Fayetteville State University
DigitalCommons@Fayetteville State University

Collegiate Learning Assessment Instructors' Reports

Academic Affairs – Quality Enhancement Plan

4-28-2009

CLA Report

Phoebe Hall
Fayetteville State University, phall@uncfsu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.uncfsu.edu/div_aa_wp

Recommended Citation
Hall, Phoebe, "CLA Report" (2009). *Collegiate Learning Assessment Instructors' Reports*. Paper 16.
http://digitalcommons.uncfsu.edu/div_aa_wp/16

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Affairs – Quality Enhancement Plan at DigitalCommons@Fayetteville State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Collegiate Learning Assessment Instructors' Reports by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Fayetteville State University. For more information, please contact xpeng@uncfsu.edu.

Academic Affairs

Collegiate Learning Assessment Instructors' Reports

Fayetteville State University *Year 2009*

CLA Project Report

Phoebe Hall †

†Fayetteville State University, phall@uncfsu.edu

This paper is posted at DigitalCommons@Fayetteville State University.
http://digitalcommons.uncfsu.edu/div aa wp/5

CLA Project Report

****Developed by****

Ms. Phoebe Hall, Performing and Fine Arts

1. Course information

    A. The CLA Performance Task was administered in SPEE311, Oral Interpretation, in which the range of students enrolled are sophomores, juniors, or seniors.

2. Performance task

    A. Their task was to determine whether or not the National Endowment for the Arts should continue to be federally funded. Students were asked to determine whether or not art supports economic prosperity AND whether or not art flourishes during economic trials.
    B. Several faculty members worked as a group to devise questions as well as letters from the Washington Post, Oprah Winfrey, the director of the Movie City news, an article in The Boston Globe, several charts outlining NEA appropriations history and history of government support for the arts, samples of works submitted for NEA funding, a breakdown of the economic impact of the nonprofit arts industry, an Issue Brief from the Economic and Technology Policy Studies, and a member bulletin produced by the Alliance of Legislative Policy Organizations.
    C. Students were to explain in narrative how answers they gave were supported by the documents and to what degree and/or extent art had an impact or not on our economic system. The majority of their responses would have been narrative although the opportunity to include scales and quantity existed.

3. Performance Task Administration

A. The performance task was administered on February 12, 2009.
B. The student's score on the assessment was not calculated in the final grade for this class. The assessment was given as a non-graded required assignment. Participation in the assignment was only given consideration for their overall class participation grade.

4. Student Performance

A. Consistent strengths found in student performance were that students reliably read ALL of the evidence and made notations while reading when they found information that seemed pertinent to their questions. Students actively searched for information to support an opinion they formed fairly quickly. Students were able to rationalize the data in order to support their own opinion.
B. Consistent weaknesses were that students became frustrated sometimes at wading through so much documentation. Several students did not see correlations between some documents and the task. Students also had a tendency to form their opinion fairly quickly based on predetermined ideas about the economy and allowed that to color their perception of this assignment to a degree. Some students tended to rationalize the data so that it conformed to their own personal opinion rather than allow the documentation to actually support or not.
C. In reviewing the results with students, student comments indicated that the questions asked of them were too ambiguous and generic to determine what I wanted them to determine. In retrospect, I agree with them. They were not given specific enough questions to answer thereby making the task far too open to interpretation.

5. Recommendation and follow up

A. Knowing that students' performance on the CLA will be part of our institutional assessment, I will include more assignments of this nature that require students to assess evidence in relation to a common task. However, I will be sure to be more specific in what I require from them.
B. Recommendations I would offer other faculty members including this type of assignment would be: Be more specific in your questions! Do not expect students to figure out what it is you want them to do—tell them! While the assignment is certainly designed to make them think and examine data to arrive at a relatively common solution, making it too indistinct is counterproductive.

It has come to our attention that President Obama intends to work with the Senate to cut some excess spending passed by the House as part of the economic stimulus package. He will maintain increased funding for the National Endowment for the Arts stating that "If singers, actors and dancers can stimulate audiences, they can also stimulate the economy." Authors of the current stimulus package seem to agree and have included $50 million for the National Endowment for the Arts and $150 million for infrastructure repairs at the Smithsonian.

President Obama noted that "Arts groups large and small are hurting, just like every other industry. The Sacramento Ballet has canceled performances; the administrative staff of the Virginia Symphony Orchestra took a 20 percent pay cut; and the Austin Museum of Art is postponing plans for a new museum downtown. We can't let that happen."

We know that President Obama has one chance here. One chance. If the package fails and the recession deepens, many more will hurt even further, including Obama in the early stages of his administration.

Last week, the House Appropriations Committee took notice and approved a plan to include the arts in the recovery package, formerly known as the American Recovery and Reinvestment Plan, with a provision for $50 million in supplemental grants funding for the National Endowment for the Arts along

with other provisions to benefit arts organizations. However, the Senate Appropriations Committee has not included arts jobs funding in their version of the bill.

Bill Ivey, former chair of the NEA and a member of President Obama's transition team, told NPR's *All Things Considered* in an interview this week, "A healthy arts community is important, especially during hard times." Americans for the Arts estimates that for every dollar the NEA doles out to arts groups, another $7 is generated in additional support through local, state and private donations. They estimate that the proposed $50 million in the economic stimulus recovery bill could actually leverage $350 million of investments and prevent 14,422 jobs from being lost.

So what is the problem and why is there opposition for this stimulus package line item? Perhaps a little history lesson may shed some light on the issue at hand.

In 1965 the federal government created the National Endowment for the Arts, with the expressed idea of advancing the arts, artistic freedoms and creativity free from government approvals. To make its desires perfectly clear, Congress wrote into the NEA law that, "It is necessary and appropriate for the Federal Government to help create and sustain not only a climate encouraging freedom of thought, imagination, and inquiry, but also the material conditions facilitating this release of creative talent."

Congress recognized that America did not have the long tradition of support and public assistance for arts as in Europe. It also realized that the best art, many times, can be very controversial and radical in style as well as in substance. We all know that art is supposed to question the status quo, to 'shake things up' and elicit strong reactions from the viewer. Congress also recognized the many risks to "freedom of thought, imagination, and inquiry" in a federal arts funding program.

The 1965 Senate report on the bill to establish the NEA specified that "the fullest attention" must be given "to freedom of artistic and humanistic expression," and added: "Countless times in history artists who were vilified by their contemporaries because of their innovations in style or method of expression have become prophets to a later age."

Congress found a way to prevent the kind of political interference or censorship that could easily destroy the integrity of public arts funding.

They created an elaborate "peer panel" review structure to insulate decisions made by the Endowment from partisan pressures. The peer panels, committees of experts in the field, were to review grant applications and make recommendations to the presidentially appointed National Council and chair of the endowment. The Council relied on the recommendations of the experts.

The system worked well for the first twenty-four years. Periodically there were questions raised about a theatre production, a best-selling novel or scandalous dance production, but the NEA managed to deflect criticism and maintain its position. In a rather public episode, Congressman Mario Biaggi in 1984 objected to a performance of the Verdi opera *Rigoletto* because ads for the opera showed an Italian looking man in a black suit and white hat emerging from large letters spelling the words RIGOLETTO riddled with bullet holes. He felt the ads were insulting to Italians. The NEA agreed that the ads were in "poor taste", but would not interfere; the endowment's integrity depended on avoiding any appearance of attempting to influence or control artistic content. Representative Biaggi's proposals to censor the ideas found in NEA-supported works eventually died a peaceful death.

Through the leadership of the early chairs of the NEA, the endowment managed to create a wonderful presence for live theatre, classical music, dance, and the visual arts throughout America. The agency was able through its grants, which required matching funds, to create a catalytic effect. NEA approval became the "Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval" for the arts. Corporate funds began to flow into organizations with NEA approval.

Then in 1989 the system went awry and it seems not altogether clear what happened. Some feel that the emergence of America's fundamentalist right which stressed the "social" issues of sexuality, the proper place for women, patriotism, and preserving Judeo-Christian cultural values were a factor. The NEA chair at that time felt the real issues for NEA resistance revolved around "the nature of tolerance and the unwillingness of people to encounter differences."

Dirty words, nudity, homosexuality and eroding American values became the buzz words for the battle cries for NEA protesters. Fundamentalist leaders generated thousands of letters and postcards to Congress, the White House and the NEA protesting "pornography" or "blasphemy" in particular works of art that most protesters had not even seen. The "fear of art" made the NEA an appealing target. It became increasingly clear that the goal of many of the

agency's critics was to abolish arts funding altogether. So the NEA became an easy object for government control and decreased funding.

Another factor in the success to erode NEA funding, are the feelings many Americans have toward the arts as being "elitist". Despite the many successes of the NEA, Public Broadcasting and other arts agencies, there is still a large gap in America between popular culture and high art culture such as ballet. A suspicion of artists whose work may be different, difficult, obscure or "avant-garde" is still prevalent in the land. President Obama will have an uphill battle restoring National Endowment funding to the levels it once enjoyed in the late 1960's.

Alpo is asking all of its member agencies to have their members support this stimulus package funding item as good for the American way of life. Send a postcard to your elected officials and tell them not to remove the NEA funding.

DOCUMENT A

QUESTIONS

The Alpo Corporation has had a long history of supporting the Arts. They are calling for all member agencies to support funding for the National Endowment for the Arts to a high level. As President of a member agency, they are asking for your support. Answer the two sets of questions below.

1. Alpo is asking all of its member agencies to have their members support President Obama's stimulus package. In their letter, they present the case as for the American way of life. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Plan is the specific provision. Based on the evidence, what are the strengths and weaknesses of their case in light of current economic and social divisions? Why? What specific information in the evidence led you to this conclusion?

2. In this call for support, Alpo quotes Bill Ivey, former chair of the NEA, who states," A healthy arts community is important, especially during hard times" yet the Senate Appropriations Committee has not included art jobs funding in their version of the bill, Why ? Based on all the information and documents and any other factors you considered, what led you to your conclusion?

_____

YOUR ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS SHOULD INCLUDE THE APPROPRIATE OR RELEVANT EVIDENCE (DRAWN FROM THE INCLUDED SOURCES OF INFORMATION, LABELED DOCUMENT B – J) NECESSARY TO SUPPORT YOUR POSITIONS. EXPLAIN THE REASONS FOR YOUR CONCLUSIONS, AND JUSTIFY THOSE CONCLUSIONS BY EXPLICITLY REFERRING TO THE SPECIFIC DOCUMENTS, DATA, AND STATEMENT ON WHICH YOUR CONCLUSIONS ARE BASED. YOUR ANSWERS WILL BE JUDGED NOT ONLY ON THE ACCURACY OF THE INFORMATION YOU PROVIDE, BUT ALSO ON HOW CLEARLY THE IDEAS ARE PRESENTED, HOW EFFECTIVELY THE IDEAS ARE ORGANIZED AND HOW THOROUGHLY THE INFORMATION IS COVERS.

Again, while your personal values and experiences are important, you should base your response on the evidence provided in the documents.

Dearest Halle,

Girl, I'm so happy you're involved in this program I could just jump up and down all over Stedman! You know how hard I push reading and the fact that we've turned this into a film makes it even better. Just so you know how big this is going to be, I'm sending you some of the information I have on the Reading Center and the Big Read program. It began in the August Wilson Center—never hurts to have a famous playwright involved, huh? Reading changes lives! I have been so blessed to have gotten support early on from the NEA to get this project rolling. I can pay for it now, but back then I couldn't rub two pennies together to make them scream so I am deeply grateful for the help I got.

This Read for Life Campaign is a community challenge to inspire new, reluctant, and lapsed readers to make a commitment to ensure that reading becomes an essential part of their lives. Asserting that a love of reading improves the quality of one's life, we encourage people of all ages to visit their local libraries, educational resource centers and book stores to pick up a book and READ! More than half of adults in the U.S. do not read literature and according to the Literacy Campaign, a quarter of the adult workforce reads below the fourth grade level. Reading enables people of diverse backgrounds and experiences to lead healthy, well-rounded and enjoyable lives. Are you ready to read?

THANK YOU SO MUCH FOR JOINING ME IN THIS PROJECT, HALLE. YOUR FRIENDSHIP AND DEDICATION TO FURTHERING EDUCATION IS INVALUABLE TO ME. I OWE YOU ONE, SISTAH!

LOVE,

Harpo is a registered trademark of Harpo Productions, Inc. All rights reserved. Harpo is an equal opportunity employer.

TM & © 2008 Harpo Productions, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

The August Wilson Center is encouraging everyone to read Their Eyes Were Watching God. The first 100 pledges to read will receive a FREE copy of the novel! Call 412.258.2665 or e-mail bmguni@augustwilsoncenter.org to receive your pledge card. The Big Read is designed to restore reading to the center of American culture. The Big Read is an initiative of the National Endowment for the Arts in partnership with the Institute of Museum and Library Services and Arts Midwest. The Big Read: Pittsburgh 2008 reads Their Eyes Were Watching God by Hurston is brought to you by the August Wilson Center, and the United Black Book Club of Philadelphia.

What is The Big Read?
The Big Read is an initiative of the National Endowment for the Arts designed to restore reading to the center of American culture. The August Wilson Center for African American Culture, The United Black Book Clubs of Pittsburgh and The Allegheny County Library Association are working together to inspire the Pittsburgh region to read Their Eyes Were Watching God by Zora Neale Hurston through exciting programs and events surrounding this seminal novel and to educate the community about the life and times of Zora Neale Hurston. Join us for exciting Big Read programs and events from now until June.

About Their Eyes Were Watching God
*Hurston's **Their Eyes Were Watching God** is one of 16 classic novels - all modern American classics - selected by the National Endowment for the Arts for promotion nationally in various communities through June.*

Hurston (1891-1960) is considered one of the pre-eminent writers of twentieth-century African American literature. Hurston was closely associated with the Harlem Renaissance and has influenced such writers as Ralph Ellison, Toni Morrison, Gayl Jones, Alice Walker and Toni Cade Bambara.

***Their Eyes Were Watching God** is arguably the best-known and perhaps the most controversial of Hurston's fiction works. It is about Janie Crawford, the fair and long-legged, independent and articulate woman who sets out to be her own person -- no mean feat for a black woman living in the black town of Eaton, Fla. in the 1930s. Janie's quest for identity takes her through three marriages and into a journey back to her roots.*

Halle Berry is currently in production on the Oprah Winfrey produced tele-film "Their Eyes Were Watching God" from the best-selling book of the same name by Zora Neale Hurston. Next up is the highly anticipated summer film "Catwoman," opening soon.

Berry most recently opened the psychological thriller "Gothika," which grossed more than $140 million worldwide. For her performance in Lions Gate Films' "Monster's Ball," Berry made history by becoming the first African-American woman to win an Academy Award for Best Actress. In addition, she earned a SAG Award, the Berlin Silver Bear and was named Best Actress by the National Board of Review. On the small screen, Berry starred in and produced the HBO movie "Introducing Dorothy Dandridge," which brought her a Golden Globe, SAG and Emmy Award. She will soon begin production on the independent film "October Squall," in which again, she will star and produce.

The NEA's budget now stands at $99 million, down one-third from last year. Congressional conservatives hope to zero it out altogether. The arts will not suffer if they do. The NEA, after all, has not exactly fueled an explosion of artistic genius. ``In looking back over the past two or three decades,'' the distinguished essayist Joseph Epstein, longtime editor of The American Scholar, wrote in 1995, ``what chiefly comes to mind are fizzled literary careers, outrageous exhibitions, and inflated . . . reputations in the visual arts.'' (Quick: Name one great American symphony -- or painting -- or poem -- created in the last 30 years.)

Yet NEA partisans warn of a new Dark Age if the endowment is shuttered. ``We will have regained our position,'' groans Robert Brustein of the American Repertory Theater, ``as the dumbest and most philistine democracy in the Western world.''

Well. Back before anyone thought it was the government's business to subsidize art and entertainment, the dumbest and most philistine democracy in the Western world was incubating an artistic richness of unparalleled breadth and variety.

As William Craig Rice observes in the March/April issue of Policy Review, American communities of every description have long sustained painters, musicians, actors, and poets. A century ago, there were thriving arts havens in such far-flung towns as Berea, Ky.; Woodstock, N.Y.; Carmel, Calif., and Ogunquit, Maine. In the 1920s, Mabel Dodge Luhan moved from Greenwich Village to Santa Fe, N.M., establishing an arts center yeasty enough to draw the likes of D.H. Lawrence, John Marin, and Georgia O'Keeffe.

In Provincetown, Mass., actors ``staged plays by Eugene O'Neill deemed too radical by New York theater producers. The Provincetown Players and other thespian groups have ever since attracted major talent.'' So does the Provincetown Art Association, which was founded in 1914.

Rice's article is an exuberant reminder of the power of volunteerism in American culture. He describes Tulsa, Okla. -- home to 15 museums, an opera, a ballet, and a symphony, all of them nurtured by a privately-funded Arts & Humanities Council that predates the NEA. In Louisville, Ky., the 48-year-old Fund for the Arts raises more than $5 million annually, thanks to the generosity of 30,000 local residents.

For more than half a century, the Wallace Stegner Fellowships at Stanford University have sustained promising new writers. So have the Hopwood awards at the University of Michigan. The Getty Trust gives away more money to the arts each year than the NEA. Ross Perot paid for the concert hall that houses the Dallas Symphony. Examples are numberless.

The story of the arts in America is one of stunning *private* generosity, unmatched by any society on earth. The NEA neither catalyzes, sustains, nor enriches American culture. The Huntington Theater Company can get along fine without it. So can we all.

THE FRAMERS WOULD HAVE VOTED TO ABOLISH THE N.E.A.
By Jeff Jacoby
The Boston Globe

Thursday, July 3, 1997

The Washington Post

MEMO FROM: MELISSA SILVERSTEIN, JOURNALIST FOR THE WASHINGTON POST

DATE: OCTOBER 20, 2008

TO: CLAUDIA RANKIN, PLAYWRIGHT

SUBJECT: NEA GRANT/WOMEN IN HOLLYWOOD

DEAR MS. RANKIN:

I AM PLEASED TO HEAR THAT YOUR GRANT HAS BEEN APPROVED. YOUR APPROVAL MARKS A MILESTONE IN ADVANCEMENT FOR WOMEN IN THE ARTS! THIS RAISES THE NUMBER OF WOMEN RECEIVING GRANTS FROM THE NEA CONSIDERABLY EVEN WHILE THE AMOUNTS REMAIN BELOW THE AVERAGE FOR MALE ARTISTS. STILL, WE ARE HAPPY THAT YOUR PROJECT CAN NOW MOVE FORWARD. THIS FUNDING FROM THE NEA MAKES IT ALL POSSIBLE NOW! WITHOUT THEIR SUPPORT YOUR PROJECT MAY WELL HAVE ENDED UP ON THE CUTTING ROOM FLOOR. OUR MANY CONGRATULATIONS AND BEST WISHES FOR CONTINUED SUCCESS.

I AM ENCLOSING THE PRESS RELEASE THAT WILL BE SENT OUT LATER THIS AFTERNOON FOR TOMORROW'S EDITION.

RELEASE: **OCTOBER 30, 2008** **Equality Watch: NEA Funds 7 New Plays**

To the Washington Post: NEA to Nurture 7 Varied New Plays

The National Endowment for the Arts has announced the selection of seven plays to be funded as part of its New Play Development Program. The pilot project, which is being administered by Arena Stage, is designed not only to underwrite new works already in progress but also to spot successful collaborations among artists, theaters, communities and other entities that might be used as models.

The largest grants - $90,000- went to male playwrights. Shocker. Of the five $20,000 development grants -- two-- went to women. Claudia Rankine and Aditi Brennan Kapil.

Total Percentage of women receiving grants- 35%

MCN
Movie City News

MAY 19, 2008

DEAR MR. SAMUEL L. JACKSON,

WE ARE SO GRATEFUL FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THE UPCOMING LOS ANGELES FILM FESTIVAL. YOU AND MS. BERRY WILL BOTH BE HONORED FOR YOUR CONTRIBUTIONS TO FILM AND FOR SERVING AS CO-CHAIRS OF THIS YEAR'S FESTIVAL. BOTH YOU AND HALLE BERRY HAVE BEEN ABLE TO USE YOUR STATURE IN THE INDUSTRY TO SUPPORT INDEPENDENT FILM, THE SPIRIT AWARDS, AND NOW THE LOS ANGELES FILM FESTIVAL. THE INDEPENDENT FILM PROJECT/LOS ANGELES APPRECIATES

your championing the cause of independent film and raising awareness for new artists. Without such opportunities, new artists may never get their works seen.

As Honorary Co-Chair of the festival, Berry will host Closing Night festivities, where she will give out two Target Filmmaker Awards: The Target Filmmaker Award for Best Narrative Feature carries with it an unrestricted cash prize of $50,000 funded by Target Stores, offering the financial means for filmmakers to transfer their vision to the screen. The largest cash prize bestowed by a major U.S. film festival, the award recognizes the finest American narrative film at the festival. The award is given to the winning director of the Narrative Feature Competition. A special jury selects the winner. All narrative feature-length films screening in the Narrative Competition section are eligible. While these awards cannot begin to compare to more significant awards given by the NEA, they do make a substantial contribution to the needs of new artists.

The second award is the Target Documentary Award for Best Documentary Feature. This award recognizes the finest American documentary feature at the festival and is awarded to the winning director of the Documentary Competition. The award carries with it an unrestricted cash prize of $25,000 funded by Target Stores. Again, this is not as financially high an award as the NEA but still a major accomplishment for a new artist. A special jury selects the winner.

As Honorary Co-Chair of the festival, Mr. Jackson, you will host the annual Filmmaker Reception held on Wednesday, June 16. The Filmmaker Reception serves as a forum for VIPs to mingle with filmmakers whose work will be showcased at the festival before the official kick-off. This function also serves as recruitment for potentially award donors, so you can see that your presence will mean a great deal to these young artists!

The Los Angeles Film Festival is sponsored by Premier Sponsors - In Style and Target Stores; by Principal Sponsors - American Airlines, the Directors Guild of America, Eastman Kodak Company, and Sofitel Los Angeles; by Platinum Sponsors - 8000 Sunset, CFI, IFC, and Moviola; and by Promotional Sponsor the Los Angeles Times. Special support provided by the National Endowment for the Arts. WireImage is the official photographer for the Los Angeles Film Festival.

IFP/Los Angeles, a nonprofit membership organization, champions the cause of independent film and supports a community of artists who embody diversity, innovation, and uniqueness of vision. IFP/LA provides its members with educational programs, affordable camera and equipment rentals, and discounts to hundreds of industry-related businesses. IFP/LA's Filmmaker Labs offer writers, directors, and producers the opportunity to develop their projects. IFP/LA's mentorship and job placement program, Project Involve: pairs filmmakers from culturally diverse communities with film industry professionals. With more than 6,000 members, IFP/Los Angeles is Southern California's largest non-profit organization for independent filmmakers.

Sincerely,

Dana Pollock

Vice President Movie City News and the IFP/Los Angeles Board

©2008. Movie City News. All Rights Reserved. *Movie City Geek and MCG are trademarks of Movie City News.*

EVALUATION OF EVIDENCE

HOW WELL DOES THE STUDENT ASSESS THE QUALITY AND RELEVANCE OF EVIDENCE?

	NOT ATTEMPTED	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	MASTERING
QUESTION 1&2	0	1 2 DOES NOT ADDRESS RELEVANT DOCUMENTS	2 4 DISCUSSES THE RELEVANCE OF SOME	5 6 DISCUSSES THE RELEVANCE OF ALL

		and/or agrees with the Alpo Corporation. Writes in generalities.	of the Documents and notes limitations in the evidence. Moves away from an egocentric perspective towards a focus on evidence.	documents and notes any additional explanations. Considers what information is or is not pertinent to the task at hand.
Overall	0	1 2 Does not address relevant Documents. Accepts the data "as is" but does not indicate how it might be limited or compromised. Accepts flawed arguments.	3 4 Considers some of the documents, but does not use all relevant sources of evidence. Mentions how evidence may be limited or compromised.	5 6 Considers all of the evidence and distinguishes between rational claims and emotional ones, fact from unsupported opinion. Spots and explains holes in others' arguments.

ANALYSIS AND SYNTHESIS OF EVIDENCE

How well does the student analyze and synthesize data and information?

	Not	Emerging	Developing	Mastering

	Attempted			
Question 1&2	0	1 2 Does not address the evidence or interprets it incorrectly.	3 4 Provides only a superficial analysis of the evidence.	5 6 Interprets the evidence and presents own analysis rather than accepting 'as is'. Distinguishes correlation from causation and draws connections among documents.
Overall	0	1 2 Does not make connections among documents.	3 4 Addresses errors in evidence but only in general.	5 6 Addresses the evidence and breaks it down into individual parts. Addresses ambiguous information with comments.

Drawing Conclusions

How well does the student form a conclusion from his/her analysis?

	Not Attempted	Emerging	Developing	Mastering
Question 1&2	0	1 2 Concludes that the NEA should be funded based on previous years funding.	3 4 States that there is a relationship between economic hard times and the arts.	5 6 Concludes that the NEA should be funded based on the documents presented.
Overall	0	1 2 Conclusions rely heavily on personal opinion. Uses flawed claims to support the conclusion.	3 4 Conclusion represents a mix of unsupported opinion and evidence from the documents	5 6 Constructs a cogent argument based on data/evidence. Selects strongest and most relevant set of information. Suggests

				ADDITIONAL IDEAS THAT MIGHT RESOLVE THE ISSUE MORE.

ACKNOWLEDGING ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATIONS/VIEWPOINTS

HOW WELL DOES THE STUDENT CONSIDER OTHER OPTIONS AND ACKNOWLEDGE THAT HIS/HER ANSWER IS NOT THE ONLY PERSPECTIVE?

	NOT ATTEMPTED	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	MASTERING
QUESTION 1&2	0	1 2 NO ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATION OR VIEWPOINT WAS OFFERED.	3 4 ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATION OR VIEWPOINTS WERE OFFERED BUT MAY BE INCORRECT OR NOT PLAUSIBLE.	5 6 SUGGESTS OTHER METHODS OR REASONS FOR FUNDING DURING ECONOMIC DIFFICULTIES.
OVERALL	0	1 2 ASSUMES THE PROBLEM IS A SIMPLE ONE THAT REQUIRES AN UNCOMPLICATED RESPONSE. DOES NOT CONSIDER THE IMPACT OVERALL.	3 4 RECOGNIZES THE PROBLEM IS COMPLEX WITH NO CLEAR SOLUTION. MENTIONS ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS WITHOUT PROVIDING ANY DETAILS.	5 6 RECOGNIZES THE PROBLEM IS COMPLEX WITH NO CLEAR SOLUTION; ACKNOWLEDGES THE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IN ORDER TO DRAW A CONCLUSION. MENTIONS ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS AND INVOLVES THEM IN THE DECISION MAKING PROCESS.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATION

HOW WELL DOES THE STUDENT CONVEY HIS/HER THOUGHTS?

	NOT ATTEMPTED	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	MASTERING
PRESENTATION HOW CLEAR AND CONCISE IS THE ARGUMENT?	0	1 2 RAMBLING SUGGESTS NO CLEAR UNDERSTANDING OF THE TOPIC.	3 4 A POSITION IS TAKEN BUT MAY BE TENTATIVE.	5 6 ARGUMENT IS CLEARLY ARTICULATED WITH SUPPORT; CONVEYS A CLEAR UNDERSTANDING OF THE TOPIC.
DEVELOPMENT HOW EFFECTIVE IS THE STRUCTURE?	0	1 2 VAGUE UNDEVELOPED IDEAS WITH IRRELEVANT SUPPORT; LITTLE OR NO ORGANIZATION.	2 4 SOME IDEAS DEVELOPED WITH MARGINAL SUPPORT. ORGANIZATION IS INCONSISTENT.	5 6 IDEAS ARE CLEARLY AND FULLY DEVELOPED AND SUPPORTED WITH RELEVANT INFORMATION FROM THE DATA. LOGICAL ORGANIZATION IS EVIDENT.
PERSUASIVENESS HOW WELL DOES THE STUDENT DEFEND THE ARGUMENT?	0	1 2 ARGUMENT IS UNSUPPORTED AND NOT CONVINCING.	3 4 CURSORY STATEMENTS ARE SUPPORTED BY MINIMAL EVIDENCE AND PRESENTED IN A HAPHAZARD WAY.	5 6 CORRECTLY INTERPRETS THE EVIDENCE TO DEFEND THE ARGUMENT; CONSIDERS COUNTERARGUMENTS AND ADDRESSES WEAKNESSES IN THE WRITER'S OWN ARGUMENT. INFORMATION IS WELL ORGANIZED.

MECHANICS WHAT IS THE QUALITY OF THE STUDENT'S WRITING?	0	1 2 MECHANICAL AND USAGE ERRORS SERIOUSLY INTERFERE WITH THE PRESENTATION OF INFORMATION AND IDEAS.	3 4 MECHANICAL AND USAGE ERRORS MADE; BUT DO NOT SIGNIFICANTLY INTERFERE WITH THE PRESENTATION OF INFORMATION AND IDEAS.	5 6 FEW OR NO MECHANICAL OR USAGE ERRORS WERE MADE.
INTEREST HOW WELL DOES THE STUDENT MAINTAIN THE READER'S INTEREST?	0	1 2 WRITING STYLE DOES NOT ENGAGE THE READER.	3 4 WRITING STYLE REFLECTS SOME READER CONSIDERATION, BUT LIMITED AT BEST.	5 6 WRITING STYLE ACTIVELY ENGAGES THE READER AND IS SOMEWHAT STYLISTICALLY SOPHISTICATED.
OVERALL	0	1 2	3 4	5 6

SCORE SHEET

STUDENT NAME: **X**

QUESTION #1	
1) AGREES WITH THE ASSERTION THAT ART STIMULATES THE ECONOMY A) ART MEANS JOBS AND BUSINESS REVENUE B) IN MANY ENVIRONMENTS ART AND CULTURE ARE A GOOD INVESTMENT	
2) DOES NOT AGREE WITH THE ASSERTION:	
A) MORE MONEY FOR ART DOES NOT EQUATE TO ECONOMIC STIMULATION B) CORRELATION DOES NOT MEAN CAUSATION C) A THIRD VARIABLE COULD CAUSE BOTH ART AND THE ECONOMY TO BE CORRELATED	
3) FUNDING PROMOTES THE 'BEST' IN ART A) ART THAT IS NOT OFFENSIVE TO MOST AMERICANS SHOULD BE FUNDED	
QUESTION #2	
1) AGREES THAT ART PROVIDES OPPORTUNITIES DURING DIFFICULT ECONOMIC TIMES A) ART STIMULATES PRODUCTIVITY B) JOBS ARE CREATED TO SUPPORT ART AND ART RELATED VENUES C) EXPOSURE TO ART INCREASES SELF-ASSESSMENT SKILLS D) EXPOSURE TO ART INCREASES COMPETENCE	
2) DOES NOT AGREE THAT ART INCREASES PERFORMANCE AND DECREASES RECIDIVISM A) EDUCATION AND TRAINING CAN CULTIVATE THE SAME COMPETENCIES THAT ART CAN B) STUDYING THE ARTS DOES NOT IMPROVE ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE C) WOMEN AND MINORITIES DO NOT PROFIT FROM THE ARTS AS MUCH AS MEN DO	

3) The arts can survive without NEA funding a) Private support is equal to government support b) Artists who want to produce will find a way to produce without subsidy	
4) Eliminating NEA funding would balance the US budget a) Funding the arts has put our budget in a deficit b) Funds given to promote art is a waste of tax dollars best used in other ways	
5) Does NOT agree that funding the arts must include censorship a) Determining what is 'art' and what is not is not necessary b) Those given funding should not be scrutinized for content or message	
6) Agrees that funding the arts must include censorship c) Someone must determine what is 'art' and what is not d) Those given funding should be heavily scrutinized for content and message e) Funds to the arts should be used appropriately	

(attach copy of the ALPO newsletter in PDF format with art work)