%		
Total	40	100%		