

## Communication Studies Program Assessment Report 2015-2016

### I. Introduction of the Communication Studies Major Program

Located exclusively at the Klamath Falls campus, the Communication Studies program offers courses in a variety of communication contexts, including technical, rhetorical, interpersonal, group, and organizational communication. 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.

#### *Enrollment Trends*

For Fall 2015, there were 46 total Communication Studies majors, including 2 first year students, 7 sophomores, 24 juniors, and 21 seniors.

The retention rate for 2013-2014 was 80%.<sup>1</sup>

The program revision was approved by the CPC in Winter 2014. New courses are currently being rolled out. As the new courses were designed to more completely meet the PSLOs, more and more data points will be available in the coming years. The new Gender and Communication course, COM325, was assessed this year, providing our first data set for the Cultural Communication PSLO and part of the first data set for the new Diverse Perspectives ESLO. For this year, due to the revisions and rather low course enrollment in the courses that best align with this year's outcomes, the data sets are small, but they should increase in the coming years.

### II. Program Purpose, Mission Statement, and Objectives

#### *Program Purpose, Objectives and Student Learning Outcomes*

Communication faculty reviewed the current program objectives and learning outcomes to provide feedback for change to the program. All of the most recent modifications to the program mission, educational objectives, and learning outcomes are included in the sections below. Although the student learning detailed in this report was assessed in a classroom setting, students had other opportunities to demonstrate their learning in Communication student clubs, honor societies, externships, and regional academic conferences. In April 2016, four COM majors presented original research at the Northwest Communication Association annual convention.

#### *Communication Studies Program Mission Statement*

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.

---

<sup>1</sup> The most recent retention data provided to the department was for the 2013-2014 school year.

### *Program Education Objectives*

After 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.

### *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.

### *Information about the Objectives*

The program objectives are reviewed annually, most recently throughout CSAC meetings in the 2015-2016 academic year. The department meets with their advisory board twice per year, and the advisory board last reviewed the program objectives in May 2015.

### **III. Three-Year Cycle for Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes**

The eight learning outcomes will be assessed, two or three each year, on a three-year cycle as demonstrated in Table 1.

*Note: Due to approved changes to the major, the PSLO rubrics are being redesigned to better serve our students. The curriculum changes were approved by the COM advisory board in Fall 2013 and by the CPC in Winter 2014. The new Gender and Communication course rolled out this year, and others will roll out in 2016-2017.*

Learning Outcomes	'11-'12	'12-'13	'13-'14	'14-'15	'15-'16	'16-'17
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>2</sup>	

Table1: Communication Studies Assessment Cycle

#### IV. Summary of 2015-2016 Assessment Activities

The Communication Studies faculty conducted formal assessment of Cultural Communication (PSLO6) and Ethics (PSLO7).

**Program Student Learning Outcome 6:** Students with a Bachelor's degree in Communication Studies should be able to respond effectively to cultural communication differences.

**Program Student Learning Outcome 7:** Students with a Bachelor's degree in Communication Studies should be able to communicate ethically.

#### Direct Assessment of PSLO 6

PSLO 6 was assessed at the 300-level in the new COM325 course, Gender and Communication. Most of the students were juniors or seniors. This course has COM205, Intercultural Communication, as a pre-requisite. COM205 is already approved as a foundational level Diverse Perspectives course, and COM325 is already approved as a practice level course for Communication Studies students. Thus, this assessment will serve as one of the benchmarks for future Diverse Perspectives at the institutional level. Additionally, even though cultural communication is a PSLO for Communication Studies, the only course in which the concept was addressed directly was in COM205, which is a general education course. In any given year, there were not enough Communication students to assess how Communication majors were (or were not) meeting the outcome. Thus, while there is no data to compare how Communication Students fared compared to previous cohorts, this data can serve as a benchmark for assessing this PSLO in the future.

PSLO 6 was assessed at the 300-level. The final paper was assessed for all 10 students in the class. The new Oregon Tech Diverse Perspectives rubric (attached as

<sup>2</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.

an appendix) was used to assess the students' ability to understand and interact with diverse others.

COM325: Gender and Communication  
Final Ethnography Paper  
Effective Cultural Communication/Diverse Perspectives Outcome

The final paper was used to assess cultural communication/diverse perspectives. The OIT Diverse Perspectives rubric was used to score the final papers. A total of 10 students were assess. A graphic representation of the assessment results appears below:

Performance Criteria	Assessment Method	Measurement Scale	Minimum Acceptable	Results (% at 3 or 4)
Recognized	Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	100%
Understand	Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	80%
Know	Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	90%
Apply	Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	80%

Table 2: COM325: Respond Effectively to Cultural Communication—used a rubric to assess the final paper.

Having 80% of students rated at level 3 or 4 shows proficiency. Thus, from the above table, it appears that COM students are doing well with recognizing their own perspectives, researching and understanding others' perspectives, interacting with diverse others effectively, and applying course content a real-world situation.

### Indirect Assessment of PSLO 6

The exit survey was administered to the seniors graduating from the Communication program in 2016; however, only 1 responded.<sup>3</sup> This survey included two questions asking students to assess their ability to interact with diverse others (the first question focused on how well the skills were taught while the other dealt with how well the students could effectively put the skills into practice in their own interactions); taken together, the two serve as a validity check. On both measures, the respondent reported that s/he was highly proficient at interacting with diverse others and that OIT had helped in developing these skills.

The small number of responding graduates may have skewed the results. Next year, there will be more graduates, which means more people should take the survey, so the validity should be increased next year.

### PSLO 6 Summary and Reflection

**Areas of Competence:** The COM325 assessment showed that COM students are doing well with recognizing their own perspectives, researching and understanding

---

<sup>3</sup> The COM department and/or the Assessment Commission should find a way to maximize response rates.  
Communication Studies Assessment Report

others' perspectives, interacting with diverse others effectively, and applying course content a real-world situation.

**Areas for Improvement:** While all four criteria showed at least 80% competence, the fact that two were only at the bare minimum of 80% demonstrates that there is room for improvement. About 20% of the students had a difficult time explaining the foundations of others' diverse perspectives, which could tie in with the overarching research issue that has been identified in previous COM assessments, for it requires research to acquire knowledge about others and their practices. Additionally, about 20% of students did not fully apply their course knowledge to interactions with others, resulting in descriptions that were evaluative rather than reflective, which could tie in with the overarching critical thinking issue that has been identified in previous COM assessments.

**Plans for Improvement:** Since this is the first time that PSLO 6 has been assessed, there is no way to compare how students have improved in this area; however, given that the two areas of (slight) concern come from issues related to research and critical thinking, there are a couple of steps that faculty could take.

In the intro-level sequence courses, departmental faculty could elaborate on what an academic source is and how to use such a source effectively to help foster knowledge. Moreover, activities that focus on critical thinking could help with application issues.

**Other Areas for Consideration:** In the COM325 assessment, students were meeting the 80% or higher benchmark for all areas assessed. There are a few things that could account for the high levels of proficiency:

1. The small sample size (10 students) could skew the data and thus may not accurately reflect COM students' ability to interact with diverse others.
2. The instructor for the course was also quite instrumental in drafting the Diverse Perspectives rubric and was thus able to teach the course specifically to the rubric criteria. While this is neither positive nor negative per se, it could help to explain why the students scored so well.
3. The students had taken COM205, giving them a firm grounding in understanding diverse others and interacting with diverse others. *This assessment report thus shows how students are actually ready to put foundational level concepts (from COM205) into practice.*

### **Direct Assessment of PSLO 7**

PSLO 7 was assessed in COM255, the Communication Ethics course. Due to the way that the COM program is structured, many lower-division courses, including COM255, have several junior and senior level students in the course. In the new ESLO structure, COM255 will serve as the foundational level ethics course for COM students, but, as it is the only ethics-focused course in the COM curriculum at this time, it is a great course to use to assess ethics.

COM255: Communication Ethics  
 Ethical Position Paper  
 Ethical Communication/Ethics outcome

The students' final paper (written in pairs) was used to assess ethics. As the OIT ethics rubric is currently being revised to better align with the revised ethics ESLO, the AAC&U Ethics rubric was used to assess the final papers. The AAC&U rubric was chosen over the soon-to-be replaced OIT ethics rubrics for two reasons:

1. The new ethics outcome and thus the new rubric align closely with the AAC&U ethics outcome, making the AAC&U rubric a better option for setting up a benchmark for future ethics assessments.
2. The old OIT ethics rubric was focused mainly on ethical codes, while the COM255 course, like the newly-revised ethics outcome, is focused more on theory and application, and the AAC&U rubric is focused on theory and application.

A total of 10 student pair papers were assessed. A graphic representation of the assessment results appears below:

Performance Criteria	Assessment Method	Measurement Scale	Minimum Acceptable	Results (% at 3 or 4)
Ethical self-awareness	Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	70%
Understanding different ethical principles/concepts	Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	50%
Ethical issue recognition	Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	60%
Application of ethical perspectives/concepts	Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	70%
Evaluation of different ethical perspectives/concepts	Rubric	1-4	80% at 3 or 4	70%

Table 3: COM109: Technology Use—used a rubric to assess the mid-term project.

Having 80% of students rated at 3 or 4 shows proficiency. Thus, when it comes to ethics criteria, COM students are not entirely proficient, but the small sample size (10) could have skewed the data and may not accurately reflect all COM students. Per the results, COM students are pretty good at identifying their own ethical viewpoints, applying ethical theories, and evaluating ethical theories; understanding, recognizing, and explaining ethical theories show where the students need some work.

**Indirect Assessment of PSLO 7**

The exit survey was administered to the seniors graduating from the Communication program in 2016; however, only 1 responded. This survey included two questions asking students to assess their ability to communicate ethically (the first question focused on how well the skills were taught while the other dealt with how well the students could effectively put the skills into practice in their own interactions); taken

together, the two serve as a validity check. On both measures, the respondent reported that s/he was highly proficient at communicating ethically and that OIT had helped in developing these skills.

The small number of responding graduates may have skewed the results. Next year, there will be more graduates, which means more people should take the survey, so the validity should be increased next year.

## **PSLO 7 Summary and Reflection**

**Areas of Competence:** The results show that a strong majority (70%) of students can convey their ethical self-awareness and can evaluate and apply ethical theories; however, this is still below the 80% benchmark. The relatively strong percentage does show that COM students can identify, explain, and use ethical theories and apply them to a specific case. It will be interesting to see if there is marked improvement when ethics is assessed at the practicing level (as this is a foundational level course).

**Areas for Improvement:** While none of the criteria hit the 80% threshold, the students need to work on properly identifying and explaining ethical theories that are appropriate to use for analyzing an ethical case. While some students did a great job explaining and then using multiple ethical frameworks, others only mentioned theories or did not use a variety of appropriate theories, both of which result in lower scores on the AAC&U Ethics Value rubric.

**Plans for Improvement:** Understanding ethical concepts was scored the lowest, and this could tie to basic research and summarizing skills. Throughout assessments in COM, a need for improved critical thinking and research has been emphasized, and those skills could help here (as students would know how to research different ethical approaches and then how to summarize those approaches). The new focus on inquiry and analysis may help with developing these skills. COM faculty can encourage students to fully explain any concepts used and to begin to think about why a given concept is best suited for analyzing a case. This transferrable skill will help address the shortcoming shown in this assessment.

**Other Areas for Consideration:** There are a few things that should be considered when interpreting the results of the ethics assessment:

1. Due to rubric revisions, it is difficult to compare the results of this assessment with the 2012-2013 assessment of ethics. The OIT Ethics rubric, focused on ethical codes, was used for that assessment. However, both rubrics do focus on identification and analysis, and it is worth noting that, while the scores in this assessment have not yet met the 80% mark, the analysis score has improved from 53% competence to 70%, which is significant, and identifying different viewpoints has remained relatively consistent (40% and 73% in 2012-2013 to 70% here).

2. The small sample size (10 students) could skew the data and thus may not accurately reflect COM students' ability to interact with diverse others.
3. Due to extenuating circumstances, the assignments were not assessed by the instructor who gave the assignment. While this is not a negative (the MSC relies on outside assessors), it is a slight deviation from the way that assessment is usually done at Oregon Tech.

## **V. Summary of Student Learning**

### **Student Learning Outcome 6: Students with a Bachelor's degree in Communication should be able to respond effectively to cultural communication differences.**

Strengths: The COM325 assessment showed that COM students are doing well with recognizing their own perspectives, researching and understanding others' perspectives, interacting with diverse others effectively, and applying course content a real-world situation. However, the small sample size could affect these data.

Weaknesses: About 20% of the students had a difficult time explaining the foundations of others' diverse perspectives, which could tie in with the overarching research issue that has been identified in previous COM assessments, for it requires research to acquire knowledge about others and their practices. Additionally, about 20% of students did not fully apply their course knowledge to interactions with others, resulting in descriptions that were evaluative rather than reflective, which could tie in with the overarching critical thinking issue that has been identified in previous COM assessments.

Plans for Assessment: Since this is the first time that this outcome has been assessed, it is mainly serving as a benchmark for future cultural communication/diverse perspectives assessment. That said, by focusing on encouraging critical thinking and research skills (both of which will be assessed before the next cultural communication assessment), COM faculty could help students become more rounded scholars.

### **Student Learning Outcome 5: Students with a Bachelor's degree in Communication Studies should be able to communicate ethically.**

Strengths: The results show that a strong majority (70%) of students can convey their ethical self-awareness and can evaluate and apply ethical theories; however, this is still below the 80% benchmark. The relatively strong percentage does show that COM students can identify, explain, and use ethical theories and apply them to a specific case. It will be interesting to see if there is marked improvement when ethics is assessed at the practicing level (as this is a foundational level course).

Weaknesses: While none of the criteria hit the 80% threshold, the students need to work on properly identifying and explaining ethical theories that are appropriate to use for analyzing an ethical case. While some students did a great job explaining and then using multiple ethical frameworks, others only mentioned theories or did not use a variety of appropriate theories, both of which result in lower scores on the AAC&U Ethics Value rubric.

Plans for Assessment: Understanding ethical concepts was scored the lowest, and this could tie to basic research and summarizing skills. Throughout assessments in COM, a need for improved critical thinking and research has been emphasized, and those skills could help here (as students would know how to research different ethical approaches and then how to summarize those approaches). The new focus on inquiry and analysis may help with developing these skills. COM faculty can encourage students to fully explain any concepts used and to begin to think about why a given concept is best suited for analyzing a case. This transferrable skill will help address the shortcoming shown in this assessment.

## **VI. Changes as a Result of Previous Assessments**

### **Closing the Loop/Relating This Assessment to Previous Ethics Assessment**

In the last ethics assessment (completed in 2012-2013), students were assessed on a code of ethics rather than ethical theory, but there is some overlap between some of the criteria that deserve reflection.

In the 2012-2013 assessment, only 53% of students could use ethical theory to analyze a case, and that number has increased to 70, and identifying different viewpoints has remained relatively consistent (40% and 73% in 2012-2013 to 70% here).

Thus, compared to the previous ethics assessment, analysis skills have increased. This could be due to an overarching focus on critical thinking and analysis in a variety of COM courses, for applying ethical theories and analyzing ethics in a case are a form of applied critical thinking. To continually improve proficiency on this outcome, faculty can continue to emphasize critical thinking and can also work to find ways to integrate ethics in various other points in the curriculum (right now, COM255 is the only ethics-specific course in the curriculum); having an upper-division measure could also improve scores.

Plans for further addressing shortcomings are explained above in the “Plans for Improvement.”

Given that this is the first time that the cultural communication/diverse perspectives outcome has been assessed (as least from the reports that this Assessment Coordinator could find on the OIT website), there is not a lot to compare at this point; however, this assessment provides a baseline for future assessments not only in the COM program but as a diverse perspectives outcome assessment for the campus community.

**VII. Curriculum Map** (will be refined in the coming years as new COM major courses are being rolled out)

Courses below are coded for the level of competence expected in the course. In each of the courses noted, students demonstrate skills or knowledge in the PSLO, and/or students receive feedback on their performance on the PSLO.

I = Introduced  
R = Reinforced  
E=Emphasized

**Outcome (PSLO 6): Students with a Bachelor’s degree in Communication Studies should be able to respond effectively to cultural communication differences.**

<b>Communication Studies Course</b>	<b>Introduced</b>	<b>Reinforced</b>	<b>Emphasized</b>
COM 104 Intro to Comm			
COM 105 Intro to Comm Theory	I		
COM 106 Intro to Comm Research			
COM109 Technology and Comm			
COM 115 Intro to Mass Comm	I		
COM 205 Intercultural Comm	I	R	
COM 216 Grammar and Punct			
COM 225 Interpersonal Comm	I		
COM 226 Nonverbal Comm	I		
COM 237 Intro to Visual Comm	I		
COM 248 Digital Media Production			
COM 255 Communication Ethics			
COM 256 Public Relations			
COM 276 Democracy and Media	I		
COM 301 Rhet Theory and Apps.			
COM 309 Applied Technology			
COM 325 Gender and Comm		R	E
COM 326 Comm Research			
COM 345 Organizational Comm I			
COM 346 Health Comm	I		
COM 347 Negotiation and Con Res			
COM 348 Facilitation			
COM 358 Comm and the Law			
COM 365 Elect Comm and Soc			
COM 407 SPECIAL TOPICS			
COM 415 Multimedia Presentation			
COM 420 Externship			
COM 424 Capstone			
COM 425 Mediation			
COM 426 Mediation Practicum			
COM 437 Training and Dev			

COM 445 Organizational Comm II			
COM 446 Leadership and Comm			
JOUR 211 Publications: Newspaper			
JOUR 311 Advanced Newspaper			
SPE 314 Argumentation	I		
WRI 328 Technical Journalism			
WRI 350 Document Editing			
WRI 415 Technical Editing			
WRI 420 Document Design			

**Outcome (PSLO 7): Students with a Bachelor’s degree in Communication Studies should be able to communicate ethically.**

<b>Communication Studies Course</b>	<b>Introduced</b>	<b>Reinforced</b>	<b>Emphasized</b>
COM 104 Intro to Comm			
COM 105 Intro to Comm Theory			
COM 106 Intro to Comm Research	I		
COM109 Technology and Comm			
COM 115 Intro to Mass Comm			
COM 205 Intercultural Comm			
COM 216 Grammar and Punct			
COM 225 Interpersonal Comm	I		
COM 226 Nonverbal Comm			
COM 237 Intro to Visual Comm			
COM 248 Digital Media Production			
COM 255 Communication Ethics	I	R	
COM 256 Public Relations	I		
COM 276 Democracy and Media	I		
COM 301 Rhet Theory and Apps.			
COM 309 Applied Technology			
COM 325 Gender and Comm			
COM 326 Comm Research			
COM 345 Organizational Comm I			
COM 346 Health Comm	I		
COM 347 Negotiation and Con Res			
COM 348 Facilitation			
COM 358 Comm and the Law	I	R	
COM 365 Elect Comm and Soc			
COM 407 SPECIAL TOPICS			
COM 415 Multimedia Presentation			
COM 420 Externship			
COM 424 Capstone			
COM 425 Mediation			
COM 426 Mediation Practicum			
COM 437 Training and Dev			

COM 445 Organizational Comm II			
COM 446 Leadership and Comm	I		
JOUR 211 Publications: Newspaper			
JOUR 311 Advanced Newspaper			
SPE 314 Argumentation	I		
WRI 328 Technical Journalism			
WRI 350 Document Editing			
WRI 415 Technical Editing			
WRI 420 Document Design			

## Appendix: Rubrics

# ETHICAL REASONING VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact [value@aacu.org](mailto:value@aacu.org)



Association  
of American  
Colleges and  
Universities

	Capstone 4	Milestones		Benchmark 1
		3	2	
<b>Ethical Self-Awareness</b>	Student discusses in detail/analyzes both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs and discussion has greater depth and clarity.	Student discusses in detail/analyzes both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs.	Student states both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs.	Student states either their core beliefs or articulates the origins of the core beliefs but not both.
<b>Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts</b>	Student names the theory or theories, can present the gist of said theory or theories, and accurately explains the details of the theory or theories used.	Student can name the major theory or theories she/he uses, can present the gist of said theory or theories, and attempts to explain the details of the theory or theories used, but has some inaccuracies.	Student can name the major theory she/he uses, and is only able to present the gist of the named theory.	Student only names the major theory she/he uses.
<b>Ethical Issue Recognition</b>	Student can recognize ethical issues when presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context AND can recognize cross-relationships among the issues.	Student can recognize ethical issues when issues are presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context OR can grasp cross-relationships among the issues.	Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues and grasp (incompletely) the complexities or interrelationships among the issues.	Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues but fails to grasp complexity or interrelationships.
<b>Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts</b>	Student can independently apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, accurately, and is able to consider full implications of the application.	Student can independently apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, accurately, but does not consider the specific implications of the application.	Student can apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, independently (to a new example) and the application is inaccurate.	Student can apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question with support (using examples, in a class, in a group, or a fixed-choice setting) but is unable to apply ethical perspectives/concepts independently (to a new example).
<b>Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts</b>	Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of and can reasonably defend against the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/concepts, and the student's defense is adequate and effective.	Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of, and respond to the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/concepts, but the student's response is inadequate.	Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/concepts but does not respond to them (and ultimately objections, assumptions, and implications are compartmentalized by student and do not affect student's position.)	Student states a position but cannot state the objections to and assumptions and limitations of the different perspectives/concepts.

**Oregon Tech Diverse Perspectives Rubric**

	<b>Not Proficient (1)</b>	<b>Some Proficiency (2)</b>	<b>Proficiency (3)</b>	<b>High Proficiency (4)</b>
<b>Recognize:</b> Shows awareness of one's own perspective.	The student does <b>not</b> demonstrate awareness of their own perspective.	The student demonstrates an <b>emerging</b> awareness of their own perspective.	The student demonstrates an <b>evolving</b> self-awareness in relation to other perspectives.	The student demonstrates a <b>refined</b> self-awareness in relation to other perspectives.
<b>Know:</b> Demonstrates factual knowledge of the foundations of others' perspectives.	The student has <b>no</b> factual knowledge of diverse cultures, personalities, places, histories, and/or technologies.	The student acquires a <b>basic</b> level of factual knowledge regarding diverse cultures, personalities, places, histories, and/or technologies.	The student acquires a <b>developed</b> body of factual knowledge regarding diverse cultures, personalities, places, histories, and/or technologies.	The student <b>applies</b> factual knowledge of diverse cultures, personalities, places, histories, and/or technologies to their studies/work/community.
<b>Understand:</b> Displays understanding of others' perspectives through practice.	The student is <b>unable</b> to recognize diverse perspectives.	The student is able to <b>recognize</b> diverse perspectives.	The student is able to <b>understand</b> a diversity of perspectives.	The student is able to <b>apply</b> their understanding of a diversity of perspectives to their studies/work/community.
<b>Apply:</b> Applies factual knowledge and understanding of diverse perspectives to their interactions with others.	The student is <b>unable</b> to apply knowledge and understanding of diverse perspectives to their studies.	The student may <b>understand how</b> to apply knowledge and understanding of diverse perspectives to their studies, but <b>does not do so</b> .	The student <b>applies</b> their knowledge and understanding of diverse perspectives to their studies.	The student applies their knowledge and understanding of diverse perspectives to their <b>studies/work/community</b> .