



New Mexico Common Course Assessment Reports Form

Reporting Institution: Central New Mexico Community College

New Mexico Common Core Area: Humanities and Fine Arts

Competency Number Assessed: (note that *not* all competencies have to be assessed – mark all that apply to this assessment by double-clicking on the check box and choosing the •checked• option)

State Competency 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	State Competency 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	State Competency 3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
State Competency 4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	State Competency 5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	State Competency 6 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Academic Year of Assessment: 2015-2016

Submission Date: June 2, 2017

Institution Course Number: See crosswalk below

NM Common Core Number: See crosswalk below

Submitted by: Ralph Trimnell

HUMANITIES & FINE ARTS CROSSWALK:

CNM COURSE #	NMCCN	Course Name
ARTS 2205		Drawing II
ARTS 2207		Painting I
ARTS 2210		Art Career Concerns
ARTS 2208		Jewelry/Small Metals I

ARTH 2250		Modern Art
ARTH 2251		Art of the American Southwest
ARTH 1101	ARTS 1013	Introduction to Art
ARTH 2202	ARTS 2123	History of Art II
GNHN 1121		General Honors-The Ancient Legacy
GNHN 1122		General Honors-The Modern Legacy
GMHN 2211		Utopian and Dystopian Thought
HIST 1182		Modern Latin American History
HIST 1102	HIST 1063	Western Civilization II
HIST 1162	HIST 1213	History of the United States II
MUS 1140		Modern Music Appreciation
MUS 1139	MUSI 1113	Early Music Appreciation
PHIL 1110	PHIL 1113	Introduction to Philosophical Thought
PHIL 2247		Biomedical Ethics
RGLN 1107	RELI 1113	Living World Religions
SPAN 1101		Beginning Spanish
THEA 1122	THTR 1013	Theatre Appreciation

Description of Assessment Procedure:

Art History and Art Studio:

In the Spring 2015 semester, more than 12 instructors participated in actively assessing 394 CNM students currently taking 1000 and/or 2000-level Art History, or Art Studio classes. Initially, the department expected to assess more students than were assessed in the previous year, and set a target to decrease the number of students scoring a zero in the assessment criteria. The art department successfully met their expectation and target through the collection of data on 314 more students in 2015 than in the previous year's assessment. The department also reported that the percent of zero scores in the 2015 assessment were much lower what was reported in the previous year's assessment.

History:

In the Spring 2015 semester, seven instructors participated in actively assessing 249 CNM students currently taking 1000-level History classes. Initially, the department set a target to decrease the number of students scoring a zero in the assessment criteria. The History department reported that the percent of zero scores in the 2015 assessment were much lower than what was reported in the previous year's assessment.

Music:

In the Spring 2015 semester, roughly six instructors participated in actively assessing 383 CNM students currently taking 1000-level Music classes. The Music department reported that the majority of students assessed in the 2015 assessment received scores of '2' and '3'

Philosophy:

In the Spring 2015 semester, approximately six instructors participated in actively assessing 83 CNM students currently taking 1000 and/or 2000-level Philosophy classes. Initially, the department set a target to decrease the number of students scoring a zero in the assessment criteria. The Philosophy department reported that the percent of zero scores in the 2015 assessment were much lower than what was reported in the previous year's assessment thus successfully meeting their target.

Religion:

In the Spring 2015 semester, roughly 4 instructors participated in actively assessing 164 CNM students currently taking 1000-level Religion/Humanities classes. Initially, the department set a target to assess more students than were assessed the previous year and increase assessment scores in Critical Analysis and Effective Communication skills. The department met their target by assessing 79 more students in 2015 than in the previous year.

Spanish:

In the Spring 2015 semester, more than 12 instructors participated in actively assessing 462 CNM students currently taking modern language classes. Initially, the department set a target to increase the number of students assessed and decrease the percentage of students scoring a zero in the assessment criteria. The Modern Language department successfully met their targets by increasing their assessed population by 377 students; the department also reported that no assessed student received a zero scores in the 2015 assessment.

Theatre:

In the Spring 2015 semester, roughly 4 instructors participated in actively assessing 84 CNM students currently taking 1000-level Theatre and/or Dance classes. Initially, the department set a target to increase student scores in Critical Analysis and Effective Communication.

Report of Assessment Data and Results:

Art History and Art Studio:

Assessment Categories & Score	2016 All Students	2015 Art History	2016 Art History	2015 Art Studio	2016 Art Studio
CA1					
0	.5%	11.1%	4.9%	0%	
1	10.4%	11.1%	8.3%	9.1%	2.1%
2	30.9%	27.8%	35.2%	0%	27.1%

3	58.2%	50.0%	51.5%	90.9%	70.8%
CA2					
0	2.7%	11.1%	4.9%	0%	
1	13.1%	5.6%	10.5%	9.1%	2.1%
2	34.4%	44.4%	28.7%	63.6%	33.3%
3	49.7%	38.9%	55.9%	27.3%	64.6%
CA3					
0	3.0%	11.1%	5%	9.1%	
1	17.0%	25.0%	15.2%	0%	3.4%
2	38.0%	22.2%	33.1%	36.4%	36.2%
3	42.0%	41.7%	46.7%	54.5%	60.3%
AVG CA	2.3		2.3		2.6
DSCA1					
Not Assessed			70.2%		84.1%
1			3.4%		
2			10.2%		
3			16.0%		15.9%
DSCA2					
Not Assessed			70.2%		84.1%
1			3.4%		
2			10.8%		3.2%
3			15.4%		12.7%
EC1					
0	1.9%	11.1%	4.6%	0%	
1	11.8%	5.6%	9.0%	9.1%	2.1%
2	35.1%	44.4%	33.1%	18.2%	35.4%
3	51.1%	38.9%	53.3%	72.7%	62.5%
EC2					
0	2%	11.1%	4.6%	0%	
1	11.4%	8.3%	5.9%	9.1%	4.2%
2	31.5%	41.7%	26.9%	27.3%	33.3%
3	55.1%	38.9%	62.5%	63.6%	62.5%
Assessment Categories & Score	2016 All Students	2015 Art History	2016 Art History	2015 Art Studio	2016 Art Studio
DSEC1					
Not Assessed		70.2%			

0					
1		4.0%			
2		9.2%			
3		16.3%			
DSEC2					
Not Assessed					
0		70.2%			
1		3.7%			
2		10.8%			
3		15.1%			
AVG EC	2.4		2.4		2.6
	N 3443	36	325	11	58

General Honors:

Assessment Categories & Score	2016 All Students	2016 Gen Honors
CA1		
0	.5%	
1	10.4%	2.2%
2	30.9%	15.6%
3	58.2%	82.2%
CA2		
0	2.7%	
1	13.1%	4.4%
2	34.4%	22.2%
3	49.7%	73.3%
CA3		
0	3.0%	
1	17.0%	4.4%
2	38.0%	40.0%
3	42.0%	55.6%
AVG CA	2.3	2.7
EC1		
0	1.9%	
1	11.8%	6.7%
2	35.1%	13.3%
3	51.1%	80.0%

EC2		
0	2%	
1	11.4%	2.2%
2	31.5%	15.6%
3	55.1%	82.2%
AVG EC	2.4	2.8
N	3443	45

History:

Assessment Categories & Score	2016 All Students	2015 HIST	2015 History	2016 History
CA1				
0	.5%	14.2%	19.6%	
1	10.4%	11.3%	3.9%	12.5%
2	30.9%	26.5%	13.7%	30.0%
3	58.2%	47.9%	62.7%	57.5%
CA2				
0	2.7%	15.2%	19.6%	1.5%
1	13.1%	10.9%	2.0%	14.0%
2	34.4%	27.0%	19.6%	28.0%
3	49.7%	46.9%	58.8%	56.5%
CA3				
0	3.0%	16.5%	19.6%	1.0%
1	17.0%	11.9%	3.9%	14.0%
2	38.0%	29.0%	25.5%	36.5%
3	42.0%	42.6%	51.0%	48.5%
AVG CA	2.3			2.4
EC1				
0	1.9%	15.8%	19.6%	5.5%
1	11.8%	10.3%	3.9%	8.5%
2	35.1%	26.7%	13.7%	30.5%
3	51.1%	47.1%	62.7%	55.5%
EC2				
0	2%	15.4%	19.6%	6.0%
1	11.4%	10.3%	3.9%	9.0%
2	31.5%	27.4%	15.7%	31.0%
3	55.1%	46.9%	60.8%	54.0%

AVG EC	2.4			2.3
N	3443	486	51	249

Music:

Assessment Categories & Score	2016 All Students	2016 Music
CA1		
0	.5%	3.4%
1	10.4%	7.3%
2	30.9%	23.5%
3	58.2%	65.8%
CA2		
0	2.7%	6.3%
1	13.1%	2.3%
2	34.4%	13.6%
3	49.7%	77.8%
CA3		
0	3.0%	9.7%
1	17.0%	6.0%
2	38.0%	12.8%
3	42.0%	71.5%
AVG CA	2.3	
EC1		
0	1.9%	8.4%
1	11.8%	3.9%
2	35.1%	8.6%
3	51.1%	79.1%
EC2		
0	2%	5.2%
1	11.4%	3.7%
2	31.5%	22.5%
3	55.1%	68.7%
AVG EC	2.4	
N	3443	383

Philosophy:

Assessment Categories & Score	2016 All Students	2015 Philosophy	2016 Philosophy
CA1			
0	.5%	4.5%	
1	10.4%	19.7%	16.9%
2	30.9%	43.9%	41.0%
3	58.2%	31.8%	42.2%
CA2			
0	2.7%	3.0%	
1	13.1%	22.7%	18.1%
2	34.4%	43.9%	47.0%
3	49.7%	30.3%	34.9%
CA3			
0	3.0%	9.1%	
1	17.0%	30.3%	18.1%
2	38.0%	33.3%	47.0%
3	42.0%	27.3%	34.9%
AVG CA	2.3		2.1
EC1			
0	1.9%	6.1%	
1	11.8%	24.2%	15.7%
2	35.1%	34.8%	45.8%
3	51.1%	34.8%	38.6%
EC2			
0	2%	3.0%	
1	11.4%	15.2%	19.3%
2	31.5%	25.8%	39.8%
3	55.1%	56.1%	41.0%
AVG EC	2.4		2.2
N	3443	66	83

Religion:

Assessment Categories & Score	2016 All Students	2015 Religion	2016 Religion
CA1			

0	.5%	0%	.6%
1	10.4%	17.0%	14%
2	30.9%	54.5%	34.1%
3	58.2%	28.6%	51.2%
CA2			
0	2.7%	.9%	4.3%
1	13.1%	20.5%	16.5%
2	34.4%	50.0%	33.5%
3	49.7%	28.6%	45.7%
CA3			
0	3.0%	.9%	3.0%
1	17.0%	32.1%	18.3%
2	38.0%	42.9%	33.5%
3	42.0%	24.1%	45.1%
AVG CA	2.3		2.3
EC1			
0	1.9%	.9%	3.7%
1	11.8%	19.6%	14%
2	35.1%	49.1%	28%
3	51.1%	30.4%	54.3%
EC2			
0	2%	2.7%	3.7%
1	11.4%	17.0%	9.8%
2	31.5%	45.5%	33.5%
3	55.1%	34.8%	53.0%
AVG EC	2.4		2.3
N	3443	112	164

Spanish:

Assessment Categories & Score	2016 All Students	2015 Spanish	2016 Spanish
CA1			
0	.5%	3.5%	
1	10.4%	9.4%	7.4%
2	30.9%	34.1%	30.1%
3	58.2%	52.9%	62.6%
CA2			

0	2.7%	1.2%	
1	13.1%	16.5%	6.3%
2	34.4%	35.3%	37.0%
3	49.7%	47.1%	56.7%
CA3			
0	3.0%	2.4%	
1	17.0%	21.2%	6.5%
2	38.0%	37.6%	39.5%
3	42.0%	38.8%	54.0%
AVG CA	2.3		2.5
EC1			
0	1.9%	14.1%	
1	11.8%	18.8%	6.3%
2	35.1%	21.2%	36.2%
3	51.1%	45.9%	57.5%
EC2			
0	2%	1.2%	
1	11.4%	20.0%	6.5%
2	31.5%	40.0%	29.0%
3	55.1%	38.8%	64.5%
AVG EC	2.4		2.5
N	3443	85	462

Theatre:

Assessment Categories & Score	2016 All Students	2015 Theatre	2016 Theatre
CA1			
0	.5%	12.3%	
1	10.4%	5.2%	3.6%
2	30.9%	29.0%	19.0%
3	58.2%	53.5%	77.4%
CA2			
0	2.7%	12.3%	1.2%
1	13.1%	10.3%	3.6%
2	34.4%	32.9%	38.1%
3	49.7%	44.5%	57.1%
CA3			

0	3.0%	12.3%	
1	17.0%	7.1%	4.8%
2	38.0%	34.8%	29.8%
3	42.0%	45.8%	65.5%
AVG CA	2.3		2.6
EC1			
0	1.9%	11.6%	
1	11.8%	9.7%	8.3%
2	35.1%	31.0%	19.0%
3	51.1%	47.7%	72.6%
EC2			
0	2%	14.2%	
1	11.4%	5.2%	7.6%
2	31.5%	25.2%	19.0%
3	55.1%	55.5%	73.4%
AVG EC	2.4		2.6
N	3443	155	84

Analysis and Interpretation/Reflection on Results or Trends:

Art History and Art Studio:

Each instructor assessed students' Effective Communication and Critical Analysis skills using the LALA assessment rubric (see Appendix A). According to the Art History & Art Studio LALA results (p. 16), the student assessment scores reported in 2016 were higher than those reported in 2015. Average Critical Analysis scores were slightly higher in 2015 compared to the previous year; average Effective Communication scores were also slightly higher. Most notably, fewer students assessed in 2015 received a score of zero in Critical Analysis skills and Effective Communication than in the previous year's assessment. This demonstrates student improvement in both emerging Critical Analysis and Effective Communication skills.

History:

Each instructor assessed students' Effective Communication and Critical Analysis skills using different assignments but with same guidelines and the LALA assessment rubric (see Appendix A). According to the History LALA results (p. 26), the student assessment scores reported in 2016 were higher than those reported in 2015. Average Critical Analysis scores were slightly higher in 2015 compared to the previous year. Most notably, fewer students assessed in 2015 received a score of zero in Critical Analysis skills than in the previous year's assessment. This demonstrates student improvement in both emerging Critical Analysis and Effective Communication skills.

Music:

Each instructor assessed students' Effective Communication and Critical Analysis skills using a specific question on a multiple choice exam in combination with a concert report scored using the LALA rubric (see Appendix A). According to the Music LALA results (p. 30). Overwhelmingly, students who participated in the Music assessment demonstrated higher levels of Critical Analysis skills and Effective Communication than the assessed population as a whole.

Philosophy:

Each instructor assessed students' Effective Communication and Critical Analysis skills using the LALA assessment rubric (see Appendix A); however, assessment assignments were chosen at the instructor's discretion. According to the Philosophy LALA results (p. 32), the student assessment scores reported in 2016 were higher than those reported in 2015. Most notably, fewer students assessed in 2015 received a score of zero in Critical Analysis skills and Effective Communication than in the previous year's assessment. This demonstrates student improvement in both emerging Critical Analysis and Effective Communication skills.

Religion:

Each instructor assessed students' Effective Communication and Critical Analysis skills using the LALA assessment rubric (see Appendix A). Further, a higher percentage of students assessed received a score of '3' on their assessment assignments in both Critical Analysis and Effective Communication skills. This difference may be due, in part, to the creation and implementation of a new assessment assignment in 2015.

Spanish:

Each instructor assessed students' Effective Communication and Critical Analysis skills using different assignments but with same guidelines and the LALA assessment rubric (see Appendix A). According to the Modern Languages LALA results (p. 35), the student assessment scores reported in 2016 were higher than those reported in 2015. Average Critical Analysis scores and Effective Communication scores were slightly higher in 2015 compared to the previous year. Most notably, all of the students assessed received at least an assessment score of '1'. This demonstrates student improvement in both emerging Critical Analysis and Effective Communication skills.

Theatre:

The department reported that the majority of students assessed demonstrated satisfactory Critical Analysis and Effective Communication skills (students scored a '2' or a '3'). Each instructor assessed students' Effective Communication and Critical Analysis skills using the LALA assessment rubric (see Appendix A) and an oral presentation in conjunction with the written analysis of play performance(s).

Plan for Improving the Assessment Process and/or Student Learning:

Art History and Art Studio:

Art History and Art Studio faculty agree that, with an assessment of this size, they will need to implement a norming session to standardize faculty scoring. The 2015 LALA experience revealed that norming will be key for obtaining consistent data. Faculty also agree that prior to future assessments, classroom instruction will include an independent discussion with students on critical thinking and Effective Communication.

Faculty in the Art History and Art Studio Department are beginning to see some value in the assessment data gathered through the LALA assessment process. Overall, instructors who participated in the 2016 assessment were comfortable with some of the changes made by the LALA team to the data collection process; however, they felt that they lacked adequate support from their LALA coordinator as they performed and completed the assessment. Furthermore, the Art History and Art Studio department has proactively and effectively expanded their current LALA assessment tool and rubric to include General Education criteria thereby eliminating the need to conduct two, separate, formal assessments.

History:

History faculty agree that, in order to improve assessment in their department, they will design and implement a pre-test/post-test assessment design. Students will be assessed during the first quarter of the semester to get a baseline for student ability in Critical Analysis and Effective Communication skills. The LALA assessment will then be performed during the last quarter of the semester and used as a post-test. Faculty expect that student ability will improve over the course of the semester with instruction on Critical Analysis and Effective Communication that is tailored to student needs identified in the pre-test. Faculty will work to share instructional techniques and assignments that they feel facilitate student learning improvement.

History Department faculty are beginning to see some value in the assessment data gathered through the LALA assessment process. Overall, instructors who participated in the 2016 assessment were comfortable with the changes made by the LALA team to the data collection process and they are very pleased with the support they received from their LALA coordinator as they performed and completed the assessment. Furthermore, the History department is very interested in working with the LALA team to incorporate General Education criteria into their assignment and rubric thereby eliminating the need for two separate assessments.

Music:

The Music faculty learned that assessment scores are likely affected by when in a term the instructor chose to administer the assessment. They also note the importance of a norming session. Music faculty will continue to discuss the possibility of setting a time-frame for all music student assessment administration. Further, they will continue to work toward norming in order to improve consistency in faculty scoring. After discussion, the music faculty agree that student improvement can be made if the instructors utilize more writing assignment activities. They will work toward offering students more opportunities to practice Critical Analysis and Effective Communication skills.

Faculty in the Music Department are beginning to see some value in the assessment data gathered through the LALA assessment process. Overall, instructors who participated in the 2016 assessment were comfortable with the changes made by the LALA team to the data collection process and they are very pleased with the support they received from their LALA coordinator as they performed and completed the assessment. Furthermore, the Music department is very interested in working with the LALA team to incorporate General Education criteria into their assignment and rubric thereby

eliminating the need for two separate assessments.

Philosophy:

Moving forward, the Philosophy department will strive to maintain as much continuity in future measures as possible so that the numbers can begin to allow for meaningful analyses. The hope is to compare how students who have taken philosophy score on all departmental assessments. The faculty are also working toward development and implementation of assessment tools that are comparable in content/quality with other departments within CHSS. Philosophy instructors are also discussing the possibility of giving students specific guidelines for assessment assignments in order to make performance expectations clear.

Overall, the Philosophy department faculty agree that critical thinking and Effective Communication skills are foundational to the discipline. They argue that because these skills are the very nature of their discipline, instructors are continuously working to challenge and improve student ability in these areas. It appears that the Philosophy faculty do not agree that this type of student assessment yields any valuable measure of teaching successes or student skills in critical thinking or Effective Communication. Faculty in the Philosophy Department strongly disagree that LALA processes and results offer any value to their teaching or understanding of student learning in critical thinking or Effective Communication. Instructors who participated in the 2016 assessment were comfortable with some of the changes made by the LALA team to the data collection process, and they were satisfied with the support that they received from their LALA coordinator. Furthermore, they do not envision incorporating General Education criteria into their LALA assignment or assessment; they will likely opt to perform separate LALA and General Education student learning assessments.

Religion:

The Religion/Humanities department intends to continue revising and strengthening teaching practices that will prepare students to move beyond the basic levels of Critical Analysis and Effective Communication skills. Further, they will continue to discuss strategies for supporting student learning in the assessment areas.

Overall, the Religion faculty do not think that there is value in the data gathered through the LALA process. Faculty are willing to continue working toward an assessment that will yield valuable information. Overall, instructors who participated in the 2016 assessment were comfortable with some of the changes made by the LALA team to the data collection process, they appreciated clear instructions for data entry. Furthermore, the Religion department has not discussed combining LALA with General Education assessment criteria, but they seem open to entertaining this possibility.

Spanish:

Modern Languages faculty agree that, in order to improve assessment in their department, they will strive to improve the attendance of their “norming party”. The faculty also agree that they will thoroughly explain the assessment process to their students and also provide a mock assessment assignment (or demonstration) in classes.

Faculty in the Modern Languages Department strongly agree that there is value in the assessment data gathered through the LALA assessment process. Overall, instructors who participated in the 2016 assessment were comfortable with and very pleased with the changes made by the LALA team to the data collection process and they are very pleased with the support they received from their LALA coordinator as they performed and completed the assessment. Furthermore, the Modern Languages department is very interested in working with the LALA team to incorporate General Education criteria

into their assignment and rubric thereby eliminating the need for two separate assessments.

Theatre:

Faculty in the Theatre and Dance department plan to incorporate more specific points that students should address in their assessment presentations.

Overall, the Theatre and Dance faculty agree that the LALA process and associated data are strong and meaningful. Instructors who participated in the 2016 assessment were comfortable with some of the changes made by the LALA team to the data collection process, they appreciated clear instructions for data entry and were pleased with the support that they received from their LALA coordinator. Furthermore, they have discussed an interested in combining the LALA and General Education assessments thus assessing student learning in numerous areas with only one set of assessment tools.

Appendix A: **LIBERAL ARTS SCORING RUBRIC : CRITICAL ANALYSIS**

<p>Given new information, situation, and/or application, the student will:</p>	<p><i>Did it awesomely</i> Score = 3</p>	<p><i>Did it</i> Score = 2</p>	<p><i>Kind of did it</i> Score = 1</p>	<p><i>Didn't do it:</i> <i>Non-attempt or Emerging</i> Score = 0</p>
<p>Identify and critically consider the main issues, concepts, problems, and/or techniques.</p>	<p>Student explicitly, critically, and comprehensively considers all relevant material. Student identifies all relevant information necessary for mastery of the subject matter.</p>	<p>Student identifies, describes, applies, and/or clarifies relevant material to demonstrate a proficient understanding.</p>	<p>Student identifies relevant material but may struggle to describe, apply, or clarify the content.</p>	<p>Student uncritically identifies relevant material, offering no clarification, application, or description.</p>
<p>Incorporate more than one perspective (e.g. source, method, technique, and/or approach)</p>	<p>Student incorporates many diverse perspectives to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Student clearly justifies her/his own view or approach. Analysis/application of other perspectives is consistently accurate and respectful. Student provides ample evidence of reflection and self-assessment.</p>	<p>Student incorporates some diverse perspectives, but the approach is limited. Student somewhat justifies her/his own view or approach. Analysis/application of other positions is usually accurate and respectful. Student provides some evidence of reflection and self-assessment.</p>	<p>Student incorporates a singular or very few perspective(s). Student begins to relate alternative views but the integration of multiple viewpoints lacks development. Student investigates or applies ideas in a limited way. Analysis/application of other views lacks accuracy in some areas. Student provides little evidence of self-assessment.</p>	<p>Student fails to incorporate or engage others' perspectives or discusses an incorrect perspective. Student adopts a single idea with little question and does not integrate alternatives. Student presents obvious ideas, avoids discomforting ideas, and or treats other positions superficially. Student provides no evidence of self- assessment.</p>
<p>Demonstrate mastery by evaluating, analyzing, interpreting and/or synthesizing</p>	<p>Student demonstrates a comprehensive evaluation, analysis, interpretation, or synthesis. Student thoroughly examines and/or applies the viewpoints of experts.</p>	<p>Student develops a coherent evaluation, analysis, interpretation, or synthesis. Student accurately examines and/or applies the viewpoints of experts, but not comprehensively.</p>	<p>Student struggles to develop a coherent evaluation, analysis, interpretation, or synthesis. Student inaccurately or inconsistently examines and/or applies the viewpoints of experts.</p>	<p>Student offers little or no evaluation, analysis, interpretation, or synthesis. Student fails to examine and/or apply the viewpoints of experts.</p>

LIBERAL ARTS SCORING RUBRIC: EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION

<p><i>In written, oral, numeric or visual formats, the student will:</i></p>	<p><i>Did it awesomely</i> Score = 3</p>	<p><i>Did it</i> Score = 2</p>	<p><i>Kind of did it</i> Score = 1</p>	<p><i>Didn't do it:</i> <i>Non-attempt or Emerging</i> Score = 0</p>
<p>Demonstrate organization and/or coherence of ideas, content, and/or formulas</p>	<p>Material is sharply focused and organized. The student presents a logical organization of ideas around a common theme that demonstrates an advanced understanding of the subject matter.</p>	<p>Material is mostly focused and organized. The student presents logical constructions around a common theme that reflects meaning and purpose.</p>	<p>The student's ideas and organizational patterns reflect a common theme that demonstrates a basic understanding of the subject matter. Ideas are disorganized or may lack development in some places.</p>	<p>The material lacks focus and organization with few or no ideas around common theme. Student struggles to demonstrate her/his understanding of the subject matter.</p>
<p>Produce communication appropriate to audience, situation, venue, and/or context</p>	<p>Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses on all elements of the work.</p>	<p>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).</p>	<p>Demonstrates a basic awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).</p>	<p>Struggles to demonstrate attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).</p>

LALA Outcomes (below) and NMHED Area 1: Communications Competencies (right)	1. Analyze and evaluate oral and written communication in terms of situation, audience, purpose, aesthetics, and diverse points of view	2. Express a primary purpose in a compelling statement and order supporting points logically and convincingly	3. Use effective rhetorical strategies to persuade, inform, and engage	4. Employ writing and/or speaking processes such as planning, collaborating, organizing, composing, revising, and editing to create presentations using correct diction, syntax, grammar, and mechanics	5. Integrate research correctly and ethically from credible sources to support the primary purpose of a communication	6. Engage in reasoned civic discourse while recognizing the distinctions among opinions, fact, and inferences
Identify main issues, concepts, problems, and/or techniques	X	X	X	X	X	X
Incorporate more than one perspective, source, method, technique, and/or approach	X		X		X	X
Demonstrate mastery by evaluating, analyzing, interpreting and/or synthesizing	X			X	X	X
Demonstrate organization and/or coherence of ideas, content, and/or formulas	X	X	X	X	X	X
Produce communication appropriate to audience, situation, venue, and/or context	X		X	X	X	X