

## **Communication Studies Program Assessment Report 2017-2018**

### **I. Communication Studies Program Mission and Educational Objectives**

#### *A. Program Mission*

The Communication Studies Program prepares students for the challenges of a society that is shaped by communication. As participants in the program, students develop and integrate knowledge, creativity, ethical practice, and skills. Students also examine and produce work in oral, written, and visual communication and practice skills in group and intercultural communication.

#### *B. Mission Alignment*

The Communication Studies degree typically culminates in an externship, offering students a chance to practice their target career with a current professional. Prior to that hands-on experience, Communication courses offer a variety of open-ended projects and opportunities to engage with professional or public communities as objects of study for research (e.g. COM 326: Communication Research) or practice (e.g. COM 425/426: Mediation and Mediation Practicum).

As every student's focused sequence creates a unique degree program, innovation is a regular feature of the curriculum. AY 2017's iterations of two technology-focused courses (COM 109: Introduction to Communication Technology and COM 309: Communication Technology in Use) both began to explore contemporary communication media such as podcasts and dynamically generated web content (e.g. Twine applications) in a robust way, as many students' careers are likely to take them into content development on the internet.

#### *C. Additional Information*

The Communication Studies program fills a niche in the Human and Professional Communication world by offering students the opportunity to design a major particular to their career goals. All students are required to complete 36 credit hours in courses of their choosing, forming a Focused Sequence tailored to them. These courses may come from within the Communication department, but many students enroll in courses from Business, CSET, and Psychology to gain specific technical expertises in addition to the interpersonal communication knowledge and skill they gain in a Communication Studies program.

The diversity of our students' career goals results in a graduate body that does not conform to a single mold. Graduates have pursued careers in law enforcement, education, management and marketing, while others have moved on to Communication-focused graduate programs. Each student is guided by their advisor to craft a focused sequence. The student to faculty ratio in our program (X:Y in AY 2016) allows students to work with an advisor with some expertise in their career goal.

## II. Program Description and History

The Communication Studies program fills a niche in Communication programs nationally. Rather than focus on content production within a specific medium (e.g. television or radio broadcast) or on the dynamics of interpersonal communication, the Communication Studies B. S. gives students the flexibility to craft their own program of study through the use of 36 “focused sequence” credits, chosen and justified by the student. Students do gain experience in content production through courses like COM 248: Digital Media Production and COM 309: Communication Technology in Use, and they do gain experience in interpersonal communication through OIT’s general education requirements and courses like COM 205: Intercultural Communication and COM 347: Negotiation and Conflict Resolution. However, these experiences are the foundations for students to develop their specific professional interests.

### *A. Program History: AY 2014 to Present*

The Communication Studies program was revised and approved by the CPC in Winter 2014. All new courses within the major have been rolled out, but many courses in the major are offered once per year or once per two years. As a result, initial PSLO data has not been collected in many of these courses and will not be until AY 2021. Similarly, the new Professional Writing program was approved in Winter of 2017 and its first courses launched in Winter 2018. While it is a distinct program from Communication Studies, the two share many faculty and some courses. As this report discusses in section III: Three-Year Cycle for Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes, the PSLO assessment cycle will be revised to more efficiently assess these programs.

### *B. Program Locations*

All Communication Studies students are located on the Klamath Falls campus, but the department is developing hybrid and online offerings to make the major more appealing to students in other locations. Communication faculty are present on the Klamath Falls campus (9), the Portland-Metro campus (2) and online (1).

The program serves primarily Communication Studies majors, but also serves a group of students in other fields interested in communication-related course work to complement their chosen major.

### *C. Enrollment and Retention Trends*

According to FAST, at the end of AY 2017, there were 46 total Communication Studies majors, including 14 first year students, 4 sophomores, 13 juniors and 15 seniors.

	AY 2015	AY 2016	AY 2017
Total Students	46	56	46
Graduated Previous Year	3	8	11
Retained from Previous Year	33	33	26

*Table 1: Communication Studies B. S. Enrollment and Retention*

Retention numbers are presented above by class standing and only count students persisting from year to year. As the Communication Studies program has many students who transfer in from

Community College programs (37 current students) or from other programs at OIT, common retention data focused on first-time freshmen would not accurately describe our retention figures.

#### *D. Program Graduates*

In AY 2017, 13 students graduated with a Communication Studies B. S.

#### *E. Industry Relationships*

The Communication department as a whole does not maintain industry relationships beyond its advisory board, which includes school board members, Jeld-Wen employees and members of the community.

During AY 2017, the Communication department joined the MadCap Scholar Program, gaining access to the professional MadCap Flare suite of technical writing applications for students (normally \$1,799 per license).

#### *F. Learning Experiences*

In April of 2018, four students presented papers at the Northwest Communication Association's annual conference in Coeur d'Alene, Idaho. These students experienced an academic conference in its entirety, networking with faculty from colleges and universities around the Pacific and Inland Northwest. Their work was presented at the same level as graduate students and faculty.

#### *G. Program Changes*

The Communication Studies B. S. has no programmatic changes from AY 2016 to AY 2017 due to assessment data. Some programmatic changes are occurring due to changes in the faculty body, but the results will not be known until AY 2018 or AY 2019.

### **III. Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs)**

#### *A. Program Education Objectives*

Upon completion of the Communication Studies program, students should be able to:

1. Apply appropriate communication skills across settings, purposes, and audiences.
2. Demonstrate knowledge of communication theory and application.
3. Practice critical thinking to develop innovative and well-founded perspectives related to the students' emphases.
4. Build and maintain healthy and effective relationships.
5. Use technology to communicate effectively in various settings and contexts.
6. Demonstrate appropriate and professional ethical behavior.

#### *B. Expected Program Student Learning Outcomes*

Students with a bachelor's degree in Communication Studies should be able to:

1. Demonstrate critical and innovative thinking.
2. Display competence in oral, written, and visual communication.
3. Apply communication theories.

4. Understand opportunities in the field of communication.
5. Use current technology related to the communication field.
6. Respond effectively to cultural communication differences.
7. Communicate ethically.
8. Demonstrate positive group communication exchanges.

### *C. Origin and External Validation*

The program objectives are reviewed annually by the department and at each advisory board meeting. They will be discussed (with the possibility of expanding, revising or removing objectives) at the Spring 2018 Advisory Board meeting. Program Objectives and Learning Outcomes are implicitly discussed at each CSAC (Communication Studies Advisory Committee) meeting, occurring twice per academic term, as individual students' programs of study are reviewed.

The Communication department has not yet begun external validation of these outcomes nor assessment of student proficiency after graduation.

## **IV. Curriculum Map**

A detailed curriculum map is currently under development and will be included in the AY 2018 assessment report.

## **V. Assessment Cycle of Student Learning Outcomes**

Due to scheduling and technology challenges, the Communication Studies Assessment Coordinator was unable to gather data to assess the AY 2017 PSLOs directly. Further, because the two majors housed by the Communication department (Communication Studies and Professional Writing) share many faculty and several courses, the assessment cycle is currently being revised for AY 2018 to improve efficiency in data collection and in the department's ability to respond to assessment findings.

The assessment cycle prior to now has followed the table below, with the furthest right column showing the three PSLOs that have not been assessed since AY 2012.

Learning Outcomes	'13-'14	'14-'15	'15-'16	'16-'17	'17-'18	'18-'19
PSLO 1: Critical Thinking	●				●	
PSLO 2: Competence in Comm		●		●		
PSLO 3: Communication Theory				●	●	
PSLO 4: Opportunities in Field				●		
PSLO 5: Use of Technology		●				
PSLO 6: Cultural Communication			●			●
PSLO 7: Ethics			●			●
PSLO 8: Group Communication			● <sup>1</sup>			●

Table 2: Communication Studies Assessment Cycle

## VI. Summary of 2017-2018 Assessment Activities

The Communication Studies faculty conducted formal assessment of the Inquiry and Analysis Essential Studies Learning Outcome (ESLO IA). Indirect assessments of PSLO 1 (Critical Thinking) and PSLO 3 (Communication Theory), the scheduled PSLOs for this cycle, are discussed below.

Indirect assessments were formed by taking up to five years (AY 2013-2017) of final grade data from FAST, examining student performance in a series of courses (described below). This data is compared to responses in the Student Exit Survey, broadly measuring the agreement between students and faculty about their performance in these outcomes. This inexact process helps fill the gap caused by limited artifact gathering, though it is complicated by a limited response rate from graduating Communication Studies students graduating in Spring 2017 (response n = 3).

### A. PSLO 1: Critical Thinking

#### 1) Indirect Assessment: Student Exit Survey

All students (n = 3) rated themselves as having “high proficiency” in critical thinking according to ESLO 2 and PSLO 1 responses, and all students credit their time at Oregon Tech and in the Communication Studies program “very much” in developing this ability. Of these three students, only one had started their academic career in a different program (Medical Imaging), transferring to Communication Studies as a junior. The exit survey did not ask how much prior majors (if any) contributed to learning outcomes.

Further, all students believed that Communication courses helped them “develop intellectually” and that they were relevant to the students’ lives or needs.

---

<sup>1</sup> A combination of a relatively low number of upper-division Communication Students and a very small number of courses that have a graded group work component, Group Communication was not assessed this year (one class had one major group project, but, given the small size of the class, there were only three articles of student work, which is too small of a sample to provide meaningful results).

All three students had positive remarks about the program in their exit survey, but one in particular discussed the program's effect on his/her ability to view the world with a critical lens (emphasis added):

**Conducting research and presenting it** at the NWCA conferences was a tremendous milestone in my educational career. I was not only able to **apply the learned knowledge** from my research, COM theory, and public speaking courses, but I was able to **integrate aspects from my own experience** in the research subject matter. Also, because of my passion for the research and personal investments in it, it was also a pleasure being a part of a panel of other COM professors at the conference. I was also able to be a part of the International Media Seminar in Paris course that took place at the American University of Paris. Professor Christian Vukasovich was deeply invested and always excited to help his students **learn history and understand its significance to our subject matter**. He created a classroom environment that made me want to get just as excited as he was about whatever topic he was teaching on. I will never forget our trip to Paris over Spring break, the connections I was able to make with leaders in the industry, learning about the robustness of the French culture, and creating memories with my friends and professor on foreign land. Perhaps the most important features that the Communication studies major had to offer me at Oregon Tech was invested and experienced professors, small class sizes, and hands on realistic application of the education. A combination of these three things created an enriched learning environment that enabled me to thrive as a life-long learner and student.

Again, this is a small set of responses from a small program, so the results must be viewed as the individual experiences of three students, rather than a robust assessment of the program as a whole.

2) *Coordinated Direct Assessment: Academic Performance in COM 326: Communication Research*  
Students' ability to think critically was assessed directly in COM 326: Communication Research for the Inquiry and Analysis ESLO. Data from that assessment is discussed in greater detail below. This course has WRI 227: Technical Report Writing as a prerequisite and all students will have taken COM 106: Introduction to Communication Research as part of the normal program sequence. Students in COM 326 spend a full academic term gathering, analyzing and reporting on data from a communication-focused research project of their own design. These projects often extend from conversations or projects in other courses, like COM 106 and WRI 227. Nine students' term projects were assessed. Due to this small count of artifacts and the extensive preparation of students in the class, the quantitative data does not provide much detail.

It is worth noting that four of the nine student projects assessed received **external validation** by the Northwest Communication Association, as those students' work was accepted and presented at the annual conference that year.

3) *Coordinated Indirect Assessment: Academic Performance in Research and Analysis Courses*

However, the responses above can be coordinated with class performance in courses that emphasize critical thinking and analytical thinking (Table 2). As this measurement is inexact and cannot fully abstract critical thinking ability from other course grading criteria, it should only be viewed as a rough measurement of agreement between students (who all rated their critical thinking ability highly as a result of their time in the Communication Studies program) and faculty.

Due to scheduling, staffing limitations and transfer credits, some students receive alternative credit for upper division courses. While lower division courses in this list see a spread of academic performance from outstanding work (A) to minimally acceptable (C or D), students have largely shifted to outstanding work in upper division courses and in their general education report writing course.

It is important to remember that grading and assessment are two entirely different processes. However, these grades indicate that time spent in the Communication Studies program does correlate with better performance in courses that reinforce or expect critical thinking.

Course	Students in Exit Survey (n=3)				All Communication Students			
	A	B	C	<C	A	B	C	<C
COM 106	33% (n=1)		33% (n=1)	33% (n=1)	57.6% (n=34/59)	13.6% (n=8/59)	15.3% (n=9/59)	13.6% (n=8/59)
COM 255	33% (n=1)	33% (n=1)		33% (n=1)	44.9% (n=22/49)	24.5% (n=12/49)	24.5% (n=12/49)	6.1% (n=3/49)
COM 309	100% (n=1)				83.3% (n=15/18)	11.1% (n=2/18)	5.6% (n=1/18)	0% (n=0/18)
COM 326	100% (n=2)				39.6% (n=21/53)	39.6% (n=21/53)	15.1% (n=8/53)	5.7% (n=3/53)
WRI 227	100% (n=2)				35% (n=14/40)	17.5% (n=7/40)	17.5% (n=7/40)	30% (n=12/40)

Table 3: *Academic Performance in Critical-Thinking –Oriented Courses, Fall 2013 through Summer 2018*

**COM 106: Introduction to Communication Research** is the final course in the Communication Studies introductory sequence. Students perform some research and data analysis tasks and begin preparing a project for COM 326: Communication Research.

**COM 255: Communication Ethics** requires students to regularly examine real life situations and apply ethical frameworks to either assess action that was taken or determine the most prudent course of action based on various criteria. Students must perform some independent research, and they must be able to critically analyze social situations to justify their assessments or proposed responses.

**COM 309: Communication Technology in Use** requires students to utilize advanced communication media to convey messages to a particular audience. Because students have access to a variety of communication media and because audience features can never be fully defined, students must think critically to make the most effective choices they can and to justify those choices to others.

**COM 326: Communication Research** is described above. Students spend a full term gathering, analyzing and presenting data pertaining to a research question of their own design.

**WRI 227: Technical Report Writing** is a general education course taught by Communication faculty. Students spend a full term gathering and organizing information pertaining to a research question or professional problem, ideally with the intent of delivering it to a supervisor or other individual who can put that information into action. Performing well in this course requires significant pre-planning and audience awareness.

4) *Discussion: Critical Thinking*

Data indicate that Communication Studies students are performing at least as expected in PSLO 1: Critical Thinking.

While more direct assessment would yield more detailed results, this report would note that significant staffing changes in the Communication department will result in changes to several critical-thinking-oriented courses. Faculty scheduled to teach courses like COM 106: Introduction to Communication Research COM 309: Communication Technology in Use are already reviewing prior course content and student performance to further reinforce or emphasize this outcome. **This report advises that future assessment plans consider tracking student critical thinking longitudinally, particularly in course sequences that allow students to revisit projects over several terms, as that would provide greater detail in measuring growth rather than snapshots of performance.**

B. *PSLO 3: Communication Theory*

1) *Indirect Assessment: Student Exit Survey*

Similar to the Exit Survey results discussed above, all students rated themselves with “High Proficiency” in PSLO 3: Applying communication theories, as well as PSLOs related to applying communication theories (PSLO 6: Respond effectively to cultural communication differences, PSLO 7: Communicate ethically and PSLO 8: Demonstrate positive group communication exchanges). Likewise, all students credited their experience in the Communication Studies program “very much” in developing this knowledge.

In terms of program curricula, all students “strongly agreed” that the program provided “sufficient depth of information about specific topics.” While “topics” does not directly indicate theories of communication, all students at least “agreed” that the curriculum (a) was properly scaffolded, with “lower-division courses provid[ing] a foundation for upper division courses” (2/3 strongly agree) and (b) provided “sufficient breadth of information about Communication Studies” (2/3 strongly agree), a field that is strongly theory-driven. Only one student provided a narrative comment regarding the curriculum, noting that there is room for more “professional development and practical experience,” shortcomings that are not directly connected to developing a theoretical foundation in the field.

In commenting on the program overall, one student discussed clear connections between the theoretical or abstract knowledge discussed in the classroom and the hands-on application they developed later (emphasis added):

1. The **training and development class was very helpful in showing how** to run a training class. Something I could be doing in the future. 2. The professors all do a great job in explaining **how the course material could be applied in real world situations**. 3. Being a COM major in general. We go to a tech school where everyone is either complaining about doing math, or memorizing the body. As a COM major **I enjoyed a majority of my work, and doing them will help me in the future** as well. Let's see those engineer majors try to communicate interpersonally with someone from a different culture. I don't think they can.

Without addressing the cross-major comparison in that comment's closing, this student clearly sees a connection between the theory discussed in the classroom and the real world practice it informs.

2) *Coordinated Indirect Assessment: Academic Performance in Theory-Oriented Courses*

As with Critical Thinking, it is important to discuss whether there is agreement between the students' reflection and classroom assessment. Table 3 below compares the classroom performance of students included in the exit survey with Communication Studies students overall. Again, it looks at grade data from five years (AY 2013-2017) for courses that deal primarily with theories of communication. These data are not granular enough to fine-tune individual courses or curricular interventions, but they do indicate, in general, how well Communication Studies students are meeting faculty goals in courses that require knowledge of communication theory.

These data do not share the same upward trend presented in Table 2. Without more detailed data collection, this report cannot conclude any causes or remedies. It can only suggest that students are less in agreement with their faculty when it comes to assessments of their knowledge of communication theories and strategies.

Course	In Exit Survey				All Communication Students			
	A	B	C	<C	A	B	C	<C
COM 105	33.3% (n=1)	-	33.3% (n=1)	33.3% (n=1)	57.6% (n=34)	13.6% (n=8)	15.3% (n=9)	13.6% (n=8)
COM 115	100% (n=2)	-	-	-	35% (n=14)	17.5% (n=7)	17.5% (n=7)	30% (n=12)
COM 205	33.3% (n=1)	33.3% (n=1)	-	33.3% (n=1)	44.9% (n=22)	24.5% (n=12)	24.5% (n=12)	6.1% (n=3)
COM 225	33.3% (n=1)	33.3% (n=1)	-	-	51.1% (n=24)	25.5% (n=12)	14.9% (n=7)	8.5% (n=4)
COM 301	-	100% (n=2)	-	33.3% (n=1)	31.5% (n=17)	44.4% (n=24)	16.7% (n=9)	7.4% (n=4)
COM 345	50% (n=1)	50% (n=1)	-	-	28.9% (n=13)	46.7% (n=21)	17.8% (n=8)	6.7% (n=3)
COM 347	33.3% (n=1)	-	33.3% (n=1)	33.3% (n=1)	57.6% (n=34)	13.6% (n=8)	15.3% (n=9)	13.6% (n=8)

Table 4: *Academic Performance in Communication-Theory-Oriented Courses*

**COM 105: Introduction to Communication Theory** is the second course in our introductory sequence. The course focuses primarily on describing different theories and strategies of communication, culminating in students analyzing one instance of communication through the lens of a theory of their choosing.

**COM 115: Mass Communication** examines theories and strategies for mass-media communication. Like COM 105, it primarily describes these theories as a foundation for future courses.

**COM 205: Intercultural Communication** focuses on problems related to communicating with individuals from different cultural backgrounds, whether those backgrounds be race, religion, nationality, language or social group. Students apply various strategies for communication across cultural boundaries.

**COM 225: Interpersonal Communication** focuses on communication between individuals. Like COM 205, it requires students to learn and apply various strategies to solve specific interpersonal problems.

**COM 301: Rhetorical Theory** covers a range of classical rhetorical theories for effective communication. Students must use these approaches to design their own orations.

**COM 345: Organizational Communication I** covers theories and strategies for intra- and inter-organizational communication. Students produce work that demonstrates knowledge of these theories and their application in professional life.

**COM 347: Negotiation and Conflict Resolution** covers theories and strategies for resolving conflicts between individuals or groups. Students must apply the theories learned in class to resolve conflicts.

### 3) *Discussion: Communication Theory*

As with PSLO 1, grade data indicates that students are learning at least enough communication theory to continue progressing through the program. Quantitative data at this distance, however, cannot say whether students are learning a broad base of theories to apply in a variety of situations or if they are learning and applying a narrow set of theories repeatedly to perform well in class (though this report cannot claim that either is a better outcome than the other).

While more data would produce findings with finer detail, the introduction of the Professional Writing major will cause some communication theory curricula to migrate into new courses (particularly those approaches dealing with technical writing and document design), and it will require existing courses to take on additional theoretical content to meet the needs of both Communication Studies and Professional Writing students. **This report advises that future assessment plans consider defining the communication theory knowledge/application being assessed in greater detail.**

*C. Direct Assessment of Inquiry and Analysis ESLO*

The Inquiry and Analysis ESLO was also assessed in COM 326: Communication Research (described above). As elements of Inquiry and Analysis align with Critical Thinking, this is also a direct assessment of PSLO 1: Critical Thinking. However, as noted above, the small sample of students and a long project development process both result in data that skews strongly toward High Proficiency. All student artifacts were rated in LiveText by the course professor, Dr. Kevin Brown. Dr. Brown works closely with each student, offering a significant amount of feedback and advice throughout the project – including multiple chances for revision of the final research paper at the end of the term. This focus helps produce very high quality work from students. As noted earlier in this report, four students in the course had their research papers accepted for presentation at a regional conference, where they presented alongside graduate students and faculty in Communication. The full rubric is included in Appendix: Inquiry and Analysis ESLO Rubric.

	HIGH PROFICIENCY	PROFICIENCY	SOME PROFICIENCY	LIMITED PROFICIENCY
IDENTIFY	55.6% (n=5)	44.4% (n=4)	-	-
INVESTIGATE	44.4% (n=4)	55.6% (n=5)	-	-
SUPPORT	88.9% (n=8)	11.1% (n=1)	-	-
EVALUATE	77.8% (n=7)	22.2% (n=2)	-	-
CONCLUDE <sup>2</sup>	75% (n=6)	25% (n=2)	-	-

*Table 5: Performance on Inquiry and Analysis ESLO Rubric*

*1) Discussion: Inquiry and Analysis*

Data suggests that Communication Studies students perform well in Inquiry and Analysis. It is unclear whether this assessment is weighted by the increased time, preparation and faculty focus on student projects or if Communication Studies students are especially good at Inquiry and Analysis. Grade data from the PSLO discussions above suggests the former. **This report advises creating a cohort-study model for future assessment to better understand what knowledge students are transferring from course to course.**

**VII. Action Plan**

As a result of formal and informal data collected in AY 2017, the Communication department has the following goals.

*A. AY 2018*

Due to faculty concerns over student preparation to use software and technologies central to most communication experts’ careers, a new foundational course will be developed to teach core concepts in communication technology and computer literacy. After this course’s second iteration, students will be assessed longitudinally on their ability to perform technological tasks central to

---

<sup>2</sup> One artifact was not rated in this area.

communication research and practice. This assessment is likely to be driven by artifacts developed in the new course, in COM 326: Communication Research and COM 248: Digital Media Production.

Further, due to regular complications with small data sets in Communication Studies assessment reports, future assessments will forego linkage between PSLOs and individual courses. Instead, samples of artifacts will be pulled from a variety of courses both to increase the amount of student work assessed and to provide a more detailed understanding of how the program is performing overall.

#### *B. Ongoing*

Due to potential changes in assessment technology and definite changes resulting from the new Professional Writing program (which is affecting content in some Communication Studies classes), the Communication department will explore ways to increase efficiency in assessment, both by increasing the breadth of artifacts assessed each year and by developing a longitudinal assessment strategy to ensure students grow in the program.

As stated in previous sections, this report would also advise broadening the collection method to gather artifacts and assessments from a variety of courses, rather than individual interventions where students may be primed to perform well on an outcome. More robust data would also be possible with a cohort model, if it becomes possible to archive the work of small groups of students from their first year of classes until graduation.

### **VIII. Closing the Loop**

The AY 2016 report did not have specific action items except to grow our data set and potentially look for ways to assess PSLOs in courses that do not prime students to perform them, e.g. demonstrating ethical practice (PSLO 7) in COM 255: Communication Ethics. The Communication department is looking for ways to develop a larger common set of artifacts for assessment purposes, allowing us to assess more PSLOs across a wider range of courses each year. However, this process has not moved past the early planning stages, as the university's contract with LiveText is uncertain.

## Appendix: Inquiry and Analysis ESLO Rubric

### Inquiry & Analysis Rubric (2017-18 Assessment)

DEFINITION				
Inquiry and analysis consists of posing meaningful questions about situations and systems, gathering and evaluating relevant evidence, and articulating how that evidence justifies decisions and contributes to students' understanding of how the world works.				
CRITERIA				
	<b>HIGH PROFICIENCY (4): The work meets listed requirements for this criterion; little to no development needed.</b>	<b>PROFICIENCY (3): The work meets most requirements; minor development would improve the work.</b>	<b>SOME PROFICIENCY (2): The work needs moderate development in multiple requirements.</b>	<b>LIMITED PROFICIENCY (1): The work does not meet this criterion: it needs substantial development in most requirements.</b>
<b>IDENTIFY: Identify a meaningful question or topic of inquiry.</b>	Identifies a creative, focused, and manageable topic that addresses potentially significant yet previously less-explored aspects of the subject.	Identifies a focused and manageable topic that appropriately addresses relevant aspects of the subject.	Identifies a topic that, while manageable, is too narrowly focused and leaves out relevant aspects of the subject.	Identifies a topic that is too general and wide-ranging to be manageable.
<b>INVESTIGATE: Examine and critically evaluate existing knowledge and views on the topic of inquiry.</b>	Clearly states, comprehensively describes, and synthesizes in-depth information from relevant high-quality sources representing various approaches and points of view.	States, comprehensively describes, and presents in-depth information from relevant high-quality sources representing various approaches and points of view.	Presents information from relevant sources representing a limited set of approaches or points of view, but descriptions leave some terms undefined or ambiguities unexplored.	Presents information from irrelevant sources representing a limited set of approaches or points of view, or states information without clarification or description.
<b>SUPPORT: Design and execute a means of collecting evidence</b>	All elements of the methodology or theoretical framework are skillfully developed. (Appropriate methodology or theoretical frameworks may be synthesized from across disciplines.)	Critical elements of the methodology of theoretical framework are appropriately developed. However, more subtle elements are ignored.	Critical elements of the methodology of theoretical framework are missing, incorrectly developed, or unfocused.	Inquiry design demonstrates a misunderstanding of the methodology or theoretical framework.
<b>EVALUATE: Analyze evidence obtained in their investigation.</b>	Organizes and synthesizes evidence to reveal insightful patterns, differences, or similarities related to subject focus.	Organizes evidence to reveal important patterns, differences, or similarities related to subject focus.	Organizes evidence, but the organization is not effective in revealing important patterns, differences, or similarities.	Lists evidence, the evidence presented is not organized or it is unrelated to the subject focus.
<b>CONCLUDE: Draw conclusions based on analysis of evidence; grasp the limitations and implications of their analyses.</b>	States an eloquently supported conclusion that is a logical extrapolation of the inquiry, reflecting the student's informed evaluation and ability to place substantial evidence and perspectives in priority order.	States a conclusion focused solely on the inquiry findings, arising specifically from and responding specifically to the inquiry findings.	States a general conclusion beyond the scope of the inquiry, the support for which is inadequate, or information was chosen to fit the conclusion.	States an ambiguous, illogical, or fallacious conclusion that is inconsistently tied to the inquiry findings.