NCA Self Study

Criterion 4 Documents

Eastern Illinois University

Year~2014

Collegiate Learning Assessment Seniors 2012 CASA

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