

2013-2014 ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT TEMPLATE

DEPARTMENT OF KINESIOLOGY AND HEALTH SCIENCE
HEALTH SCIENCE
JUNE 2014

Part 1: Background Information

B1. Program name: [____BS in Health Science ____]

B2. Report author(s): [____Patty Woodward____]

B3. Fall 2012 enrollment: [__416__]

Use the *Department Fact Book 2013* by OIR (Office of Institutional Research) to get the fall 2012 enrollment:
(<http://www.csus.edu/oir/Data%20Center/Department%20Fact%20Book/Departmental%20Fact%20Book.html>).

B4. Program type: [SELECT ONLY ONE]

X	1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
	2. Credential
	3. Master's degree
	4. Doctorate: Ph.D./E.D.D.
	5. Other, specify:

Part 2: Six Questions for the 2013-2014 Annual Assessment

Question 1 (Q1): Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) Assessed in 2013-2014.

Q1.1. Which of the following program learning outcomes (PLOs) or Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals did you assess in 2013-2014? (See 2013-2014 Annual Assessment Report Guidelines for more details). [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) *
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
X	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2013-2014 but not included above: a. b. c.

* One of the WASC’s new requirements is that colleges and universities report on the level of student performance at graduation in five core areas: **critical thinking, information literacy, written communication, oral communication, and quantitative literacy.**

Q1.1.1. Please provide more detailed information about the PLO(s) you checked above:

The Health Science undergraduate program has developed seven program learning outcomes (See Appendix 1 for more details). This year, we have assessed program learning outcome 4 (**PLO 4**): effective writing composition and oral communication skills. The assessment for 2012-2013 included the oral communications portion, and this assessment includes the written communication portion.

Q1.2. Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don’t know

Q1.3. Is your program externally accredited (except for WASC)?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (If no, go to Q1.4)
	3. Don’t know (Go to Q1.4)

Q1.3.1. If yes, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q1.4. Have you used the *Degree Qualification Profile (DQP)** to develop your PLO(s)?

	1. Yes
	2. No, but I know what DQP is.
X	3. No. I don't know what DQP is.
	4. Don't know

* **Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP)** – a framework funded by the Lumina Foundation that describes the kinds of learning and levels of performance that may be expected of students who have earned an associate, baccalaureate, or master's degree. Please see the links for more details:

http://www.luminafoundation.org/publications/The_Degree_Qualifications_Profile.pdf and
<http://www.learningoutcomeassessment.org/DQPNew.html>.

Question 2 (Q2): Standards of Performance/Expectations for EACH PLO.

Q2.1. Has the program developed/adopted **EXPLICIT** standards of performance/expectations for the PLO(s) you assessed in **2013-2014 Academic Year**? (For example: We expect 70% of our students to achieve at least a score of 3 on the Written Communication VALUE rubric.)

	1. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for ALL PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
	2. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for SOME PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
X	3. No (If no, go to Q2.2)
	4. Don't know (Go to Q2.2)
	5. Not Applicable (Go to Q2.2)

Q2.1.1. If yes, what are the desired levels of learning, including the criteria and standards of performance/expectations, especially at or near graduation, for **EACH PLO** assessed in 2013-2014 Academic Year? (For example: what will tell you if students have achieved your expected level of performance for the learning outcome.) **Please provide the rubric and/or the expectations that you have developed for EACH PLO one at a time below.** [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

Q2.2. Have you published the **PLO(s)/expectations/rubric(s) you assessed in 2013-2014**?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (If no, go to Q3.1)

Q2.2.1. If yes, where were the **PLOs/expectations/rubrics** published? [**CHECK ALL THAT APPLY**]

	1. In SOME course syllabi/assignments in the program that claim to introduce/develop/master the PLO(s)
	2. In ALL course syllabi/assignments in the program that claim to introduce /develop/master the PLO(s)
	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
	4. In the university catalogue
	5. On the academic unit website or in the newsletters
	6. In the assessment or program review reports/plans/resources/activities

	7. In the new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
	8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents
	9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents
	10. In other places, specify:

Question 3 (Q3): Data, Results, and Conclusions for EACH PLO

Q3.1. Was assessment data/evidence collected for 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)
	3. Don't know (Go to Part 3)
	4. Not Applicable (Go to Part 3)

Q3.2. If yes, was the data scored/evaluated for 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)
	3. Don't know (Go to Part 3)
	4. Not Applicable (Go to Part 3)

Q3.3. If yes, what DATA have you collected? What are the results, findings, and CONCLUSION(s) for EACH PLO assessed in 2013-2014? In what areas are students doing well and achieving the expectations? In what areas do students need improvement? Please provide a simple and clear summary of the key data and findings, including tables and graphs if applicable for EACH PLO one at a time. [WORD LIMIT: 600 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

Data for the written communication ability of our undergraduate students are presented below in Table I.

Table I: The Results for Written Communication

Five Criteria	Capstone (4)	Milestone (3)	(2.5)	Milestone (2)	(1.5)	Benchmark (1)	Total (N=4)
4.1 Context and Purpose for Writing	100% (4/4)						3.75 (100%, N=4)
4.2 Central Development	75% (3/4)			25% (1/4)			3.50 (100%, N=4)
4.3 Genre and Disciplinary Conventions	100% (4/4)						4.00 (100%, N=4)

4.4 Sources and Evidence	25% (1/4)	75% (3/4)					3.25 (100%, N=4)
4.5 Control of Syntax and Mechanics	75% (3/4)	25% (1/4)					3.75 (100%, N=4)

Based on the standards and criteria from 3.1 to 3.5 in the written communication rubric in Appendix II, the majority of the students did well with written communication. Overall writing performance was positive.

The context of and purpose for the writing (4.1) were clearly understood and conveyed by each student. The assignment was a take home midterm exam question and virtually all students provided thorough responds with their answers. Each respondent demonstrated comprehensive understanding of context and purpose of the writing and responded with appropriately aligned responses with a clear focus of intent.

The content development (4.2) provided in student responses was less precise. One student apparently did not fully understand the definition of Health People 2020. This meant that 25% of students didn't fully grasp an underlying factor in Healthy People 2020, or couldn't convey the answer in writing response (that Healthy People is not just data, but a whole program).

Genre and disciplinary conventions (4.3) were rated quite high. All students used proper formatting; however given that this writing sample was part of a midterm take-home exam, specific APA formatting was not considered to be a part of the grading rubric. Rather the reader was more concerned with the organization, content, and presentation of written responses. All of the students showed detailed attention executing responses and the overall score for the criteria was 4.0.

Sources and evidence (4.4) was difficult to tweeze from the writing. This assignment evaluated the student understanding of lecture presented, readings provided to the students, and information available on the Healthy People website. Although students were not required to research the evidence and site the sources of their findings for this assignment, the writings demonstrated that 75% of students utilized the information available and developed responses and ideas that were compelling and appropriate for the genre. Students were succinct and comprehensive in nature. To fully address the prompt students needed a thorough understanding of Health People 2020. The assignment did not involve research per say however students were not dissuaded from additional independent research. It appears as though most students found their lecture notes and readings sufficient for answering the prompt. One of the students referenced lecture slides, Health People 2020 and Healthy People 2020 Objective Development Process. This student was part of a special major and not a HLSC major. The referencing was not APA style as utilized by HLSC majors, and points were not deducted. The overall rating for this criteria was 3.25.

Control of syntax and mechanics (4.5) seemed to only expose a small error among the four samples reviewed. One student made a minor error in syntax lowering the score to three rather than four for this area (4.5). The other 75% of students were virtually error-free. This may be due in part to the nature of the assessment-being a take home exam. The overall sample of writing displayed graceful language which communicated clarity and fluency expressing replies to the prompt. Scoring for this criteria was 3.75.

These writing samples were randomly obtained from a class of 27. Overall, student writing samples were quite good with a grand mean of 3.65. Faculty will discuss the results of this sampling to ensure scores

continue to reflect our students' learning.

Q3.4. Do students meet the expectations/standards of performance as determined by the program and achieved the learning outcomes? [PLEASE MAKE SURE THE PLO YOU SPECIFY HERE IS THE SAME ONE YOU CHECKED/SPECIFIED IN Q1.1].

Q3.4.1. First PLO: [Written Communication]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
X	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

[NOTE: IF YOU HAVE MORE THAN ONE PLO, YOU NEED TO REPEAT THE TABLE IN Q3.4.1 UNTIL YOU INCLUDE ALL THE PLO(S) YOU ASSESSED IN 2013-2014.]

Q3.4.2. Second PLO: [_____]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

Question 4 (Q4): Evaluation of Data Quality: Reliability and Validity.

Q4.1. How many PLOs in total did your program assess in the 2013-2014 academic year? [1]

Q4.2. Please choose **ONE ASSESSED PLO** as an example to illustrate how you use direct, indirect, and/or other methods/measures to collect data. If you only assessed one PLO in 2013-14, YOU CAN SKIP this question. If you assessed MORE THAN ONE PLO, please check **ONLY ONE PLO BELOW EVEN IF YOU ASSESSED MORE THAN ONE PLO IN 2013-2014.**

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) ¹
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
X	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge

	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Other PLO. Specify:

Direct Measures

Q4.3. Were direct measures used to assess this PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q4.4)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q4.4)

Q4.3.1. Which of the following **DIRECT** measures were used? [Check all that apply]

	1. Capstone projects (including theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
	2. Key assignments from other CORE classes
	3. Key assignments from other classes
X	4. Classroom based performance assessments such as simulations, comprehensive exams, critiques
	5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community based projects
	6. E-Portfolios
	7. Other portfolios
	8. Other measure. Specify:

Q4.3.2. Please provide the direct measure(s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] that you used to collect the data. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

Community Health (HLSC 118) was used for data collection for Written Communication. This course is a three unit upper division core for all HLSC students in the following concentrations: Occupational Health and Safety, Community Health Education, and Health Care Administration. Data were collected in the fall of 2013.

The writing assignment used for this assessment included the random selection of four student exam answers taken from a class of 27 students. The exam was a mid-term exam which was take-home. Students self-selected six questions to answer from ten questions provided. The exam question chosen for assessment included a short answer question which all four of the students had answered. Each question was worth 12.5 points.

The question used for the assessment was: In four sentences or less, tell me what is “Healthy People 2020”? (8.5 points). List the overarching goals of “Healthy People 2020” (4 points).

Q4.3.2.1. Was the direct measure(s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] aligned directly with the rubric/criterion?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.3. Was the direct measure (s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] aligned directly with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.4. How was the evidence scored/evaluated? [Select one only]

	1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (If checked, go to Q4.3.7)
X	2. Use rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class
	3. Use rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty
	4. Use rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty
	5. Use other means. Specify:

Q4.3.5. What rubric/criterion was adopted to score/evaluate the above key assignments/projects/portfolio? [Select one only]

X	1. The VALUE rubric(s)
	2. Modified VALUE rubric(s)
	3. A rubric that is totally developed by local faculty
	4. Use other means. Specify:

Q4.3.6. Was the rubric/criterion aligned directly with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.7. Were the evaluators (e.g., faculty or advising board members) who reviewed student work calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way?

	1. Yes
	2. No
X	3. Don't know

Q4.3.8. Were there checks for inter-rater reliability?

	1. Yes
X	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.9. Were the sample sizes for the direct measure adequate?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.10. How did you select the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc)? Please briefly specify here:

Four midterms were randomly selected from a class of 27. One question from the exam was chosen. The chosen question was answered by all four students. See Q4.3.2 for further explanation.

Indirect Measures

Q4.4. Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (If no, go to Q4.5)

Q4.4.1. Which of the following indirect measures were used?

	1. National student surveys (e.g., NSSE, etc.)
--	--

	2. University conducted student surveys (OIR surveys)
	3. College/Department/program conducted student surveys
	4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	7. Others, specify:

Q4.4.2. If surveys were used, were the sample sizes adequate?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.4.3. If surveys were used, please briefly specify how you select your sample? What is the response rate?

Other Measures

Q4.5. Were external benchmarking data used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (If no, go to Q4.6)

Q4.5.1. Which of the following measures was used?

	1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams
	2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g., CLA, CAAP, ETS PP, etc)
	3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g., ETS, GRE, etc)
	4. Others, specify:

Q4.6. Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
	2. No (Go to Q4.7)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q4.7)

Q4.6.1. If yes, please specify: [_____]

Alignment and Quality

Q4.7. Please describe how you collected the data? For example, in what course(s) (or by what means) were data collected? How reliable and valid is the data? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

The data used were collected from Community Health (HLSC 118). This is an upper division majors only (unless instructor permission is granted) course that is part of the core for Health Science. This course is required for all majors from each of the three concentrations: Community Health Education, Occupational Health and Safety, and Health Care Administration. This course is offered every semester.

In the fall of 2013 students were given a take-home midterm exam. The exams were submitted electronically to the course instructor. The exam was given as a take-home exam to ensure students could provide comprehensive responses to demonstrate acquired knowledge.

Exam instructions asked the students to "Please choose any 6 questions out of the 10 below for your exam" and further stated "You MAY use your notes-just not your neighbor or her/his notes." The question used for the assessment was #2.

Because all responses were submitted electronically, the instructor was able to easily spot any plagiarism which might have been associated with the responses. None was detected. It is believed that the data collected is valid. The reliability has not been established since exams are specific to each term and instructor.

Q4.8. How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO? [1]

NOTE: IF IT IS ONLY ONE, GO TO Q5.1.

Q4.8.1. Did the data (including all the assignments/projects/portfolios) from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

<input type="checkbox"/>	1. Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. No
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Don't know

Q4.8.2. Were **ALL** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO?

<input type="checkbox"/>	1. Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. No
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Don't know

Question 5 (Q5): Use of Assessment Data.

Q5.1. To what extent have the assessment results **from 2012-2013** been used for? [**CHECK ALL THAT APPLY**]

	Very Much (1)	Quite a Bit (2)	Some (3)	Not at all (4)	Not Applicable (9)
1. Improving specific courses			X		
2. Modifying curriculum					X
3. Improving advising and mentoring					X
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals					X
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations			X		
6. Developing/updating assessment plan			X		
7. Annual assessment reports			X		
8. Program review			X		
9. Prospective student and family information					X
10. Alumni communication					X
11. WASC accreditation (regional accreditation)		X			
12. Program accreditation					X
13. External accountability reporting requirement					X
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations					X
15. Strategic planning			X		
16. Institutional benchmarking					X
17. Academic policy development or modification					X
18. Institutional Improvement					X
19. Resource allocation and budgeting					X
20. New faculty hiring					X

21. Professional development for faculty and staff				X	
22. Other Specify:					

Q5.1.1. Please provide one or two best examples to show how you have used the assessment data above.

The course used in the 2012-2013 assessment was also HLSC 118. As a result of the data collected and reported, the instructor chose to again include oral presentations in the group work for the fall 2013 semester. The data from the fall of 2013 has not yet been compared to the data collected in 2012-2013; however a cursory look indicates similar results to those reported in 2012-2013.

Reviewing the data from 2012-2013, faculty has begun to revisit the use of rubrics for this course. While rubrics have always been used, the availability of value rubrics offers the opportunity to compare courses over multiple terms, time permitting.

Q5.2. As a result of the **assessment effort in 2013-2014** and based on the prior feedbacks from OAPA, do you anticipate making any changes for your program (e.g., course structure, course content, or modification of program learning outcomes)?

	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q5.3)
X	3. Don't know (Go to Q5.3)

Q5.2.1. What changes are anticipated? By what mechanism will the changes be implemented? How and when will you assess the impact of proposed modifications? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

Q5.2.2. Is there a follow-up assessment on these areas that need improvement?

	1. Yes
	2. No
X	3. Don't know

Q5.3. Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspects of a program that are not related to program learning outcomes (i.e., impacts of an advising center, etc.). If your program/academic unit has collected assessment data in this way, please briefly report your results here. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

Question 6 (Q6). Which program learning outcome(s) do you plan to assess next year?

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) ¹
X	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning

	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that the program is going to assess but not included above : a. b. c.

Part 3: Additional Information

A1. In which academic year did you **develop** the current assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
X	6. 2011-2012
	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet developed a formal assessment plan

A2. In which academic year did you last **update** your assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
X	9. Have not yet updated the assessment plan

A3. Have you developed a curriculum map for this program?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A4. Has the program indicated explicitly where the assessment of **student learning** occurs in the curriculum?

	1. Yes
	2. No
X	3. Don't know

A5. Does the program have any capstone class?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A5.1. If yes, please list the course number for each capstone class: [_HLSC 195_____]

A6. Does the program have ANY capstone project?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A7. Name of the academic unit: [__KHS __]

A8. Department in which the academic unit is located: [__Health Science __]

A9. Department Chair's Name: [_Joan Neide_____]

A10. Total number of annual assessment reports submitted by your academic unit for 2013-2014: [_5__]

A11. College in which the academic unit is located:

	1. Arts and Letters
	2. Business Administration
	3. Education
	4. Engineering and Computer Science
X	5. Health and Human Services
	6. Natural Science and Mathematics
	7. Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies
	8. Continuing Education (CCE)
	9. Other, specify:

Undergraduate Degree Program(s):

A12. Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has: [__3__]

A12.1. List all the name(s): [_Athletic Training, Kinesiology, Health Science_____]

A12.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program? [__ __]

Master Degree Program(s):

A13. Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has: [__2__]

A13.1. List all the name(s): [_____Masters in Movement Studies and Exercise Science_____]

A13.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program? [__1__]

Credential Program(s):

A14. Number of credential degree programs the academic unit has: [__0__]

A14.1. List all the names: [_____]

Doctorate Program(s)

A15. Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: [__0__]

A15.1. List the name(s): [_____]

A16. Would this assessment report apply to other program(s) and/or diploma concentration(s) in your academic unit*?

	1. Yes
--	--------

X	2. No
---	-------

*If the assessment conducted for this program (including the PLO(s), the criteria and standards of performance/expectations you established, the data you collected and analyzed, the conclusions of the assessment) is the same as the assessment conducted for other programs within the academic unit, you only need to submit one assessment report.

16.1. If yes, please specify the name of each program: _____

16.2. If yes, please specify the name of each diploma concentration: _____

Appendix I: Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) for the Health Science Program

Here is the list of the program learning outcomes (PLOs) for the Health Science program. Health science students are expected to demonstrate the ability to:

1. Demonstrate critical thinking skills through the application of health promotion, prevention and protection theories and concepts.
2. Integrate diverse disciplines such as sociology, psychology, chemistry, biology, anatomy, and physiology in the identification and control of psycho-social and physical factors affecting health.
3. Use fundamental statistics and research methods for the systematic study and evaluation of the distribution and determinants of health risk in populations.
4. Demonstrate effective writing composition and oral communication skills.
5. Use computer technology to research, analyze, communicate and present health information.
6. Work collaboratively with others in problem solving, research, decision-making and the completion of projects.
7. Articulate values, ethics and standards of the profession.

Appendix II: Rubric for PLO 3: Written Communication

Criterion	Capstone 4	Milestone 3	Milestone 2	Benchmark 1
4.1 Context and Purpose for Writing	Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.	Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.	Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) (e.g. begins to show awareness of audience's perception and assumptions).	Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) (e.g. expectations of instructor or self as audience).
4.2 Central Development	Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work.	Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work.	Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work.	Uses appropriate and relevant content develop simple ideas in some parts of the work.
4.3 Genre and Disciplinary Conventions	Demonstrates detailed attention to and successful execution of a wide range of conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) including organization, content, presentation, formatting, and stylistic choices.	Demonstrates consistent use of important conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) including organization, content, presentation, and stylistic choices.	Follows expectations appropriate to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) for basic organization, content, and presentation.	Attempts to use a consistent system for basic organization and presentation.
4.4 Sources and Evidence	Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing.	Demonstrates consistent use of credible sources to support ideas that situated within the discipline and genre of the writing.	Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing.	Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.

4.5 Control of Syntax and Mechanics	Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free.	Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers, and the language has few errors.	Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors.	Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	--