

## Institutional Learning Outcome (ILO): Communication

	<b>1 Beginning</b>	<b>2 Approaching</b>	<b>3 Meeting</b>	<b>4 Exceeding</b>
<b>Foci</b>	<i>Entry level, insufficient at the end of first ILO course</i>	<i>Minimally sufficient after first ILO course</i>	<i>Well-developed, sufficient at graduation</i>	<i>Exceptional at end of undergraduate degree)</i>
<b>1. Technical</b>	Inconsistent use of grammatical and mechanical conventions, limited clarity of concepts and topics are tangential. The audience the writing is intended for is not clear. The scope of topic is not explicit and there are questionable word choices.	Ideas are presented in a logical way and the writing flows smoothly. The intended audience is not clear, and some aspects of the writing lack clarity. Concepts utilized are appropriate to topic and scope. Concepts require further definition.	The writing is clear and conveys the intent and purpose of the topic. The topic is clearly defined. There are very few and only minor grammatical errors. Word choices are applicable, and the intended audience is clear.	Flawless with no grammatical errors. Concepts are appropriate and the topic is very well-defined, precise, and accurate. Word choices are applicable to context and audience with proper use of mechanical conventions.
<b>2. Cognitive</b>	Describes the problem from a single perspective. There are general statements that are not fully supported within the context of the discipline.	The topic is approached from multiple perspectives. While there is some discussion of strengths and limitations, there is little integration of the concepts presented.	Analysis incorporates multiple perspectives, exploring the strengths and limitations of each. Perspectives are well articulated and grounded in the disciplinary context.	Evidence of high analytic skills. Clear integration of multiple perspectives with discussion grounded within the context of the discipline.
<b>3. Theoretical</b>	Demonstrates partial theoretical understanding. Identifies a theory.	Theory is broadly described. There is limited application of theory or some misrepresentation in application.	Demonstrates appropriate interpretation and application of theory.	Integrates multiple theories and recognizes their strengths and weaknesses. Acknowledges theoretical gaps and articulates ways forward.
<b>4. Scholarly</b>	Limited use and application of academic and non-academic sources. Presentation of ideas do not reflect academic or scholarly writing and/ or inconsistent application of disciplinary specific citation format.	Some application of academic and non-academic sources. Presentation of ideas partially reflect academic or scholarly writing. Some consistency in the application of disciplinary specific citation format.	Academic and non-academic sources are utilized to support statements and evidence arguments. Presentation of ideas reflects academic or scholarly writing. Consistently applies disciplinary specific citation format.	Draws from a variety of scholars within the field, both leading and contemporary. Draws from appropriate literature. Demonstrates ethical citation practices by drawing on sources representative of different worldviews. Recognizes trends and differences in worldviews. Flawless application of disciplinary specific citation format.

	<b>1 Beginning</b>	<b>2 Approaching</b>	<b>3 Meeting</b>	<b>4 Exceeding</b>
<b>5. Comprehension</b>	<p>Emerging ability to digest information and paraphrase into one's own words.</p> <p>Supports arguments or relays information mostly using direct quotations.</p> <p>Sporadically uses discipline-specific language.</p>	<p>Frequently demonstrates understanding of assigned reading by paraphrasing into one's own words.</p> <p>Relays information using direct quotations with minimal interpretation and synthesis.</p> <p>Demonstrates ability to understand the language of the discipline.</p>	<p>Paraphrases and critiques information and consistently articulates how concepts and theories connect.</p> <p>Demonstrates an ability to discern between relevance and merit of information and minor details.</p> <p>Appropriate use of discipline-specific vocabulary. Evidence of appropriate application of key terms.</p>	<p>Demonstrates deeper analysis and synthesis of knowledge which may result in new discoveries.</p> <p>Discussions and analysis are contextualized to disciplinary and philosophical perspectives and paradigms. Reflects on practical implications of the knowledge.</p> <p>Appropriate use of disciplinary specific vocabulary with recognition that vocabulary evolves over time.</p>
<b>6. Ethical</b>	<p>Expresses understanding of the discipline from a single perspective without articulating consequences, risks and benefits, or outcomes.</p>	<p>Beginning to recognize that knowledge can be harmful and acknowledges the historical impacts of the discipline on certain populations.</p> <p>Aware of regulations that bound communication within the discipline (e.g., Indigenous protocols, Freedom of Information laws)</p>	<p>Demonstrates understanding of the discipline from multiple perspectives. Articulates historical impacts of the discipline and its evolution and impacts in the contemporary context.</p> <p>Applies appropriate regulations that bound communication within the discipline (e.g., Indigenous protocols, Freedom of Information laws)</p>	<p>Articulates an ethically sound and historically grounded understanding of the discipline free of discriminatory and out-dated language. Demonstrates understanding of the power and evolving nature of terminology (e.g., Indigenous peoples, non-binary gendered language).</p> <p>Applies and recognizes limitations within regulations that bound communication within the discipline (e.g., Indigenous protocols, Freedom of Information laws).</p>