

# "Building Towards Success in Senior Year: A Quantitative Assessment of the Role Long-Term Exposure to Multimodal Composition Plays in Art College Undergraduate Educational Attainment"

By: Natalie Arps-Bumbera, M.F.A.  
Lecturer, Otis College of Art and Design  
May 31, 2017

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS
2. ABSTRACT, pg. 4
3. INTRODUCTION, pg. 5
  - a. Context
4. ANNOTATED LITERATURE REIVEW, pg. 9
5. RESEARCH DESIGN, pg. 15
  - a. Research Questions
  - b. Key Terms
  - c. Study Design
  - d. Units of Analysis
  - e. Participant Sampling
  - f. Potential Areas of Bias
  - g. Data Analysis
6. RESULTS, pg. 19
  - a. Findings, PT 1
  - b. Findings, PT 2
  - c. Findings, PT 3
  - d. Findings, PT 4
7. DISCUSSION, pg. 23
  - a. Trends One and Two
  - b. Trends Three and Four
  - c. Trend Five
8. CONCLUSION, pg. 27
  - a. Implications for pedagogy
  - b. Limitations, and Implications for further research, pg.
9. APPENDIX: CHARTS AND FIGURES

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

With special thanks to...

Debra Ballard, Randall Lavender, and Sue Maberry for the exciting opportunity to research and compose an OARs report.

Rosa Belerique, Marnie Farmer, and Jean-Marie Venturini for help with the monumental task of gathering and formatting study data...

The many LAS faculty members who kindly contributed study data to this research project...

And the students of Otis College of Art and Design whose creativity and talent make the campus endlessly inspiring.

## **ABSTRACT**

Few studies of multimodality and composition have utilized quantitative data to compare traditional composition to multimodal composition, or, to quantify the effects of long-term exposure to multimodal English Composition and Rhetoric on student scores in English Composition and Rhetoric. This study attempts to fill this gap by utilizing quantitative and demographic data from a group of art college seniors with approximately four years of instruction in multimodal English Composition and Rhetoric to make statistical comparisons between multimodal and traditional composition; generate statistical measurements of the efficacy of multimodal composition; find baseline measurements of student equity in a blended traditional (paper based) and multimodal English composition and Rhetoric courses. Study findings suggest that multimodal composition was more successful in allowing senior students to draw on, and demonstrate important skills central to English composition and Rhetoric; that increasing the number of students participating in Multimodal composition will graduate students that are well versed in in-demand professional skills and will thus increase student equity.

## INTRODUCTION

Have you done any of the following this month: Checked your email? Posted a photo to “Instagram” or a statement to “Twitter” and debated about which “hashtags” to include? Browsed “Facebook” while thinking about the relationship between “big data”, advertising, technology, and privacy? Watched a news report featuring an event captured on cell phone footage? Had a strong opinion about when and where it is appropriate to use “emojis”? Recognized an image from a TV program, film, or work of art that had been repurposed as a “meme” with a political or social message buried in its humor? Seen a job listing that required all applicants be “social media fluent”? Thought of creating, or updating on a professional website, Instagram, or “blog”? Heard others discuss opinions on why an ad or commercial was controversial or “off-tone” for the brand?

The social landscape of the early 21<sup>st</sup> century so far is a laptop toting, smartphone swiping, Wi-Fi enabled one; rare is the professor who hasn’t done at least one of the above within the past month, rarer still is the student who hasn’t. Within this context, research on Digital Humanities in general, and Multimodal Composition in particular, has flourished. Research by multimodal literacy pioneer, Selfe, has shown that 21<sup>st</sup> century literacy and pedagogy must embrace the fact that “the relevance of technology in the English studies disciplines is not simply a matter of helping students work effectively with communication software and hardware, but, rather, also a matter of helping them to understand and to be able to assess-to pay attention to-the social, economic, and pedagogical implications of new communication technologies and technological initiatives that affect their lives.”<sup>1</sup> Still other research by Parker Beard has added to Selfe’s case by demonstrating that “Multimodal composition can be used to enhance the teaching of writing and communication, engage and empower students to participate in convergence culture, and better prepare them for the challenges and possibilities of life in our rapidly changing digital age.”<sup>2</sup> More recently still, research by Gonzales has shown that adopting a multimodal composition and rhetoric curriculum supports not just native English speakers, but, L2 learners as well, for whom multimodality enables the “express[ion of] complex concepts through their work [in] a number of modes with greater facility than they might while using the linguistic mode alone”<sup>3</sup>.

However, while research on multimodal composition has continued to grow over the years, much of research on multimodal composition uses qualitative data, such as, interviews with students and faculty surveys. This makes sense; after all, multimodal projects are, by nature, blends of not just the literary mode, but the spatial, gestural, auditory, and visual modes as well, and, a classroom of students that have all received the same multimodal prompt are likely to come up with projects as wide-ranging as; a music video, a photo essay, a hand-drawn comic, or a spoken word performance; so qualitative data allows for a level of standardization in how multimodal curriculum is evaluated despite the unique and varied nature of multimodal composition itself. Moreover,

---

<sup>1</sup> Selfe, pg. 23

<sup>2</sup> Parker Beard, pg. 3

<sup>3</sup> Gonzalez, pg. 10

multimodal composition is a relatively new tool in English composition and rhetoric pedagogy. Many universities and colleges have either just recently incorporated multimodal composition courses, or, are still debating the use of doing so, thus, very few programs would, as a result, have had the opportunity to gather data over a period of years on the success of multimodal English composition and rhetoric courses over time. And yet, having quantitative data that assessed the efficacy of multimodal composition is essential, especially in an academic landscape where, as Poovey<sup>4</sup> has noted, pressure remains for institutions of higher education to prove the worth of a college education using concrete data. Often as not, quantitative data plays a crucial role in supporting assessments of student equity, and finding ways to better serve an increasingly diverse student body.

The following study, undertaken in fulfillment of an Otis College of Art and Design OARS faculty research grant, seeks to address these areas by investigating multimodal composition in a way it is rarely explored, namely, by using data from assignment scores on multimodal English composition assignments taken from a group of students that have had two to four years of courses in multimodal English composition and rhetoric—data that is both quantitative and longitudinal in nature. The study will use this data to: 1) make statistical comparisons of how multimodal and traditional composition differ; 2) generate statistical measurements of the efficacy of multimodal composition in providing students with skills in-demand in the professional landscape of the 21<sup>st</sup> century and 3), mobilize this data to measure student equity, and generate recommendations to increase student equity based on these measurements.

Within the wider pedagogical context, the following research can be used to document the effect that long-term exposure to multimodal English composition and rhetoric courses has on student mastery of key concepts in English composition and rhetoric; to provide a comparison of student scores on multimodal vs. traditional composition projects using quantitative data; and, to suggest strategies to incorporate into a blended traditional (paper based) and multimodal English rhetoric and composition based curriculum to increase student equity for a diverse student body.

### **Context:**

This study takes place at Otis College of Art and Design in 2017, a small, private art and design college located in Southern California that has been in operation since 1918<sup>5</sup>. Otis College attracts a highly diverse student body (ranked in the top 1% of colleges by *The Chronicle of Education*"<sup>6</sup>), and has a student body of roughly 1,100 full-time students<sup>7</sup>.

In 2013, Otis College redesigned its required freshman-level English Composition and Rhetoric course. Prior to 2013, the Otis College freshman-level English Composition and

---

<sup>4</sup> Poovey, pg 9, 12

<sup>5</sup> "History/Timeline." Otis College of Art and Design. N.p., 06 June 1970. Web. 31 May 2017.

<sup>6</sup> "Otis Ranked in Top 1 Percent for Diversity Nationwide." Otis College of Art and Design. N.p., 29 Aug. 2014. Web. 31 May 2017.

<sup>7</sup> "Otis at a Glance." Otis College of Art and Design. N.p., 06 June 1970. Web. 31 May 2017.

Rhetoric course featured traditional (paper-based) composition and rhetoric coursework, and centered on writing three analytical papers. After 2013, the Otis College freshman-level English Composition and Rhetoric course was rebranded "Writing in the Digital Age." or ("WITDA"). Coursework in WITDA contains a blend of traditional, paper-based composition and rhetoric, as well as, multimodal composition, which, for the purpose of this study consist of "texts ... that bring together more than one mode—images, text, graphic design, sound, moving image—often by way of technology, to achieve purposeful communication<sup>8</sup>." The class itself culminates in a project comprised of both a traditional analytical paper, and, an accompanying multimodal composition. During sophomore, junior, and senior year, Otis College students take elective courses through the department of Liberal Arts and Sciences, many of which culminate in a multimodal composition project.

During the senior year, Otis College students round out their course of study by completing a required senior-level composition and rhetoric course known as "Capstone". A number of Otis College faculty websites refer to Capstone as a course in which students "identify, articulate, research, write about, and discuss specific issues and concerns that they believe are the most critical in understanding and evaluating their chosen roles as artists and designers, or explore an important question/issue within their chosen field<sup>9</sup>." Capstone students choose between creating either an "Alternative Capstone" project or a "Traditional Capstone" project. Students that choose the Traditional Capstone project are expected to create a traditional term paper, which may include "links to websites, embed[ed] images and videos...[and] captions and commentary ...to enrich and explain [their] topic.<sup>10</sup>" In contrast, students that choose the Alternative Capstone project are expected to create an "alternative text" (ie: multimodal project), and, a well-researched 1800 word paper<sup>11</sup>." Students that wish to create an Alternative Capstone project must first submit a project proposal, and do a preliminary presentation on the project before a panel of Capstone professors. If the panel approves the student's proposal, the student moves on to create an Alternative Capstone project. If the committee does not approve the student's Alternative Capstone proposal, then the student is required to create a Traditional Capstone project.

All Capstone projects (whether Traditional or Alternative) are assessed using the same grading categories: "written communication," "critical thinking," "information literacy," "visual literacy," and "related outcomes" (i.e.: evidence of metacognition on the composition process). Two to three Capstone professors grade each Capstone project; giving a scores between 0.00 to 4.00 for each of the categories mentioned above, as well as, a recommend final grade based on the weights assigned to each grading category.

---

<sup>8</sup> Halliday, p. 38

<sup>9</sup> Capstone "Course Description"." LIBS 440 Capstone. Otis College of Art and Design, n.d. Web. 28 May 2017.

<sup>10</sup> Capstone 2017 Course template, [https://ospace.otis.edu/Hopkins-Hopkins-capstone\\_2016\\_template-Mar-2017-Mar-2017/Capstone\\_Paper1121](https://ospace.otis.edu/Hopkins-Hopkins-capstone_2016_template-Mar-2017-Mar-2017/Capstone_Paper1121)

<sup>11</sup> Capstone 2017 Course template, [https://ospace.otis.edu/Hopkins-Hopkins-capstone\\_2016\\_template-Mar-2017-Mar-2017/Capstone\\_Paper1121](https://ospace.otis.edu/Hopkins-Hopkins-capstone_2016_template-Mar-2017-Mar-2017/Capstone_Paper1121)

Both Alternative and Traditional Capstone students must earn a C- (1.7) or higher on their Capstone project in order to pass the course.

This study takes advantage of two unique, and intersecting contexts: the first is that having switched in 2013 from offering a required freshman English composition course featuring traditional composition, to a required freshman English composition course featuring multimodal composition (as of May 2017), Otis College graduated its first cohort of students to have had roughly 4 years of English composition and rhetoric courses featuring a blend of multimodal and traditional projects. Consequently, Otis is uniquely poised to explore the relationship between four years of study in multimodal composition and rhetoric, and, student scores on key principals of multimodal composition such as, written communication, critical thinking, visual literacy, and information literacy.

The second is that this study is formulated on the heels of, and in conversation with, some of the findings from the 2015-2016 Otis College faculty research project entitled "Worth A Thousand Words: Assessing Multimodal Composition as a Replacement for Traditional Composition at an Art and Design College"<sup>12</sup>. This project (on which I worked as a faculty research assistant) assessed whether WITDA (blended multimodal and traditional English Composition and Rhetoric) was comparable to the traditional freshman English Composition and Rhetoric course at Otis College that it replaced. It proposed a series of recommendations to increase the benefits of the blended traditional/multimodal composition course, and recommended ways to diminish any potential drawbacks, if any. "Worth a Thousand Words" utilized qualitative data (interviews, surveys) to assess its findings.

The current study, "Building Towards Success," represents something of a continuation of the work done in "Worth a Thousand Words" in that both studies are aimed at assessing multimodal composition at Otis College, however with two major differences; "Building Towards Success," utilizes quantitative data and assesses senior level students, and "Worth a Thousand Words" utilized qualitative data and assessed freshman level students.

---

<sup>12</sup> Ngo, J. and Arps-Bumbera, N. Worth A Thousand Words: Assessing Multimodal Composition as a Replacement for Traditional Composition at an Art and Design College Otis College of Art and Design, OARS Report. May 31, 2016."

## ANNOTATED LITERATURE REVIEW

"Building on Success" is situated at the intersection of several discussions currently occurring in liberal arts higher education. The entries in the annotated literature review below represent works that were surveyed in advance of this research project, which contain some of the basic concepts upon which this study is based, and informs some of the basic assumptions from which this study works. Key concepts and assumptions relevant to the study are briefly summarized in the annotations below.

**Bensimon, Estela Mara. "Developing a Practice of Equity-Minded Indicators"." *Equity-Mindedness | Center for Urban Education | USC*. University of Southern California, n.d. Web. 31 May 2017.**

Estela Mara Bensimon, Ed.D is a Professor of Higher Education and Director of the Center for Urban Education (CUE) at USC's Rossier School of Education. Bensimon earned an Ed.D. from Columbia University's Teachers College. The primary area of focus in her research is racial equity in higher education. In addition to having served on the boards of the American Association for Higher Education and the Association of American Colleges and Universities, Bensimon has also been the recipient of numerous grants which includes one from the National Science Foundation, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, and the Ford Foundation. The above resource is aimed at an audience of academics/academic institutions and bears a bias towards the CUE's intentions, namely "think[ing] about student success as an institutional commitment ... and institutional responsibility... [with a] focus on remediating practices and structures and policies." The above resource was published to the CUE website but does not contain a date of publication; however, since the CUE remains in active operation, and the CUE website is regularly updated and maintained, this suggests that the resource is current. Since this research project seeks to assess student equity on the Alterative and Traditional Capstone projects, Bensimon's article proved useful in that it offered guidelines that individual campuses could keep in mind when tracking student equity.

**Fraiberg, Steven. "Composition 2.0: Toward a Multilingual and Multimodal Framework." *College Composition and Communication* 62.1 (2010): 100-26.ERIC [EBSCO]. Web. 15 May 2017.**

Fraiberg has a Ph.D in English from University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and is an Assistant Professor of Writing, Rhetoric, and American Cultures at Michigan State University. Fraiberg's article was published with other articles from the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) annual Conference on College Composition and Communication, and is directed at a scholarly audience

interested in exploring issues related to multimodality, composition, and pedagogy. Despite being published seven years ago in 2010, Fraiberg's article mentions technology, pedagogical trends, and classroom practices that are still very much in evidence in 2017. Fraiberg's research centers on multilingual and international students, as a result, Fraiberg's work leans towards the point of view that English Composition professors must train students to be proficient communicators in multimodal composition, and must train students to take part in a network of global communicators. Fraiberg's research is a key component of this study in that it contains one of the basic assumptions from which this study works, namely; that it is essential for teachers of English composition and rhetoric to "develop... a perspective capable of understanding the teaching of English writing within the context of other languages and globalization<sup>13</sup>" and that a "multilingual-multimodal framework is a key for moving our research and teaching [of English composition and rhetoric] into the twenty-first century."<sup>14</sup>

**Gonzalez, Laura. "Multimodality, Translingualism, and Rhetorical Genre Studies." *Composition Forum* 31 (2015): n. pg. 2015. Web. 10 Oct. 2015.**

Gonzalez has a Ph.D. from Michigan State University, and is an Assistant Professor of Rhetoric and Writing Studies at the University of Texas-El Paso. Gonzalez's article was published fairly recently (2015) in the journal, *Composition Forum*, which uses a "double-blind" peer review process, and is published in conjunction with both the Association of Teachers of Advanced Composition, and with Penn State University. *Composition Forum*'s readership includes "...scholars and teachers interested in the investigation of composition theory and its relation to the teaching of writing at the post-secondary level." Gonzalez learned English as a second language, so her interest in L2 learning is grounded in personal experience, and her interest in multimodal composition is motivated by a desire to find tools that will help other L2 English learners succeed in composition and rhetoric courses. Gonzalez's work is relevant to this project for a number of reasons: First, the work helped provide useful terminology such as "L2 Learner" for students learning English as a second language. Second, Gonzalez's research also contained information key to both the study "Worth A Thousand Words" (Ngo & Arps, 2016), and to this study, namely that "L2 students exhibit advanced expertise and rhetorical sensitivity when layering meaning through multimodal composition. This expertise comes in part from L2 students' experiences combining and crossing various modes when they cannot exclusively rely on words to communicate in English."<sup>15</sup> This information, in fact, provides one of the basic assumptions from which this study works, namely, that L2 students utilize a "translingual," fluid approach to communication which may

---

<sup>13</sup> Horner, Bruce, and John Trimbur. "English Only and U.S. College Composition." *College Composition and Communication* 53.4 (2002): 594–630. Print. Quoted in Fraiberg, pg. 2

<sup>14</sup> Fraiberg, pg. 2

<sup>15</sup> Gonzalez, pg. 1

require “combining and crossing various modes when they cannot exclusively rely on words to communicate in English,<sup>16</sup>” and multimodal projects may provide L2 students with a way to “expand on” ideas that were not easily conveyed through written forms...[and] to layer a multiplicity of meanings rather than to reiterate a specific idea<sup>17</sup>.”

**Halliday, Christina. "Into Another 'Semiotic Landscape': Evaluating Models of Multimodal Literacy Curricula for Canadian Art and Design University Students." *Canadian Review of Art Education: Research & Issues* 36.1 (2009): 37-65. Academic Search Premier. Web. 15 Oct. 2016.**

Halliday has a Ph.D. in Education from York University, and teaches liberal arts writing skills to freshman and sophomore level undergraduate students at OCAD. Halliday also directs a writing and academic skills center at OCAD, which she has done since 2002. Halliday's work was published in the *Canadian Review of Art Education: Research & Issues*, a journal that utilizes a double-blind peer review process for all submitted articles, and that has a uniquely Canadian point of view in that it publishes topics of interest to Canadian art educators. Halliday's article was published in 2016, and is thus a current source. Halliday's research is relevant to the student population at Otis College because her research takes place within the context of the “semiotic [communication] landscape<sup>18</sup>” of another art and design college, Ontario College of Art and Design. It is of particular value because, as Halliday says, “North American re- search in multimodal literacy has not investigated practices of teaching and learning composition and multimodality in the art and design, postsecondary context in any significant way.<sup>19</sup>” Halliday's research is also key to this study in that it assesses freshman undergraduate multimodal composition at an art college, and thus presents a potential roadmap of one way of going about doing so.

**Parker Beard, Jeannie C. Ph.D., "Composing on the Screen: Student Perceptions of Traditional and Multimodal Composition." Dissertation, Georgia State University, 2012. [h p://scholarworks.gsu.edu/english\\_diss/98](http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/english_diss/98)**

Parker Beard has a Ph.D. in English from Georgia State University, and, according to her professional website, has “ten years of experience teaching writing at the college level<sup>20</sup>.” “Composing on the Screen” is Parker Beard's Ph.D

---

<sup>16</sup> Ibid, pg 1

<sup>17</sup> Ibid. pg 10

<sup>18</sup> Halliday, Pg 1

<sup>19</sup> Halliday, pg 4.

<sup>20</sup> Parker Beard, Jeannie. ""About"." *Jeannie Beard, PhD*. N.p., n.d. Web. 27 May 2017. <<http://dr.jeanniebeard.com/>>.

Dissertation in English, and appears to be aimed at an academic audience, specifically college composition professors. Parker Beard's research is very much pro-multimodal composition, which Parker sees as an extraordinarily useful tool for both composition students and their professors. Parker Beard's research was published in late 2012, however, despite it being a somewhat less recent publication than some of the other articles on this list, the technology, pedagogical trends, and classroom practices mentioned in Parker Beard's research are still very much reflective of those occurring in 2017. Parker Beard's research contains many of the basic assumptions from which this study works, namely that: "students learn valuable skills in the multimodal composition process, such as, organization and time management... Students also develop a keener sense of audience and purpose ... Multimodal composition can be used to teach traditional writing and rhetoric. Multimodal composition can be used to enhance the teaching of writing and communication, engage and empower students to participate in convergence culture, and better prepare them for the challenges and possibilities of life in our rapidly changing digital age."<sup>21</sup>

**Poovey, M. "The Twenty-First-Century University and the Market: What Price Economic Viability?" *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies*, vol. 12 no. 1, 2001, pp. 1-16. Project MUSE, [muse.jhu.edu/article/9616](http://muse.jhu.edu/article/9616).**

Poovey holds a Ph.D. in English from University of Virginia, and teaches at NYU, where she is the Samuel Rudin University Professor of Humanities; and a Professor Emeritus of English. Poovey's research interests primarily relate to feminist theory, historical literary criticism, and economics, and Poovey has been the recipient of several high profile fellowships including a Guggenheim Fellowship, an ACLS Fellowship, and a NEH Fellowship. Poovey originally delivered a portion of information in the article to a graduate level class she was teaching on the future of the US university. She later transformed the course content into an article published through *Differences*. The intended audience of Poovey's article is a primarily a scholarly one. Published back in 2001, Poovey's article is less current than some of the other sources included in the annotated literature review, however Poovey's research is relevant to this study because it provides two of the baseline assumptions in this study, that 1) "market logic" has led to the need for universities to justify and provide measurable evidence that supports the value of the liberal arts/art college university/college education, and that 2) universities can do so by documenting the scholastic and professional outcomes for students and alumni.

---

<sup>21</sup> Parker Beard, pg. 3

**Reid, Gwendolynne, Snead, Robin, Pettiway, Keon, & Simoneaux, Brent. (2016, March 28). Multimodal communication in the university: Surveying faculty across disciplines. *Across the Disciplines*, 13(1). Retrieved April 21, 2017, from <http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/articles/reidet2016.cfm> .**

Reid, Snead, Pettiway and Simoneaux are all Ph.D. candidates at North Carolina State University, in the Department of Communication, Rhetoric, and Digital Media. According to her website, Reid has faculty experience as a senior lecturer and as the Assistant Director of Program Development at North Carolina State University's First Year Writing Program. Reid's experience teaching undergraduate writing and research courses has informed her interest in exploring how digital media tools are used to aid communication. Reid et al.'s research was published in the open access journal "Across the Disciplines," which is described on the WAC Clearinghouse website as a "refereed journal devoted to language, learning, and academic writing, publishes articles relevant to writing and writing pedagogy in all their intellectual, political, social, and technological complexity." Reid et al.'s research is aimed at an academic audience, however, while much of the research on multimodal composition and rhetoric utilized language that tends to be biased towards the humanities, Reid et al.'s study purposefully seeks to utilize language and measures that can be utilized by an interdisciplinary academic audience. Reid et al.'s research was published in 2016 and is thus still quite current. Reid et al.'s research was useful to the design of this study in that it is one of the few studies found that use quantitative data to measure multimodality in composition data (although it looks at faculty, rather than student use of multimodality in composition, and includes qualitative data as well.

**Selfe, Cynthia L. "Technology and Literacy: A Story about the Perils of Not Paying Attention." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 50, no. 3, 1999, pp. 411–436. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/358859](http://www.jstor.org/stable/358859).**

Credentials: Selfe has a Ph.D in English from the University of Texas-Austin, is an Ohio State University Professor Emeritus in English, and was Director of Ohio State University's annual summer Digital Media and Composition Institute. Selfe also founded the scholarly journal "Computers and Composition: An International Journal for Teachers of Writing" and co-founded the Digital Archive of Literacy Narratives. Selfe is a pioneer in the field of digital humanities, and was the first woman and the first instructor to receive an EDUCOM Medal for innovative computer use in higher education, and is one of the earliest advocates of the importance of blending multimodal composition and technology into English composition and rhetoric. Selfe's article is aimed at a scholarly audience, particularly those that teach English Composition, but may be less than enthusiastic about the role of technology in 21<sup>st</sup> century literacy. The work bears the point of view that educators ignore the role of technology in literacy at their own (and their students') peril. Despite being published nearly two decades ago,

Selfe's article remains one of most cited texts on digital literacy and English composition. Selfe's article is relevant to this study because one of the major concepts from the article forms one of the baseline assumptions of this study, namely, that "the relevance of technology in the English studies disciplines is not simply a matter of helping students work effectively with communication software and hardware, but, rather, also a matter of helping them to understand and to be able to assess-to pay attention to-the social, economic, and pedagogical implications of new communication technologies and technological initiatives that affect their lives."<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> Selfe, pg. 23

## RESEARCH DESIGN

Having covered the scholarly framework upon which "Building Success" is based, I now turn to the research questions guiding this study. They are:

- How successful are senior students in demonstrating mastery of English rhetoric and composition concepts (written communication, critical thinking, visual literacy, information literacy)?
- How successful is a senior multimodal project vs. the traditional project in reinforcing English rhetoric and composition concepts (written communication, critical thinking, visual literacy, information literacy) that senior-level students learned during 2-4 years of multimodal English Composition at Otis which may include WITDA and sophomore through senior multimodal English Composition electives)?
- Are there any factors (major, gender, GPA, L2 vs. native English, etc.) common to students who compose successful senior multimodal projects?
- Are any factors (major, gender, GPA, L2 vs. native English, etc.) under or over represented in students who compose senior multimodal projects?
- Would adopting additional policies (such as a GPA cut-offs for senior multimodal project applicants, or quotas for a set number of students per major allowed to do senior multimodal projects) be useful in increasing student equity, and improving student success in senior-level English composition and rhetoric?

### Study Design:

This study aims to:

- Measure data pertaining to the Class of 2017 as a whole with an eye towards assessing how well they have retained approximately four years of instruction in English composition and rhetoric,
- Assess and compare undergraduate senior scores in Alternative vs. Traditional Capstone to see which form of composition provides the best opportunity for students to demonstrate skills learned in composition and rhetoric courses over approx. 4 years of instruction,

And...

- Assess the demographic makeup of the Otis College Class of 2017, explore whether certain demographic groups are over or underrepresented in Alternative Capstone, and generate a list of recommendations geared towards increasing

student equity. This study is designed around utilizing quantitative data (student scores in senior composition courses, student demographic data), thus statistical measurements (average, range, mode) are the study's primary tools of comparison.

Since multiple manipulations and comparisons of the data were needed to achieve these goals, several tables of data have been created to house each individual data set. Each chart included in the study is described in brief below, and is discussed in further detail in the chapter of the study dedicated to research findings.

The chart in **Fig. 1** is comprised of class demographic data from the Otis College senior Class of 2017. This data was compiled, and when not in numeric form, coded into numeric values to highlight general trends in demographic data for; specific categories of majors, cumulative GPA, gender, and national origin. These measurements serve as a baseline measurement of the overall demographic makeup of the Class of 2017.

The chart in **Fig. 2** contains data gathered from Otis Capstone faculty members on two data points: The number of students in their course that applied to do Alternative Capstone projects, and the number of students in their course that were accepted to do Alternative Capstone projects. This chart was designed to house data on 1) the number of students that applied for Alternative Capstone, were accepted, and created Alternative Capstone projects (or "Group A"); and the number of students that applied for Alternative Capstone, but were not accepted and created Traditional Capstone projects (or "Group B"). This chart also tracks data, such as, the number of Capstone classes excluded from the study population due to elements that disqualified them, such as, lack of response from the professor leading the class; lack of students in the class applying for Alternative Capstone; or a class completing a Group Capstone project rather than individual Capstone projects.

The chart in **Fig. 3** focuses on data for just those students in Group A to set the stage for "within group" comparisons between students in Group A, as well as, "between group" comparisons between students in Group A and Group B. The data in Fig. 3 includes the scores each student in Group A received from their two (or three) faculty graders on specific grading categories ("written communication," "critical thinking," "information literacy," "visual literacy," "related outcomes," "weighted score," and "final grade"). The scores each student in Group A received from each of their two (or three) faculty graders is then averaged to provide the average grade each student received from their faculty readers.

The chart in **Fig. 4** was designed with between group comparisons in mind, and takes the average scores computed in Fig. 3 for students in Group A, then averages these scores in individual grading categories ("written communication," "critical thinking," "information literacy," "visual literacy," "related outcomes," "weighted score," and "final grade"). These averages represent the Group A "average" score for each of the individual grading categories.

The chart in **Fig. 5** was also designed to facilitate between group comparisons, and takes each student in Group A's two to three sets of grades from their faculty readers (in the categories of "written communication," "critical thinking," "information literacy," "visual literacy," "related outcomes," "weighted score," and "final grade,") and computes the mode score for Group A students in each of these individual categories.

The chart in **Fig. 6** was designed to spotlight just the demographic data for students in Group A. This chart was created with an eye towards tallying demographic characteristics and representing overall trends in Group A demographics. To do so, this chart uses both a standard tally of variables, and for one factor (Cumulative GPA) computes the average, and mode.

The chart in **Fig. 7** was designed identically to the chart in Fig 3, but focuses on data for just those students in Group B to set the stage for "within group" comparisons between students in Group B, as well as, "between group" comparisons between students in Group B and Group A. The data in Fig. 7 includes the scores each student in Group B received from their two (or three) faculty graders on specific grading categories ("written communication," "critical thinking," "information literacy," "visual literacy," "related outcomes," "weighted score," and "final grade"). The scores each student in Group B received from each of their two (or three) faculty graders is then averaged to provide the average grade each student received from their faculty readers.

The chart in **Fig. 8** was designed identically to the chart in Fig 4, with between group comparisons in mind, and takes the average scores computed in Fig. 8 for students in Group B, then averages these scores in individual grading categories ("written communication," "critical thinking," "information literacy," "visual literacy," "related outcomes," "weighted score," and "final grade"). These averages represent the Group B "average" score for each of the individual grading categories.

The chart in **Fig. 9** was designed identically to the chart in Fig 5, to facilitate between group comparisons. The chart in Fig 9 and takes each student in Group B's two to three sets of grades from their faculty readers (in the categories of "written communication," "critical thinking," "information literacy," "visual literacy," "related outcomes," "weighted score," and "final grade,") and computes the mode score for Group B students in each of these individual categories.

The data in **Fig 10** mirrors Fig. 6, and was designed to spotlight just the demographic data for students in Group B. This chart was created with an eye towards tallying demographic characteristics and representing overall trends in Group B demographics. To do so, this chart uses both a standard tally of variables, and for one factor (Cumulative GPA) computes the average, and mode.

The data in **Fig 11** contains faculty Capstone read scores (generated through Otis Instructional Design) for all Capstone projects submitted in Fall 2016.

**Units of Analysis:**

The two primary units of analysis in this study are student grades and student demographic information. The first unit of analysis—student grades—are analyzed using a GPA scale where 0.00 corresponds to an "F," and 4.00 correspond to an "A." Since Capstone course policy dictates that students must receive a C- or better to pass the course, "success" in this category is quantified as student grades from 1.70 upwards. The second unit of analysis—demographic factors—are analyzed by either being tallied, or by being coded numerically first, then tallied. Quantities are then ordered in terms of most to least.

**Participant Sampling:**

(Fig 2) Study participants for this study were identified through a request to all 15 Capstone faculty members. 11 Capstone professors responded to the request to for data. Of the 11 faculty members that responded, six faculty members had no students that applied for Alternative Capstone—as a result, these six classes were removed from the study population. Yet another course was removed from the study population due to the fact that students in this course created a group Alternative Capstone project, and this study tracks only individual Capstone scores. Four professors did not respond to the request for study data, and these classes were also removed from the study. Ultimately, this left a study population of 14 students (eight in Group A, and six in Group B), spread across five Capstone classrooms. Each of the students included as a study participant was a senior-level undergraduate student at Otis College of Art and Design, and belonged to the class of 2017—the first class at Otis College to have had a required multimodal English Composition and Rhetoric course in freshman year, followed by three years of sophomore, junior, and senior-level elective English Composition and Rhetoric courses (many of which also adopted multimodal composition projects). Of these 14 students, one student in Group A (Student #6), was removed from the study population because the student withdrew from Capstone during Fall 2016 for health reasons. This left the final study population count at seven students in Group A and six students in Group B.

**Potential Bias:**

Significant effort has been made to minimize areas of potential bias within the study, including disclosing both student averages and mode scores; however, the study does have a fairly small "N" or study population. Consequently, averages and modes may skew somewhat higher or lower than might be the case with a larger study population.

## RESULTS

### Findings: Part 1

Study findings in Part 1 address the question: "How successful overall was the Class of 2017 in demonstrating mastery of English Composition and Rhetoric concepts (i.e.: written communication, critical thinking, information literacy, and visual literacy) after having had approximately four years of instruction in these areas?"

The chart in Fig. 11 shows that the average final Capstone grade earned by the Class of 2017 was 2.9 (B-) out of 4.00, while the most frequently awarded grade was 3 (B) out of 4.00. Since this study defines "success" in Capstone as earning a final Capstone grade above 1.7 (C-), then overall, the Class of 2017 was very successful at demonstrating mastery at English Composition and Rhetoric skills, 95.29% of the grades given to the final Capstone projects (or 405 out of 425 Capstone read scores), were at or above passing level.

If we look more specifically at the Class of 2017's scores in each grading category ("written communication," "critical thinking," "information literacy," "visual literacy," "related outcomes"), the Class of 2017 was successful on the whole in demonstrating mastery of English Composition and Rhetoric concepts. The category with the strongest score for the class of 2017 was visual literacy. The Class of 2017 earned an average of 3.22 (just .08 shy of a B+) out of 4.00, while their most commonly assigned grade on visual literacy was a perfect 4.00 out of 4.00. The Class of 2017 also scored very respectably in written communication and related outcomes, earning an average of 3.09 (B) in written communication, with the most awarded grade being a 3.00 (B); and earning an average 3.06 (B) in related outcomes, with the most awarded grade being a 4.00 out of 4.00. Just a few points below the Class of 2017's scores in written communication and related outcomes were their scores in critical thinking and information literacy, earning an average of 2.99 (just .01 shy of a B) in both categories, with the most frequently awarded grade in both categories being 4.00 out of 4.00.

These findings demonstrate that overall, the Class of 2017 earned grades in each grading category well above the 1.7 (C-) cut-off mark for Capstone. This, in turn, strongly suggests that the class of 2017 was quite successful at demonstrating mastery of "written communication," "critical thinking," "information literacy," "visual literacy," and "related outcomes"—skills earned over the course of approximately four years of blended traditional and multimodal English composition and rhetoric.

### Findings: Part 2

Having established that the Class of 2017 is overall quite successful at demonstrating mastery of English Composition and Rhetoric concepts, Part 2 of the study breaks down Capstone into its constituent parts, and explores the question of how successful is Alternative Capstone vs. Traditional Capstone in asking students to draw upon concepts learned during 4 years of multimodal composition and rhetoric at Otis (written communication, critical thinking, visual literacy, information literacy, related outcomes).

PT 2 utilizes score data from the six students that applied for, but were not approved to create Alternative Capstone projects to represent the 262 students that participated in creating a Traditional Capstone project. This subset of six students was utilized with an eye towards 1) roughly matching the number of study participants in PT 1 of the study (seven students in PT1 to the six in PT 2) to lessen the effect that greater quantities of data can have on statistical measures such as averages/mode; and, to 2) pick a study population that shared study variables with the first study population (both applied for Alternative Capstone); so that the major variable that changes between the two populations (composed Alternative Capstone vs. did not compose Alternative Capstone) could be more clearly associated with any differences between the two groups.

Study findings for PT 2 indicate that 100% of students in Group A earned passing grades on the Alternative Capstone project (Fig. 3). In contrast, 83.33 % of students in Group B earned passing grades on the Traditional Capstone project (Fig 7). These numbers indicate a 16.67% higher pass rate for students doing Alternative Capstone projects than for students doing Traditional Capstone Projects. In keeping with this trend, Group A's average final grade, 3.07, or "B", (Fig 4), with their most awarded final grade, 3.3 or B+, (fig 5), whereas Group B's average final grade was 2.87, a "B-," (fig 8), and their most frequently awarded final grade was 2.7, a "B-" (fig 9).

Student average and mode scores in the specific areas of written communication, critical thinking, visual literacy, information literacy, and related outcomes for students in Group A (Alternative Capstone) and for students in Group B (Traditional Capstone) also overwhelmingly supports these findings. In the categories of critical thinking, information literacy, visual literacy, and related outcomes, Group A averages a (B), (Fig. 4); and had the most frequently awarded grade of (3 or B-) for critical thinking, and (4 or A) for information literacy, visual literacy, and related outcomes (Fig 5). Group B averages a (B-) in critical thinking and in visual literacy, a (B) in written communication and related outcomes, and a (C+) in information literacy, with their most awarded grade being a (3 or B-) in visual literacy and written communication, a (4 or A) in related outcomes and critical thinking, and a (1 or D) in information literacy. In a comparison between groups, Measures of Group B's (Traditional Capstone) success overall less consistent across categories than Group A's scores are. Moreover, Group A scores higher than Group B in all individual grading categories save for "written communication," where Group B averaged a (3.03 or B) (Fig 8), and a mode of (3.0 or B) (Fig 9), to Group A's average of (2.93 or B-) (Fig 4), and mode of (2.00 or C) (Fig 5).

These findings suggest that while both Alternative Capstone and Traditional Capstone projects are successful getting students to demonstrate knowledge of concepts learned over the course of four years of multimodal composition and rhetoric, the projects play to different strengths. Based on the between group average and mode scores for Alternative and Traditional Capstone, Traditional Capstone offers students the most successful opportunity to showcase the skills they have built over the years in written communication. In contrast, Alternative Capstone offers students the most successful opportunity to showcase skills they have built over the years in critical thinking,

information literacy, visual literacy, and related outcomes. Between the two projects, the number of high scores across four of the five grading categories for Alternative Capstone suggest that Alternative Capstone may offer students the most opportunities overall to draw on, and successfully demonstrate concepts learned over the course of two to four years of multimodal English composition and rhetoric.

### **Findings: Part 3**

Study findings in Part 3 deal with the question of whether there are any demographic factors (major, gender, GPA, L2 vs. native English speaker, etc.) common to students who were successful in being selected for Alt Cap projects (i.e.: Group A) and in earning "passing" grades (i.e.: "C" or 2.0) on Alternative Capstone projects?

Study findings in Part 3 indicate that just under half (42.86%) of the students in Group A that applied for, and were selected to do Alternative Capstone projects were majoring in Product Design (Fig 6), indicating a significant correlation between a particular major (Product Design) and success in applying for, and being selected for Alternative Capstone. Study data also indicates male students made up 71.43% of the students in Group A, indicating another strong correlation between a particular gender (male), and success in applying for, and being selected for Alternative Capstone. Additional study data indicates that students in Group A had an average cumulative GPA of 3.29 (B+/B), with six of the seven members in Group A (87.51 %) having cumulative GPAs that fell in the range of 2.7 (B-) to 3.75 (A-) with the remaining member of Group A having a cumulative GPA just below 2.7 (i.e.: 2.66), suggesting a strong correlation between a particular range of GPA's (2.7 and above) with success in applying, and being selected for Alternative Capstone.

Students in Group A were evenly split between being Native English speakers and being L2 English speakers, suggesting that there is not a particularly strong relationship between language proficiency level, in being selected for Alternative Capstone, however the single student in Group A that did not receive a passing grade on the Alternative Capstone project was an international student (however international status does not necessarily indicate or determine English language proficiency of native English or L2 speakers). This suggests that while English proficiency might not play a significant role in applying for, and being selected for an Alternative Capstone project; the single student in Group A that failed to earn a passing grade on the Alternative Capstone project shared several demographic factors that data has shown are related to applying for and being selected for an Alternative Capstone project (male gender, cumulative GPA above 2.7). This suggests that for both Native and L2 English speakers, earning a passing grade on the Alternative Capstone assignment may relate to overall level of English proficiency.

### **Findings: Part 4**

Study findings PT 4 deals with the question of whether there are any factors (major, gender, GPA, ELL vs. native English, etc.) under or over-represented in students who were approved to compose Alternative Capstone projects?

Study data indicates that the top three most populous majors in the Class of 2017 were Digital Media with 88 students, followed by Communication Arts with 50 students, and Product Design with 36 students (Fig. 11), however students from the major Product Design made up 42.86%, of the students in Group A that were approved to do Alternative Capstone (Fig. 6). Interestingly enough, 50% of the students in Group B (those who applied for Alternative Capstone but were not approved and completed Traditional Capstones) (Fig 10) were also Product Design majors. This suggests that in terms of respective major size, the major Product Design was overrepresented in the group approved for Alternative Capstone projects. In contrast, students from the majors Architecture/Landscape/Interiors and Fine Arts (Painting, Photography, and Sculpture/New Genres) were completely absent from Group A (applied to Alternative Capstone and approved) and Group B (applied to Alternative Capstone and not approved), suggesting that these two majors were very much underrepresented in Alternative Capstone Projects.

Similarly, study data indicates that male students make up only 31.48% of the Class of 2017, while female students make up 67.78% of the senior class of 2017, and “gender neutral” students make up .074% of the senior class of 2017, however male students made up 71.43% of the students who applied for and were approved to do Alternative Capstone projects. This data suggests that both female and gender-neutral students were significantly underrepresented in those selected to do Alternative Capstone projects in comparison to the proportion of the population they represented in the Class of 2017.

Where language proficiency is concerned, L2 English speakers account for 24.44% of the Class of 2017, whereas, Native English speakers make up 75.56% of the Class of 2017. While a fairly even distribution of Native and L2 English speakers is seen across Group A (42.86% Native and 57.14% L2) (fig. 6), and Group B (50% Native English speakers, and 50% L2) (fig. 10) respectively; since L2 English speakers make up only 24.44% of the Class of 2017, L2 speakers may be somewhat overrepresented in the population of students interested in composing Alternative Capstone projects.

Of all the demographic factors explored for this study, the one that showed the most even distribution across Group A and Group B was cumulative GPA. The Class of 2017 as a whole (Fig 1) has an average cumulative GPA of 3.20 (high B), with the most commonly occurring cumulative GPA for the Class of 2017 being a 3.48 (B+). The average cumulative grade for Group A was 3.29 (just under a B+), with a little over half (57.17%) of Group A with cumulative GPAs that were a 3.3 (B+) - or higher (fig.6). Similarly, the average cumulative GPA for Group B was 3.3 (B+) as well, with over half (66.67%) of Group B with cumulative GPAs that were a 3.3 (B+) - or higher (fig.10). Since the average and mode cumulative GPAs for Group A and Group B are in the B+ range, and the average and mode cumulative GPA for the class of 2017 is also in the B+ range, this suggests that the demographic factor of cumulative GPA is being represented in the study population at roughly the same rate as it is in the Class of 2017 population as a whole.

## DISCUSSION:

Several trends ultimately emerged during the analysis of the study data.

### **Trends One and Two:**

The first trend was that the Class of 2017 as a whole was quite successful in demonstrating mastery of English Composition and Rhetoric concepts; a second trend—and one that I believe is related—was that Alternative Capstone students earned more consistently high scores across more grading categories than Traditional Capstone students did. As mentioned earlier in the study, the Class of 2017 was the first class at Otis College to take WITDA (aka “Writing in the Digital Age”) the newly redesigned freshman composition course that focused on a blend of traditional, paper-based composition and multimodal composition. It bears mentioning here that WITDA final projects are assessed using grading categories very similar to those used for Capstone final projects: three categories (“critical thinking,” “information literacy,” and “visual literacy”) appear with nearly identical wording in the final project rubric for WITDA and in the final project rubric for Capstone, while two of the categories (“written communication” and “related outcomes”) appear with very similar, but not quite identical wording in the final multimodal project rubric for WITDA and for Capstone. In these two cases where a slight difference exists, the name of the category differs between WITDA and Capstone rubric, but the content remains similar. For example, the content of the WITDA/freshman rubric category titled “control of syntax/mechanics” is similar to the Capstone senior rubric category titled “written communication,” and the freshman/WITDA rubric category “context and purpose for communication” is similar to the senior/ Capstone rubric category titled “related outcomes.” Students in both WITDA and in Capstone have a fairly high awareness that these grading categories are associated with success in English composition and rhetoric at Otis; Students are told that their final projects will be assessed using these specific categories; they receive feedback on their analytical papers and multimodal project that reference ways to improve their work taking into account the rubric requirements for these specific categories; and are asked to review their analytical paper and multimodal project and assess how well it is doing in these specific grading categories prior to submitting their final projects for a grade.

Consequently, I would suggest that the overall success that the Class of 2017 had in demonstrating mastery at English Composition and Rhetoric concepts (written communication, critical thinking, information literacy, and visual literacy), and the fact that Alternative Capstone students earned more consistently high scores across more grading categories than Traditional Capstone students did may be connected with: senior student repeated exposure from freshmen year onward to similar blends of multimodal and traditional composition projects, and, repeated reminders over the course of their two to four years at Otis that successful English composition and rhetoric projects should be constructed with attention to the demands of these specific categories (written communication, critical thinking, information literacy, and visual literacy).

**Trends Three and Four:**

A third trend (perhaps the most surprising one found in this study) was that very few students apply for Alternative Capstone in the first place: and a fourth and related trend was that demographic categories that are underrepresented in those applying for, and/or selected for Alternative Capstone are namely; female and gender neutral students, students from the major Architecture/Landscape/Interiors, and students from the major Fine Arts (Painting, Photography, and Sculpture/New Genres). Since the data in this study measures the presence or absence of demographic groups, and average and mode student scores, rather than the causes behind the presence or absence of particular groups, additional research will need to be undertaken to ascertain the causes behind both the significantly lower than expected Alternative Capstone proposal rate for the Class of 2017, as well as, the significantly lower than expected number of; female students, gender neutral students, Architecture/ Landscape/ Interiors students, and Fine Arts (Painting, Photography, and Sculpture/New Genres) students who applied for, and were accepted to Alternative Capstone overall.

**Trend Five:**

A fifth trend that appeared in the data was the apparent relationship between a number of demographic factors and the likelihood of a student being approved for Alternative Capstone. These factors included gender (male), language proficiency (native English speaker), major (Product Design), and, to a lesser extent, cumulative GPA (average of B+ or higher). The limits of the study data make it difficult to ascertain whether a causal relationship, in addition to a correlational relationship exists between demographic factors and the likelihood of being approved for Alternative Capstone. Further research will need to be undertaken to explore this possible relationship in greater depth, particularly when it comes to demographic factors such as GPA and gender.

As far as the demographic factors of major and language proficiency are concerned, one potential theory as to why Product Design Majors are overrepresented in Alternative Capstone may be because Product Design Majors are more likely than students in other majors to apply to Alternative Capstone in the first place. This might be the case because the multimodal project required for Alternative Capstone may be most similar to final projects required for Product Design courses such as “Integrated Design” and “Product Design Studio,” both of which ask students to use research to create a creative product, and present the project and research in a straightforward, simple manner. The similarity between the Alternative Capstone project and the projects in Product Design courses may, in turn, give Product Design Majors a greater sense of confidence in their ability to succeed at creating an Alternative Capstone project, more practice at doing so, and may ultimately lead to a greater willingness on their part to apply to do so.

As far as language proficiency is concerned, a similar mechanism may be at work, in that L2 English speakers may also be more likely to apply to Alternative Capstone than their classmates. One possible explanation for this trend may be that L2 English speakers may be more motivated to take part in Alternative Capstone because they feel more confident undertaking a project that allows them to convey complex concepts using a mixture of

language and design, rather than relying on language as the primary vehicle for conveying complex concepts.

A sixth and final trend revealed by the research was also related to language skills. Trends in the research in this project suggest that English proficiency skills appear to have a relationship with success in both L2 and Native English Alternative Capstone projects. In other words, whether English is a second language for the student, or the native language, the student's overall facility with the language, and with written communication appears to have a relationship with success on the Alternative Capstone project. One hypothesis of why this might be the case is that the Alternative Capstone project guidelines recommend a much shorter, 1800 word paper (whereas the Traditional Capstone recommends a 3500 word paper). The somewhat more limited space given in Alternative Capstone to convey ideas places greater demands on the student to be more eloquent and succinct with their language use, a task that will undoubtedly be simpler for both L2 and Native English speaker students with greater proficiency in English language/writing skills than their classmates that may be less proficient.

### **Recommendations**

The following recommendations are suggested to further improve student academic outcomes and increase equity for a diverse student body:

- Implement Alternative Capstone approval quotas based on major size, and cap approvals at a representative percentage of students per major based on that majors overall size in the senior class.
- Recruit/encourage and approve more students from majors underrepresented in Alternative Capstone such as Architecture/Landscape/Interiors, and Fine Arts.
- Recruit/encourage and approve more students from genders underrepresented in Alternative Capstone such as female and gender neutral students.
- Take into account the fact that Alternative Capstone offers unique benefits to students that are able to participate in it. On the whole, students that participate in Alternative Capstone score more highly, more consistently across more grading categories central to English composition and Rhetoric than do Traditional Capstone students. For L2 students in particular, research by Gonzalez (2015) suggests that the Alternative Capstone project may offer L2 students a stronger platform from than Traditional Capstone which to draw on their skills in Translingualism, resulting in improved abilities to convey complex concepts and ideas to their audience.
- Despite the significant apparent benefits that Alternative Capstone confers on students who participate, overall student participation levels in Alternative Capstone are low. Increasing student participation in Alternative Capstone would

allow a greater number of students to gain the benefits of participation in this unique learning experience.

- For both Native and L2 English speakers, success in Alternative Capstone appears to relate to overall level of English proficiency, consequently, implementing a policy requiring that all Alternative Capstone students attend writing tutoring at least twice over the course of the semester may increase student equity by providing the educational support needed to participate in the shorter paper required for Alternative Capstone for Native English and L2 students that are less confident in their English composition skills.

## CONCLUSION

Study findings demonstrate that overall, the Class of 2017 was successful in demonstrating mastery of several English composition skills in the senior English composition course, Capstone, and that this success may be linked to the fact that the Class of 2017 has had two to four years of blended traditional and multimodal English composition and rhetoric courses and assignments, in which these central concepts are learned, demonstrated, and reinforced. Study findings also suggest that Alternative Capstone may offer students the most opportunities overall to draw on, and successfully demonstrate, concepts learned over the course of two to four years of multimodal English composition and rhetoric. Study findings further indicate a significant relationship between the demographic factors of major (Product Design); gender (male), and cumulative GPA (2.7 and above); and success in applying, and being selected for Alternative Capstone. These findings in turn suggest that steps need to be taken to increase equity and opportunities to participate for students in categories underrepresented in Alternative Capstone including: female and gender neutral students, students in the majors Architecture/Landscapes/Interiors and Fine Arts. Additionally, study findings indicate that overall student participation in Alternative Capstone is quite low, though L2 students participate at a somewhat higher rate than their classmates, perhaps out of a desire to draw on their unique skillsets in “translingualism” to represent complex ideas and concepts in a multimodal format. Finally, study findings suggest that for both Native and L2 English speakers, success in the Alternative Capstone assignment appears to relate to overall level of English proficiency, and equity could be further increased by having all students participating in Alternative Capstone be required to attend the Student Resource Center and meet with a writing tutor one or more times per course to ensure that both L2 and Native English speaking students with more limited English proficiency are able to meet the unique demands of the reduced length Alternative Capstone paper.

There are several implications for pedagogy based on these findings. The first is that programs and instructors may gather data on, and track multimodal composition using not just qualitative methods, but quantitative methods. This allows for programs and instructors to spotlight to a significant degree, particular skill areas in multimodal English Composition and Rhetoric (such as written communication, critical thinking, information literacy, visual literacy, and related outcomes) in which students are succeeding, and accurately pinpoint areas in which students need additional support, then fine-tune curriculum to support this knowledge. A second implication is that long-term study of multimodal composition is very successful in allowing students to draw on, and successfully deploy skills central to multimodal English composition and rhetoric. A third implication is that multimodal English composition may offer both native English speaking and L2 students a greater opportunity to earn consistently high scores, and demonstrate vital skills in key areas in English composition, and may, so doing, increase overall student equity for a diverse student population. Further research is needed using a larger student sample, and data should be gathered and tracked from Capstone classes

graduating after the Class of 2017 to track trends in data over time, and explore these findings in further depth.

On the whole, these findings show the quantifiable benefits of long term exposure to multimodal curriculum in both student educational attainment, and in increasing student equity for a diverse student body. Ultimately, it may be useful to assess whether it might be worthwhile to consider having all senior students participate in an Alternative Capstone project, to spread the benefits of Alternative Capstone to the widest possible student population, increase student equity across the board, and dynamically prove the value of higher education by graduating a class of seniors that have skills in areas critical to 21<sup>st</sup> century literacy and 21<sup>st</sup> century professionals.

# FIGURE #1

## CLASS OF 2017 DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

MAJOR ( CODED)	CUMULATIVE GPA (as of F'16)	GRADE LEVEL	GENDER	NATIONAL ORIGIN (CODED)
2	3.25	Senior	F	1
3	3.34	Senior	F	1
5	3.32	Senior	F	1
3	2.43	Senior	F	1
3	3.52	Senior	F	1
3	3.69	Senior	M	1
3	3.23	Senior	M	1
4	2.89	Senior	F	1
6	2.66	Senior	F	1
5	3.47	Senior	F	1
7	3.49	Senior	F	1
3	3.40	Senior	F	1
5	3.51	Senior	F	1
5	2.56	Senior	F	0
6	3.56	Senior	F	1
7	3.63	Senior	M	0
3	2.43	Senior	F	0
2	2.81	Senior	F	1
3	2.64	Senior	F	1
5	3.55	Senior	M	1
3	3.15	Senior	M	1
3	2.81	Senior	M	0
2	2.23	Senior	M	0
5	1.93	Senior	M	1
6	2.81	Senior	M	0
1	2.00	Senior	F	0
3	3.10	Senior	F	0
7	3.04	Senior	F	0
1	1.86	Senior	F	0
5	3.52	Senior	F	1
2	3.16	Senior	F	0
3	1.99	Senior	M	0
3	2.04	Senior	F	1
2	2.68	Senior	F	1
6	3.40	Senior	F	1
5	3.28	Senior	F	1
2	2.99	Senior	M	0
5	3.81	Senior	F	1

# FIGURE #1

## CLASS OF 2017 DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

MAJOR ( CODED)	CUMULATIVE GPA (as of F'16)	GRADE LEVEL	GENDER	NATIONAL ORIGIN (CODED)
3	3.64	Senior	F	1
3	3.36	Senior	F	1
3	3.41	Senior	F	1
3	3.01	Senior	M	1
4	3.28	Senior	F	1
3	3.50	Senior	F	1
6	3.59	Senior	F	1
2	3.10	Senior	F	1
3	3.40	Senior	F	1
6	3.35	Senior	F	1
2	3.60	Senior	F	1
2	2.49	Senior	M	1
5	3.65	Senior	M	1
7	2.86	Senior	F	0
2	3.49	Senior	F	1
4	3.38	Senior	F	1
3	3.22	Senior	F	1
4	2.70	Senior	F	1
3	3.64	Senior	F	1
4	2.50	Senior	F	1
4	2.74	Senior	M	1
6	3.35	Senior	M	1
7	3.42	Senior	F	1
3	3.48	Senior	F	1
3	1.86	Senior	F	1
6	3.62	Senior	M	1
1	2.75	Senior	F	0
6	3.55	Senior	F	1
3	3.36	Senior	M	1
6	3.09	Senior	F	1
4	2.91	Senior	F	1
7	3.23	Senior	F	1
3	3.85	Senior	F	1
2	2.96	Senior	M	1
3	3.56	Senior	M	1
2	2.97	Senior	M	1
5	3.48	Senior	F	1
4	2.12	Senior	F	1
3	3.68	Senior	F	1

# FIGURE #1

## CLASS OF 2017 DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

MAJOR ( CODED)	CUMULATIVE GPA (as of F'16)	GRADE LEVEL	GENDER	NATIONAL ORIGIN (CODED)
2	2.34	Senior	M	1
4	2.66	Senior	F	0
2	3.01	Senior	F	1
2	3.38	Senior	F	1
4	3.18	Senior	F	0
3	2.70	Senior	F	1
5	3.18	Senior	F	1
5	3.05	Senior	F	1
4	2.97	Senior	F	1
2	3.41	Senior	F	1
4	2.20	Senior	F	0
6	3.22	Senior	M	1
3	2.30	Senior	M	1
3	3.38	Senior	F	1
3	3.69	Senior	F	1
5	3.34	Senior	F	1
3	2.78	Senior	M	1
6	3.31	Senior	F	0
3	3.55	Senior	M	1
2	3.37	Senior	F	1
3	3.73	Senior	F	1
6	3.18	Senior	F	1
7	3.07	Senior	F	1
4	2.93	Senior	M	1
3	3.25	Senior	M	1
3	3.33	Senior	F	1
3	3.44	Senior	M	0
6	3.32	Senior	F	1
2	2.92	Senior	F	1
1	3.03	Senior	M	0
4	2.73	Senior	F	1
5	3.65	Senior	F	1
3	3.44	Senior	F	1
3	3.43	Senior	M	1
2	2.85	Senior	F	1
3	3.48	Senior	F	0
5	3.02	Senior	F	0
6	3.53	Senior	F	1
5	3.26	Senior	F	1

# FIGURE #1

## CLASS OF 2017 DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

MAJOR ( CODED)	CUMULATIVE GPA (as of F'16)	GRADE LEVEL	GENDER	NATIONAL ORIGIN (CODED)
3	3.65	Senior	M	1
4	3.17	Senior	F	0
6	3.11	Senior	F	1
5	3.43	Senior	F	0
1	3.23	Senior	F	0
6	3.54	Senior	F	1
6	3.14	Senior	F	1
2	2.98	Senior	F	0
3	3.49	Senior	M	1
3	3.57	Senior	F	1
3	3.28	Senior	F	1
2	3.39	Senior	F	0
3	3.31	Senior	F	1
6	3.67	Senior	F	1
3	2.74	Senior	F	1
4	3.17	Senior	F	1
3	2.99	Senior	F	1
7	3.37	Senior	M	1
7	3.37	Senior	F	0
2	2.75	Senior	F	0
6	3.56	Senior	M	1
3	3.33	Senior	F	1
4	2.97	Senior	F	0
6	3.75	Senior	F	1
2	3.21	Senior	F	1
2	3.36	Senior	F	1
3	3.35	Senior	F	1
3	3.64	Senior	M	1
3	3.22	Senior	F	1
3	3.25	Senior	M	1
3	3.12	Senior	F	1
3	3.73	Senior	F	1
3	3.23	Senior	M	1
6	3.45	Senior	M	1
4	3.27	Senior	F	1
4	2.44	Senior	F	1
2	3.48	Senior	M	1
2	2.70	Senior	M	1
3	3.24	Senior	F	1

# FIGURE #1

## CLASS OF 2017 DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

MAJOR ( CODED)	CUMULATIVE GPA (as of F'16)	GRADE LEVEL	GENDER	NATIONAL ORIGIN (CODED)
4	2.43	Senior	F	0
4	3.51	Senior	F	0
3	2.99	Senior	M	1
3	3.60	Senior	F	1
4	3.13	Senior	F	1
1	2.22	Senior	M	0
4	3.16	Senior	F	1
7	3.17	Senior	F	1
3	3.46	Senior	M	1
6	3.35	Senior	F	1
3	3.25	Senior	M	0
2	3.37	Senior	M	1
2	3.48	Senior	F	1
7	3.03	Senior	F	1
3	3.41	Senior	M	1
3	2.70	Senior	F	1
1	3.52	Senior	F	0
1	3.10	Senior	M	0
1	3.74	Senior	M	1
6	2.28	Senior	M	1
2	3.47	Senior	M	1
2	2.94	Senior	M	1
3	3.04	Senior	M	1
2	2.83	Senior	M	0
2	3.13	Senior	F	0
4	2.16	Senior	M	0
3	2.82	Senior	F	1
6	3.33	Senior	F	1
6	3.62	Senior	F	1
5	3.35	Senior	F	1
4	3.51	Senior	M	1
3	3.55	Senior	F	0
6	3.36	Senior	F	1
3	3.45	Senior	M	1
5	3.29	Senior	F	1
3	3.63	Senior	F	0
4	2.99	Senior	F	1
5	2.62	Senior	M	1
6	3.46	Senior	F	0

# FIGURE #1

## CLASS OF 2017 DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

MAJOR ( CODED)	CUMULATIVE GPA (as of F'16)	GRADE LEVEL	GENDER	NATIONAL ORIGIN (CODED)
6	2.84	Senior	M	1
3	3.51	Senior	F	1
3	3.81	Senior	F	1
2	4.00	Senior	F	1
4	3.48	Senior	M	1
5	3.54	Senior	F	1
2	3.71	Senior	M	1
7	3.81	Senior	M	0
6	2.59	Senior	F	1
5	3.69	Senior	F	1
2	3.66	Senior	M	1
3	3.77	Senior	M	1
2	3.04	Senior	F	0
3	2.67	Senior	M	1
5	3.79	Senior	F	1
7	3.85	Senior	F	0
3	3.54	Senior	F	0
3	3.87	Senior	F	1
4	3.47	Senior	F	1
3	3.08	Senior	F	1
5	3.27	Senior	F	1
3	3.66	Senior	M	1
2	3.33	Senior	F	1
7	3.81	Senior	F	0
3	3.03	Senior	M	0
2	3.60	Senior	F	1
2	3.55	Senior	F	1
4	2.44	Senior	F	1
1	3.16	Senior	F	0
3	2.48	Senior	F	1
5	3.15	Senior	F	1
3	3.71	Senior	M	1
1	2.97	Senior	F	0
2	2.93	Senior	M	0
2	3.78	Senior	F	1
4	2.70	Senior	F	0
5	3.08	Senior	F	1
1	3.21	Senior	M	0
3	3.06	Senior	M	1

# FIGURE #1

## CLASS OF 2017 DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

MAJOR ( CODED)	CUMULATIVE GPA (as of F'16)	GRADE LEVEL	GENDER	NATIONAL ORIGIN (CODED)
1	3.15	Senior	F	0
6	3.87	Senior	F	0
1	3.18	Senior	M	1
3	3.84	Senior	M	1
6	3.51	Senior	M	1
3	3.10	Senior	M	1
2	3.90	Senior	F	0
4	2.45	Senior	M	0
1	2.93	Senior	M	0
5	3.87	Senior	F	0
7	3.54	Senior	F	0
7	3.42	Senior	F	1
3	3.76	Senior	F	1
4	3.30	Senior	F	1
2	3.31	Senior	F	1
3	3.23	Senior	M	1
5	3.20	Senior	F	1
6	3.06	Senior	N	1
2	2.83	Senior	F	0
3	3.09	Senior	M	1
2	3.59	Senior	F	1
3	2.99	Senior	M	1
3	3.48	Senior	M	1
6	3.61	Senior	M	1
6	3.29	Senior	F	0
2	3.35	Senior	F	1
3	3.78	Senior	F	0
6	3.46	Senior	M	1
2	2.76	Senior	F	1
2	3.26	Senior	M	1
3	3.42	Senior	M	1
2	2.81	Senior	F	1
7	2.97	Senior	M	1
5	3.37	Senior	M	1
2	3.39	Senior	N	0
1	2.45	Senior	M	0
5	2.99	Senior	M	1

# FIGURE #1

## CLASS OF 2017 DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

MAJOR ( CODED)	CUMULATIVE GPA (as of F'16)	GRADE LEVEL	GENDER	NATIONAL ORIGIN (CODED)
ARLI "1" = 16 STUDENTS	3.20	AVERAGE	FEMALE "F" = 183	INTERNAT IONAL "0" = 66
COMM "2" = 50 STUDENTS	3.48	MODE	MALE "M" = 85	USA "1" = 204
DIGM "3" = 88 STUDENTS			NEUTRAL "N"= 2	
FASD "4"= 32 STUDENTS				
FINA "5"= 31 STUDENTS				
PROD "6"= 36 STUDENTS				
TOYD "7"= 17 STUDENTS				

**Figure #2****Capstone Professor Reports: Accepted vs. Applied to Alternative Capstone**

PROFESSOR	STUDENT LAST NAME	STUDENT FIRST NAME	APPLIED	ACCEPTED
AHN	FELIX	ALEXANDRA	Y	Y
AHN	ZHANG	XINYANG	Y	Y
SAMUEL	SONG	JUNG AH "JAMIE"	Y	N
SAMUEL	KUO	MINHSUAN "MICHELLE"	Y	N
BREMER	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE
BREMER	(POLITICAL CAPSTONE)	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable
BERG	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE
HERNANDEZ	CAI	DYLAN	Y	Y
HERNANDEZ	BARKER	ALEXANDER	Y	Y
HERNANDEZ	LEE	JUNIE	Y	Y
HERNANDEZ	YAMAMOTO	KRISTY	Y	Y
HERNANDEZ	DRUFFNER	JASMINE	Y	N
ROBINSON	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE
HOPKINS	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE
NGO	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE
LIGHT	KIM	YOON SANG "JOSEPH"	Y	Y
CARLOS	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE
JOSEPH-WITHAM	did not respond	did not respond	did not respond	did not respond
SAUNDERS	did not respond	did not respond	did not respond	did not respond
VONDERHORST	did not respond	did not respond	did not respond	did not respond
Donohue	did not respond	did not respond	did not respond	did not respond
Arps-Bumbera	LUCERO	CLARK	Y	Y
Arps-Bumbera	CIARAMELLO	GIANNA	Y	N
Arps-Bumbera	BURKE	MARLA	Y	N
Arps-Bumbera	ZHU	HONG YU	Y	N

**FIGURE #3**

APPLIED FOR, AND ACCEPTED TO DO ALTERNATIVE CAPSTONE	
NAME	
DATE	
LOCATION	
TIME	
WEATHER	
ACTIVITY	
REFLECTION	

[illegible]

# FIGURE #3

## APPLIED FOR, AND ACCEPTED TO DO ALTERNATIVE CAPSTONE

PROFESSOR	STUDENT LAST NAME	STUDENT FIRST NAME	APPLIED	ACCEPTED	MAJOR	WRITTEN COMMUNIC ATION	CRITICAL THINKING	INFORMAT ION LITERACY	VISUAL LITERACY	RELATED OUTCOMES	WEIGHTED SCORE	FINAL GRADE
HERNANDEZ	BARKER	ALEXANDER	Y	Y	Product Design	4	3	3	4	4	3.45	B+ (3.3)
SAMUEL (FOR HERNANDEZ)	BARKER	ALEXANDER	Y	Y	Product Design	4	4	4	4	4	4	A (4.0)
					<b>STUDENT #4 AVERAGE</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3.725</b>	<b>3.7875</b>
HERNANDEZ	LEE	JUNIE	Y	Y	Product Design	4	3	4	4	4	3.65	B+ (3.3)
BREMER (FOR HERNANDEZ)	LEE	JUNIE	Y	Y	Product Design	2	3	4	2.5	4	3	B (3.0)
					<b>STUDENT #5 AVERAGE</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3.25</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3.325</b>	<b>3.429167</b>
<b>HERNANDEZ</b>	<b>YAMAMOTO</b>	<b>KRISTY</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>STUDENT #6= OMITTED</b>	<b>OMITTED</b>	<b>OMITTED</b>	<b>OMITTED</b>	<b>OMITTED</b>	<b>OMITTED</b>	<b>OMITTED</b>	<b>OMITTED</b>
LIGHT	KIM	YOON SANG "JOSEPH"	Y	Y	Toy Design	2	3.7	3	3.5	3.6	3.11	B (3.0)
AHN (FOR LIGHT)	KIM	YOON SANG "JOSEPH"	Y	Y	Toy Design	1	1.5	2	3.5	0	1.53	D (1.0)

# FIGURE #3

## APPLIED FOR, AND ACCEPTED TO DO ALTERNATIVE CAPSTONE

PROFESSOR	STUDENT LAST NAME	STUDENT FIRST NAME	APPLIED	ACCEPTED	MAJOR	WRITTEN COMMUNIC ATION	CRITICAL THINKING	INFORMAT ION LITERACY	VISUAL LITERACY	RELATED OUTCOMES	WEIGHTED SCORE	FINAL GRADE
WILLETTE (FOR LIGHT)	KIM	YOON SANG "JOSEPH"	Y	Y	Toy Design	1.7	1.7	2	2	1.7	1.79	D (1.0)
					<b>STUDENT #7 AVERAGE</b>	<b>1.56666667</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>2.3333333</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1.76666667</b>	<b>2.1433333</b>	<b>2.185</b>
Arps-Bumbera	LUCERO	CLARK	Y	Y	Communic ation Arts	2.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3	3.02	B (3.0)
HOPKINS (FOR ARPS)	LUCERO	CLARK	Y	Y	Communic ation Arts	3	2	2	4	2	2.45	C+ (2.3)
					<b>STUDENT #8 AVERAGE</b>	<b>2.65</b>	<b>2.65</b>	<b>2.65</b>	<b>3.65</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>2.735</b>	<b>2.805833</b>

**FIGURE #4****AVERAGE OF SCORES OF STUDENTS WHO APPLIED FOR, AND WERE ACCEPTED TO DO ALTERNATIVE CAPSTONE**

	WRITTEN COMMUNICATION	CRITICAL THINKING	INFORMATION LITERACY	VISUAL LITERACY	RELATED OUTCOMES	WEIGHTED SCORE	FINAL GRADE
STUDENT 1	3.6	3.9	3.8	3.85	3.9	3.8	3.65
STUDENT 2	2.85	3	2.65	2.75	2.9	2.86	2.84
STUDENT 3	2.85	3	2.85	1.85	3.1	2.83	2.75
STUDENT 4	4	3.5	3.5	4	4	3.73	3.79
STUDENT 5	3	3	4	3.25	4	3.33	3.43
STUDENT 6	OMITTED	OMITTED	OMITTED	OMITTED	OMITTED	OMITTED	OMITTED
STUDENT 7	1.57	2.3	2.33	3	1.77	2.14	2.19
STUDENT 8	2.65	2.65	2.65	3.65	2.5	2.74	2.81
<b>AVERAGE</b>	2.931428571	3.05	3.111428571	3.192857	3.16714286	3.061428571	3.065714286
	<b>2.93</b>	<b>3.05</b>	<b>3.11</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>3.17</b>	<b>3.06</b>	<b>3.07</b>

**FIGURE #5**

**MODE OF SCORES OF STUDENTS WHO APPLIED FOR/WERE ACCEPTED TO DO ALTERNATIVE CAPSTONE**

[illegible]

**FIGURE #5****MODE OF SCORES OF STUDENTS WHO APPLIED FOR/WERE ACCEPTED TO DO ALTERNATIVE CAPSTONE**

	WRITTEN COMMUNICATION	CRITICAL THINKING	INFORMATION LITERACY	VISUAL LITERACY	RELATED OUTCOMES	WEIGHTED SCORE	FINAL GRADE
STUDENT 7, SCORE 1	2	3.7	3	3.5	3.6	3.11	3
STUDENT 7, SCORE 2	1	1.5	2	3.5	0	1.53	1
STUDENT 7, SCORE 3	1.7	1.7	2	2	1.7	1.79	1
STUDENT 8, SCORE 1	2.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3	3.02	3
STUDENT 8, SCORE 2	3	2	2	4	2	2.45	2.3
<b>MODE</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3.65</b>	<b>3.3</b>

**FIGURE #6****DEMOGRAPHIC DATA OF STUDENTS APPROVED FOR ALTERNATIVE CAPSTONE**

NAME	GENDER	NATIVE/ NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKER	COUNTRY OF ORIGIN	OVERALL GPA	MAJOR
STUDENT# 1	F	NON-NATIVE	INTERNATIONAL	3.55	PRODUCT DESIGN
STUDENT #2	M	NON-NATIVE	INTERNATIONAL	3.01	GRAPHIC DESIGN
STUDENT #3	M	NATIVE	USA	2.66	FASHION
STUDENT #4	M	NATIVE	USA	3.58	PRODUCT DESIGN
STUDENT #5	F	NON-NATIVE	INTERNATIONAL	3.75	PRODUCT DESIGN
STUDENT #6	OMITTED	OMITTED	OMITTED	OMITTED	OMITTED
STUDENT #7	M	NON-NATIVE	INTERNATIONAL	3.61	TOY DESIGN
STUDENT #8	M	NATIVE (CAME AT 5 YRS)	INTERNATIONAL	2.87	COMMUNICATION ARTS
	<b>M= 5</b>	<b>Native= 3</b>	<b>AVERAGE=</b>	<b>3.29</b>	<b>PRODUCT DESIGN=3</b>
	<b>F= 2</b>	<b>Non Native= 4</b>	<b>MODE=</b>	<b>APPROX 3.5</b>	<b>FASHION= 1</b>
					<b>TOY DESIGN= 1</b>
					<b>GRAPHIC DESIGN= 1</b>

**FIGURE #7**

**APPLIED FOR BUT NOT ACCEPTED TO DO ALTERNATIVE CAPSTONE (DID TRADITIONAL CAPSTONE)**

[illegible]

# FIGURE #7

APPLIED FOR BUT NOT ACCEPTED TO DO ALTERNATIVE CAPSTONE (DID TRADITIONAL CAPSTONE)

PROFESSOR	STUDENT LAST NAME	STUDENT FIRST NAME	APPLIED	ACCEPTED								
Arps-Bumbera	BURKE	MARLA	Y	N	Product Design	4	4	4	3.9	4	3.99	4
BREMER (FOR ARPS)	BURKE	MARLA	Y	N	Product Design	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	4	3.82	3.7
					<b>STUDENT #13 AVERAGE</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>3.85</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3.905</b>	<b>3.90917</b>
Arps-Bumbera	ZHU	HONG YU	Y	N	Digital Media	2.7	3	2.7	2.7	3	2.84	2.7
	ZHU	HONG YU	Y	N	Digital Media	3	3	2	3	2	2.7	2.7
					<b>STUDENT #14 AVERAGE</b>	<b>2.85</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2.35</b>	<b>2.85</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>2.77</b>	<b>2.72</b>

**FIGURE #8****AVERAGE OF SCORES OF STUDENTS WHO APPLIED FOR, AND WERE NOT ACCEPTED TO DO ALTERNATIVE CAPSTONE**

	WRITTEN COMMUNICATION	CRITICAL THINKING	INFORMATION LITERACY	VISUAL LITERACY	RELATED OUTCOMES	WEIGHTED SCORE	FINAL GRADE
STUDENT 9	2.2	2.2	3	3.15	2.5	2.49	2.5
STUDENT 10	2.8	2.7	2.1	2.45	2.7	2.58	2.5
STUDENT 11	3.5	3	4	2.75	4	3.4	3.44
STUDENT 12	2.9	1.9	0.67	2.23	3	2.5	2.13
STUDENT 13	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.85	4	3.91	3.91
STUDENT 14	2.85	3	2.35	2.85	2.5	2.77	2.72
AVERAGE	3.025	2.78333333	2.67	2.88	3.11666667	2.941666667	2.866666667
	<b>3.03</b>	<b>2.78</b>	<b>2.67</b>	<b>2.88</b>	<b>3.12</b>	<b>2.94</b>	<b>2.87</b>

**FIGURE #9****MODE OF SCORES OF STUDENTS WHO APPLIED FOR, AND WERE ACCEPTED TO DO ALTERNATIVE CAPSTONE**

	WRITTEN COMMUNICATION	CRITICAL THINKING	INFORMATION LITERACY	VISUAL LITERACY	RELATED OUTCOMES	WEIGHTED SCORE	FINAL GRADE
STUDENT 9, SCORE 1	2.7	2.7	3	3.3	2	2.75	2.7
STUDENT 9, SCORE 2	1.7	1.7	3	3	3	2.22	2.3
STUDENT 10, SCORE 1	2.3	2.3	1	2	2	1.98	2
STUDENT 10, SCORE 2	3.3	3.1	3.2	2.9	3.4	3.18	3
STUDENT 11, SCORE 1	3	2	4	2.5	4	2.9	3
STUDENT 11, SCORE 2	4	4	4	3	4	3.9	4
STUDENT 12, SCORE 1	3.7	3.7	1	2.7	4	3.09	3
STUDENT 12, SCORE 2	2	0.5	1	2	3	1.38	1
STUDENT 13, SCORE 3	3	1.5	0	2	2	1.68	1
STUDENT 13, SCORE 1	4	4	4	3.9	4	3.99	4
STUDENT 13, SCORE 2	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	4	3.82	3.7
STUDENT 14, SCORE 1	2.7	3	2.7	2.7	3	2.84	2.7
STUDENT 14, SCORE 2	3	3	2	3	2	2.7	2.7
<b>MODE</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>APPROX 2.7</b>	<b>2.7</b>

**FIGURE #10****DEMOGRAPHIC DATA OF STUDENTS NOT APPROVED FOR ALTERNATIVE CAPSTONE**

NAME	GENDER	NATIVE/ NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKER	COUNTRY OF ORIGIN	OVERALL GPA	MAJOR
STUDENT 9	F	NON-NATIVE	INTERNATIONAL	3.01	DIGITAL MEDIA
STUDENT 10	F	NON-NATIVE	INTERNATIONAL	2.62	FASHION DESIGN
STUDENT 11	F	NATIVE	USA	3.56	PRODUCT DESIGN
STUDENT 12	F	NATIVE	USA	3.39	PRODUCT DESIGN
STUDENT 13	F	NATIVE	USA	3.37	PRODUCT DESIGN
STUDENT 14	M	NON-NATIVE	INTERNATIONAL	3.3	DIGITAL MEDIA
	<b>F= 5</b>	<b>NON-NATIVE= 3</b>	<b>AVERAGE=</b>	<b>3.208333333</b>	<b>PRODUCT DESIGN=3</b>
	<b>M= 1</b>	<b>NATIVE= 3</b>	<b>MODE=</b>	<b>APPROX 3.3</b>	<b>DIGITAL MEDIA= 2</b>
					<b>FASHION DESIGN= 1</b>

	A
1	Select Capstone Course.
2	LIBS 440 T - Capstone - Light
3	LIBS 440 T - Capstone - Light
4	LIBS 440 T - Capstone - Light
5	LIBS 440 T - Capstone - Light
6	LIBS 440 T - Capstone - Light
7	LIBS 440 T - Capstone - Light
8	LIBS 440 T - Capstone - Light
9	LIBS 440 T - Capstone - Light
10	LIBS 440 T - Capstone - Light
11	LIBS 440 T - Capstone - Light
12	LIBS 440 T - Capstone - Light
13	LIBS 440 S - Capstone - Saunders
14	LIBS 440 S - Capstone - Saunders
15	LIBS 440 S - Capstone - Saunders
16	LIBS 440 S - Capstone - Saunders
17	LIBS 440 F - Capstone - von der Horst
18	LIBS 440 F - Capstone - von der Horst
19	LIBS 440 F - Capstone - von der Horst
20	LIBS 440 F - Capstone - von der Horst
21	LIBS 440 H - Capstone - Joseph-Witham
22	LIBS 440 F - Capstone - von der Horst
23	LIBS 440 H - Capstone - Joseph-Witham
24	LIBS 440 S - Capstone - Saunders
25	LIBS 440 F - Capstone - von der Horst
26	LIBS 440 S - Capstone - Saunders
27	LIBS 440 S - Capstone - Saunders
28	LIBS 440 S - Capstone - Saunders
29	LIBS 440 F - Capstone - von der Horst
30	LIBS 440 S - Capstone - Saunders
31	LIBS 440 H - Capstone - Joseph-Witham
32	LIBS 440 S - Capstone - Saunders
33	LIBS 440 F - Capstone - von der Horst
34	LIBS 440 F - Capstone - von der Horst
35	LIBS 440 H - Capstone - Joseph-Witham
36	LIBS 440 H - Capstone - Joseph-Witham
37	LIBS 440 F - Capstone - von der Horst
38	LIBS 440 H - Capstone - Joseph-Witham
39	LIBS 440 F - Capstone - von der Horst
40	LIBS 440 H - Capstone - Joseph-Witham
41	LIBS 440 H - Capstone - Joseph-Witham

	A
1	Select Capstone Course.
42	LIBS 440 H - Capstone - Joseph-Witham
43	LIBS 440 G - Capstone - Ngo
44	LIBS 440 G - Capstone - Ngo
45	LIBS 440 G - Capstone - Ngo
46	LIBS 440 G - Capstone - Ngo
47	LIBS 440 G - Capstone - Ngo
48	LIBS 440 G - Capstone - Ngo
49	LIBS 440 I - Capstone - Samuel
50	LIBS 440 I - Capstone - Samuel
51	<b><i>LIBS 440 K - Capstone - Arps-Bumbera</i></b>
52	LIBS 440 I - Capstone - Samuel
53	LIBS 440 I - Capstone - Samuel
54	LIBS 440 I - Capstone - Samuel
55	LIBS 440 I - Capstone - Samuel
56	LIBS 440 I - Capstone - Samuel
57	LIBS 440 I - Capstone - Samuel
58	LIBS 440 I - Capstone - Samuel
59	LIBS 440 I - Capstone - Samuel
60	<b>LIBS 440 T - Capstone - Light</b>
61	<b>LIBS 440 I - Capstone - Samuel</b>
62	LIBS 440 L - Capstone - Samuel
63	LIBS 440 L - Capstone - Samuel
64	LIBS 440 L - Capstone - Samuel
65	LIBS 440 L - Capstone - Samuel
66	<b><i>LIBS 440 L - Capstone - Samuel</i></b>
67	LIBS 440 L - Capstone - Samuel
68	LIBS 440 K - Capstone - Arps-Bumbera
69	LIBS 440 L - Capstone - Samuel
70	LIBS 440 L - Capstone - Samuel
71	LIBS 440 L - Capstone - Samuel
72	LIBS 440 L - Capstone - Samuel
73	LIBS 440 N - Capstone - Ahn
74	LIBS 440 N - Capstone - Ahn
75	LIBS 440 L - Capstone - Samuel
76	<b>LIBS 440 N - Capstone - Ahn</b>
77	LIBS 440 N - Capstone - Ahn
78	LIBS 440 N - Capstone - Ahn
79	LIBS 440 N - Capstone - Ahn
80	LIBS 440 N - Capstone - Ahn

	A
1	Select Capstone Course.
81	LIBS 440 N - Capstone - Ahn
82	LIBS 440 N - Capstone - Ahn
83	<b>LIBS 440 N - Capstone - Ahn</b>
84	LIBS 440 F - Capstone - von der Horst
85	LIBS 441 A - Capstone: Sustainability - Hernandez
86	<b><i>LIBS 441 A - Capstone: Sustainability - Hernandez</i></b>
87	LIBS 441 A - Capstone: Sustainability - Hernandez
88	LIBS 440 J - Capstone - Bremer
89	LIBS 440 J - Capstone - Bremer
90	LIBS 440 K - Capstone - Arps-Bumbera
91	LIBS 440 J - Capstone - Bremer
92	LIBS 440 J - Capstone - Bremer
93	LIBS 440 J - Capstone - Bremer
94	LIBS 440 K - Capstone - Arps-Bumbera
95	LIBS 440 J - Capstone - Bremer
96	LIBS 440 J - Capstone - Bremer
97	LIBS 440 J - Capstone - Bremer
98	<b><i>LIBS 440 K - Capstone - Arps-Bumbera</i></b>
99	LIBS 440 K - Capstone - Arps-Bumbera
100	LIBS 440 K - Capstone - Arps-Bumbera
101	LIBS 440 K - Capstone - Arps-Bumbera
102	<b>LIBS 440 K - Capstone - Arps-Bumbera</b>
103	<b><i>LIBS 440 K - Capstone - Arps-Bumbera</i></b>
104	LIBS 440 K - Capstone - Arps-Bumbera
105	LIBS 441 A - Capstone: Sustainability - Hernandez
106	LIBS 441 A - Capstone: Sustainability - Hernandez
107	LIBS 441 A - Capstone: Sustainability - Hernandez
108	LIBS 440 G - Capstone - Ngo
109	LIBS 440 D - Capstone - Hopkins
110	LIBS 440 D - Capstone - Hopkins
111	LIBS 440 D - Capstone - Hopkins
112	LIBS 440 O - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Berg
113	LIBS 440 D - Capstone - Hopkins
114	LIBS 440 O - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Berg
115	LIBS 440 O - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Berg
116	LIBS 440 D - Capstone - Hopkins
117	LIBS 440 D - Capstone - Hopkins
118	LIBS 440 O - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Berg
119	LIBS 440 O - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Berg

	A
1	Select Capstone Course.
120	LIBS 440 O - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Berg
121	LIBS 440 O - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Berg
122	LIBS 440 O - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Berg
123	LIBS 440 O - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Berg
124	LIBS 440 O - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Berg
125	LIBS 440 O - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Berg
126	<b>LIBS 441 A - Capstone: Sustainability - Hernandez</b>
127	LIBS 441 A - Capstone: Sustainability - Hernandez
128	<b>LIBS 441 A - Capstone: Sustainability - Hernandez</b>
129	LIBS 440 D - Capstone - Hopkins
130	LIBS 440 D - Capstone - Hopkins
131	LIBS 440 D - Capstone - Hopkins
132	LIBS 440 R - Capstone - Ahn (Willette)
133	LIBS 440 R - Capstone - Ahn (Willette)
134	LIBS 440 E - Capstone: See Political - Bremer
135	LIBS 440 R - Capstone - Ahn (Willette)
136	LIBS 440 E - Capstone: See Political - Bremer
137	LIBS 440 E - Capstone: See Political - Bremer
138	LIBS 440 E - Capstone: See Political - Bremer
139	LIBS 440 E - Capstone: See Political - Bremer
140	LIBS 440 E - Capstone: See Political - Bremer
141	LIBS 440 E - Capstone: See Political - Bremer
142	LIBS 440 E - Capstone: See Political - Bremer
143	LIBS 440 E - Capstone: See Political - Bremer
144	LIBS 440 E - Capstone: See Political - Bremer
145	LIBS 440 E - Capstone: See Political - Bremer
146	LIBS 440 E - Capstone: See Political - Bremer
147	LIBS 440 R - Capstone - Ahn (Willette)
148	LIBS 440 R - Capstone - Ahn (Willette)
149	LIBS 440 L - Capstone - Samuel
150	LIBS 440 J - Capstone - Bremer
151	LIBS 440 J - Capstone - Bremer
152	LIBS 440 R - Capstone - Ahn (Willette)
153	LIBS 440 N - Capstone - Ahn
154	LIBS 440 R - Capstone - Ahn (Willette)
155	LIBS 440 R - Capstone - Ahn (Willette)
156	LIBS 440 R - Capstone - Ahn (Willette)
157	LIBS 440 R - Capstone - Ahn (Willette)
158	LIBS 440 D - Capstone - Hopkins
159	LIBS 440 Q - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Donohue

	A
1	Select Capstone Course.
160	LIBS 440 Q - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Donohue
161	LIBS 440 Q - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Donohue
162	LIBS 440 Q - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Donohue
163	LIBS 440 Q - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Donohue
164	LIBS 440 Q - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Donohue
165	LIBS 440 Q - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Donohue
166	LIBS 440 Q - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Donohue
167	LIBS 440 Q - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Donohue
168	LIBS 440 Q - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Donohue
169	LIBS 440 Q - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Donohue
170	LIBS 440 J - Capstone - Bremer
171	LIBS 440 S - Capstone - Saunders
172	LIBS 440 H - Capstone - Joseph-Witham
173	LIBS 440 I - Capstone - Samuel
174	LIBS 440 H - Capstone - Joseph-Witham
175	LIBS 440 F - Capstone - von der Horst
176	LIBS 440 Q - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Donohue
177	LIBS 440 Q - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Donohue
178	LIBS 440 N - Capstone - Ahn
179	LIBS 440 N - Capstone - Ahn
180	LIBS 440 B - Capstone - Robinson
181	LIBS 440 D - Capstone - Hopkins
182	LIBS 440 B - Capstone - Robinson
183	LIBS 440 R - Capstone - Ahn (Willette)
184	LIBS 440 R - Capstone - Ahn (Willette)
185	LIBS 440 F - Capstone - von der Horst
186	LIBS 440 F - Capstone - von der Horst
187	LIBS 440 F - Capstone - von der Horst
188	LIBS 440 F - Capstone - von der Horst
189	LIBS 440 N - Capstone - Ahn
190	LIBS 441 A - Capstone: Sustainability - Hernandez
191	LIBS 440 H - Capstone - Joseph-Witham
192	LIBS 440 N - Capstone - Ahn
193	LIBS 440 G - Capstone - Ngo
194	LIBS 441 A - Capstone: Sustainability - Hernandez
195	LIBS 440 N - Capstone - Ahn
196	LIBS 440 H - Capstone - Joseph-Witham
197	LIBS 440 K - Capstone - Arps-Bumbera
198	LIBS 440 R - Capstone - Ahn (Willette)
199	LIBS 440 G - Capstone - Ngo

	A
1	Select Capstone Course.
200	LIBS 440 T - Capstone - Light
201	LIBS 440 D - Capstone - Hopkins
202	LIBS 441 A - Capstone: Sustainability - Hernandez
203	LIBS 440 D - Capstone - Hopkins
204	<b>LIBS 440 T - Capstone - Light</b>
205	LIBS 440 R - Capstone - Ahn (Willette)
206	LIBS 440 M - Capstone - Carlos
207	LIBS 440 M - Capstone - Carlos
208	LIBS 440 N - Capstone - Ahn
209	LIBS 440 N - Capstone - Ahn
210	LIBS 440 I - Capstone - Samuel
211	LIBS 440 J - Capstone - Bremer
212	LIBS 440 J - Capstone - Bremer
213	LIBS 440 T - Capstone - Light
214	LIBS 440 T - Capstone - Light
215	LIBS 440 M - Capstone - Carlos
216	LIBS 440 M - Capstone - Carlos
217	LIBS 440 S - Capstone - Saunders
218	LIBS 440 N - Capstone - Ahn
219	LIBS 440 D - Capstone - Hopkins
220	LIBS 440 I - Capstone - Samuel
221	LIBS 440 N - Capstone - Ahn
222	LIBS 440 F - Capstone - von der Horst
223	LIBS 440 R - Capstone - Ahn (Willette)
224	LIBS 440 K - Capstone - Arps-Bumbera
225	LIBS 440 I - Capstone - Samuel
226	LIBS 441 A - Capstone: Sustainability - Hernandez
227	LIBS 440 B - Capstone - Robinson
228	<b>LIBS 441 A - Capstone: Sustainability - Hernandez</b>
229	LIBS 440 H - Capstone - Joseph-Witham
230	LIBS 440 B - Capstone - Robinson
231	LIBS 440 B - Capstone - Robinson
232	LIBS 440 N - Capstone - Ahn
233	LIBS 440 B - Capstone - Robinson
234	<b>LIBS 440 K - Capstone - Arps-Bumbera</b>
235	LIBS 440 B - Capstone - Robinson
236	LIBS 440 T - Capstone - Light
237	LIBS 440 O - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Berg
238	LIBS 440 K - Capstone - Arps-Bumbera
239	LIBS 440 T - Capstone - Light

	A
1	Select Capstone Course.
240	LIBS 440 N - Capstone - Ahn
241	LIBS 440 K - Capstone - Arps-Bumbera
242	LIBS 440 M - Capstone - Carlos
243	LIBS 441 A - Capstone: Sustainability - Hernandez
244	LIBS 440 G - Capstone - Ngo
245	LIBS 440 G - Capstone - Ngo
246	<b>LIBS 441 A - Capstone: Sustainability - Hernandez</b>
247	<b><i>LIBS 440 N - Capstone - Ahn</i></b>
248	LIBS 440 D - Capstone - Hopkins
249	LIBS 440 S - Capstone - Saunders
250	LIBS 440 I - Capstone - Samuel
251	LIBS 440 S - Capstone - Saunders
252	LIBS 441 A - Capstone: Sustainability - Hernandez
253	<b><i>LIBS 441 A - Capstone: Sustainability - Hernandez</i></b>
254	<b><i>LIBS 440 T - Capstone - Light</i></b>
255	LIBS 440 I - Capstone - Samuel
256	LIBS 440 S - Capstone - Saunders
257	<b><i>LIBS 441 A - Capstone: Sustainability - Hernandez</i></b>
258	LIBS 440 D - Capstone - Hopkins
259	LIBS 440 Q - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Donohue
260	LIBS 440 O - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Berg
261	LIBS 440 O - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Berg
262	LIBS 440 O - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Berg
263	LIBS 440 O - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Berg
264	LIBS 440 I - Capstone - Samuel
265	LIBS 440 D - Capstone - Hopkins
266	LIBS 440 N - Capstone - Ahn
267	<b><i>LIBS 441 A - Capstone: Sustainability - Hernandez</i></b>
268	LIBS 440 O - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Berg
269	LIBS 440 O - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Berg
270	LIBS 440 D - Capstone - Hopkins
271	LIBS 440 O - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Berg
272	LIBS 440 I - Capstone - Samuel
273	LIBS 440 S - Capstone - Saunders
274	LIBS 440 I - Capstone - Samuel
275	LIBS 440 F - Capstone - von der Horst
276	LIBS 440 G - Capstone - Ngo
277	LIBS 440 L - Capstone - Samuel
278	LIBS 440 I - Capstone - Samuel

	A
1	Select Capstone Course.
279	LIBS 440 F - Capstone - von der Horst
280	LIBS 440 O - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Berg
281	LIBS 440 S - Capstone - Saunders
282	LIBS 440 S - Capstone - Saunders
283	LIBS 440 M - Capstone - Carlos
284	LIBS 440 N - Capstone - Ahn
285	<b>LIBS 440 I - Capstone - Samuel</b>
286	<b>LIBS 440 L - Capstone - Samuel</b>
287	LIBS 440 S - Capstone - Saunders
288	LIBS 440 J - Capstone - Bremer
289	LIBS 440 N - Capstone - Ahn
290	LIBS 440 D - Capstone - Hopkins
291	LIBS 440 S - Capstone - Saunders
292	<b>LIBS 440 N - Capstone - Ahn</b>
293	LIBS 440 S - Capstone - Saunders
294	LIBS 440 J - Capstone - Bremer
295	LIBS 440 S - Capstone - Saunders
296	LIBS 440 N - Capstone - Ahn
297	LIBS 440 G - Capstone - Ngo
298	LIBS 440 G - Capstone - Ngo
299	LIBS 440 B - Capstone - Robinson
300	LIBS 440 B - Capstone - Robinson
301	LIBS 440 B - Capstone - Robinson
302	LIBS 440 N - Capstone - Ahn
303	<b>LIBS 440 K - Capstone - Arps-Bumbera</b>
304	LIBS 440 S - Capstone - Saunders
305	LIBS 440 S - Capstone - Saunders
306	LIBS 440 S - Capstone - Saunders
307	LIBS 440 S - Capstone - Saunders
308	LIBS 440 E - Capstone: See Political - Bremer
309	LIBS 440 E - Capstone: See Political - Bremer
310	LIBS 440 H - Capstone - Joseph-Witham
311	LIBS 440 H - Capstone - Joseph-Witham
312	LIBS 440 Q - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Donohue
313	LIBS 440 Q - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Donohue
314	LIBS 440 Q - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Donohue
315	LIBS 440 Q - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Donohue
316	LIBS 440 R - Capstone - Ahn (Willette)
317	LIBS 440 K - Capstone - Arps-Bumbera
318	LIBS 440 Q - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Donohue

	A
1	Select Capstone Course.
319	LIBS 440 Q - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Donohue
320	LIBS 440 Q - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Donohue
321	LIBS 440 Q - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Donohue
322	LIBS 440 D - Capstone - Hopkins
323	<b>LIBS 440 K - Capstone - Arps-Bumbera</b>
324	LIBS 440 T - Capstone - Light
325	LIBS 440 T - Capstone - Light
326	LIBS 440 H - Capstone - Joseph-Witham
327	LIBS 440 H - Capstone - Joseph-Witham
328	LIBS 440 M - Capstone - Carlos
329	LIBS 440 M - Capstone - Carlos
330	LIBS 440 J - Capstone - Bremer
331	LIBS 440 J - Capstone - Bremer
332	<b>LIBS 440 K - Capstone - Arps-Bumbera</b>
333	LIBS 440 K - Capstone - Arps-Bumbera
334	<b>LIBS 440 K - Capstone - Arps-Bumbera</b>
335	LIBS 440 L - Capstone - Samuel
336	LIBS 440 L - Capstone - Samuel
337	LIBS 440 I - Capstone - Samuel
338	LIBS 440 D - Capstone - Hopkins
339	LIBS 440 D - Capstone - Hopkins
340	LIBS 440 H - Capstone - Joseph-Witham
341	LIBS 440 H - Capstone - Joseph-Witham
342	LIBS 440 J - Capstone - Bremer
343	LIBS 440 I - Capstone - Samuel
344	LIBS 440 B - Capstone - Robinson
345	LIBS 440 B - Capstone - Robinson
346	LIBS 440 B - Capstone - Robinson
347	LIBS 440 B - Capstone - Robinson
348	LIBS 440 B - Capstone - Robinson
349	LIBS 440 B - Capstone - Robinson
350	LIBS 440 B - Capstone - Robinson
351	LIBS 440 B - Capstone - Robinson
352	LIBS 440 B - Capstone - Robinson
353	LIBS 440 B - Capstone - Robinson
354	LIBS 440 B - Capstone - Robinson
355	LIBS 440 B - Capstone - Robinson
356	LIBS 440 G - Capstone - Ngo
357	LIBS 440 I - Capstone - Samuel

	A
1	Select Capstone Course.
358	LIBS 440 I - Capstone - Samuel
359	LIBS 440 D - Capstone - Hopkins
360	LIBS 440 D - Capstone - Hopkins
361	LIBS 440 T - Capstone - Light
362	LIBS 440 T - Capstone - Light
363	LIBS 440 G - Capstone - Ngo
364	LIBS 440 E - Capstone: See Political - Bremer
365	LIBS 440 E - Capstone: See Political - Bremer
366	LIBS 440 E - Capstone: See Political - Bremer
367	LIBS 440 E - Capstone: See Political - Bremer
368	LIBS 440 I - Capstone - Samuel
369	LIBS 440 E - Capstone: See Political - Bremer
370	LIBS 440 E - Capstone: See Political - Bremer
371	LIBS 440 E - Capstone: See Political - Bremer
372	LIBS 440 L - Capstone - Samuel
373	LIBS 440 E - Capstone: See Political - Bremer
374	LIBS 440 E - Capstone: See Political - Bremer
375	LIBS 440 E - Capstone: See Political - Bremer
376	LIBS 440 E - Capstone: See Political - Bremer
377	LIBS 440 E - Capstone: See Political - Bremer
378	LIBS 440 J - Capstone - Bremer
379	LIBS 440 K - Capstone - Arps-Bumbera
380	LIBS 440 B - Capstone - Robinson
381	LIBS 440 J - Capstone - Bremer
382	LIBS 440 J - Capstone - Bremer
383	LIBS 440 I - Capstone - Samuel
384	LIBS 440 I - Capstone - Samuel
385	LIBS 440 F - Capstone - von der Horst
386	LIBS 440 B - Capstone - Robinson
387	LIBS 440 F - Capstone - von der Horst
388	LIBS 440 D - Capstone - Hopkins
389	LIBS 440 B - Capstone - Robinson
390	LIBS 440 D - Capstone - Hopkins
391	LIBS 440 T - Capstone - Light
392	LIBS 440 T - Capstone - Light
393	LIBS 440 F - Capstone - von der Horst
394	LIBS 440 M - Capstone - Carlos
395	LIBS 440 M - Capstone - Carlos
396	LIBS 440 M - Capstone - Carlos
397	LIBS 440 M - Capstone - Carlos
398	LIBS 440 M - Capstone - Carlos

	A
1	Select Capstone Course.
399	LIBS 440 D - Capstone - Hopkins
400	LIBS 440 D - Capstone - Hopkins
401	LIBS 440 G - Capstone - Ngo
402	LIBS 440 F - Capstone - von der Horst
403	LIBS 440 M - Capstone - Carlos
404	LIBS 440 K - Capstone - Arps-Bumbera
405	LIBS 440 M - Capstone - Carlos
406	LIBS 440 M - Capstone - Carlos
407	LIBS 440 M - Capstone - Carlos
408	LIBS 440 M - Capstone - Carlos
409	LIBS 440 M - Capstone - Carlos
410	LIBS 440 M - Capstone - Carlos
411	LIBS 440 M - Capstone - Carlos
412	LIBS 440 M - Capstone - Carlos
413	LIBS 440 M - Capstone - Carlos
414	LIBS 440 S - Capstone - Saunders
415	LIBS 440 M - Capstone - Carlos
416	LIBS 441 A - Capstone: Sustainability - Hernandez
417	LIBS 440 K - Capstone - Arps-Bumbera
418	LIBS 440 K - Capstone - Arps-Bumbera
419	LIBS 440 O - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Berg
420	LIBS 440 O - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Berg
421	LIBS 440 D - Capstone - Hopkins
422	LIBS 440 Q - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Donohue
423	LIBS 440 Q - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Donohue
424	LIBS 440 Q - Capstone: Senior Thesis - Donohue
425	LIBS 440 K - Capstone - Arps-Bumbera
426	LIBS 440 S - Capstone - Saunders
427	
428	
429	
430	
431	
432	
433	
434	
435	

	A
1	Select Capstone Course.
436	
437	
438	
439	
440	
441	
442	
443	
444	
445	
446	
447	
448	
449	

	B	C
1	Select Read.	Your Name: (First)
2	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
3	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
4	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
5	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
6	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
7	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
8	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
9	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
10	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
11	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
12	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
13	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
14	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
15	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
16	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
17	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
18	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
19	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
20	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
21	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
22	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
23	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
24	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
25	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
26	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
27	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
28	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
29	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
30	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
31	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
32	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
33	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
34	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
35	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
36	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
37	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
38	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
39	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
40	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
41	First Read (Instructor for Course)	

	B	C
1	Select Read.	Your Name: (First)
42	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
43	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Jessica
44	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Jessica
45	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Jessica
46	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Jessica
47	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Jessica
48	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Jessica
49	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Yael
50	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Yael
51	<b>First Read (Instructor for Course)</b>	<b>Natalie</b>
52	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Yael
53	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Yael
54	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Yael
55	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Yael
56	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Yael
57	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Yael
58	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Yael
59	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Yael
60	<b>First Read (Instructor for Course)</b>	<b>Maggie</b>
61	<b>First Read (Instructor for Course)</b>	<b>Yael</b>
62	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Yael
63	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Yael
64	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Yael
65	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Yael
66	<b>First Read (Instructor for Course)</b>	<b>Yael</b>
67	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Yael
68	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Natalie
69	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Yael
70	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Yael
71	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Yael
72	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Yael
73	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Sung Ju
74	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Sung Ju
75	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Yael
76	<b>First Read (Instructor for Course)</b>	<b>Sung Ju</b>
77	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Sung Ju
78	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Sung Ju
79	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Sung Ju
80	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Sung Ju

	B	C
1	Select Read.	Your Name: (First)
81	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Sung Ju
82	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Sung Ju
83	<b>First Read (Instructor for Course)</b>	<b>Sung Ju</b>
84	First Read (Instructor for Course)	
85	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Claudia
86	<b><i>First Read (Instructor for Course)</i></b>	<b><i>Claudia</i></b>
87	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Claudia
88	First Read (Instructor for Course)	David
89	First Read (Instructor for Course)	David
90	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Natalie
91	First Read (Instructor for Course)	David
92	First Read (Instructor for Course)	David
93	First Read (Instructor for Course)	David
94	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Natalie
95	First Read (Instructor for Course)	David
96	First Read (Instructor for Course)	David
97	First Read (Instructor for Course)	David
98	<b><i>First Read (Instructor for Course)</i></b>	<b><i>Natalie</i></b>
99	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Natalie
100	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Natalie
101	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Natalie
102	<b>First Read (Instructor for Course)</b>	<b>Natalie</b>
103	<b><i>First Read (Instructor for Course)</i></b>	<b><i>Natalie</i></b>
104	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Natalie
105	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Claudia
106	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Claudia
107	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Claudia
108	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Jessica
109	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Marsha
110	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Marsha
111	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Marsha
112	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Adam
113	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Marsha
114	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Adam
115	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Adam
116	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Marsha
117	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Marsha
118	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Adam
119	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Adam

	B	C
1	Select Read.	Your Name: (First)
120	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Adam
121	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Adam
122	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Adam
123	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Adam
124	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Adam
125	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Adam
126	<b>First Read (Instructor for Course)</b>	<b>Claudia</b>
127	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Claudia
128	<b>First Read (Instructor for Course)</b>	<b>Claudia</b>
129	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Marsha
130	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Marsha
131	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Marsha
132	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Sung Ju
133	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Sung Ju
134	Second Read	Matthew
135	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Sung Ju
136	Second Read	Matthew
137	Second Read	Matthew
138	Second Read	Matthew
139	Second Read	Matthew
140	Second Read	Matthew
141	Second Read	Matthew
142	Second Read	Matthew
143	Second Read	Matthew
144	Second Read	Matthew
145	Second Read	Matthew
146	Second Read	Matthew
147	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Sung Ju
148	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Sung Ju
149	Second Read	Kerri
150	First Read (Instructor for Course)	David
151	First Read (Instructor for Course)	David
152	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Sung Ju
153	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Sung Ju
154	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Sung Ju
155	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Sung Ju
156	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Sung Ju
157	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Sung Ju
158	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Marsha
159	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Marlena

	B	C
1	Select Read.	Your Name: (First)
160	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Marlena
161	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Marlena
162	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Marlena
163	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Marlena
164	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Marlena
165	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Marlena
166	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Marlena
167	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Marlena
168	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Marlena
169	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Marlena
170	First Read (Instructor for Course)	David
171	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Ysamur
172	Second Read	Maggie
173	Second Read	Kerri
174	Second Read	Jeanne
175	Second Read	Jeanne
176	Second Read	Jeanne
177	Second Read	jeanne
178	Second Read	jeanne
179	Second Read	Jeanne
180	Second Read	sue
181	Second Read	Jeanne
182	Second Read	Sue
183	Second Read	jeanne
184	Second Read	Sue
185	Second Read	Jeanne
186	Second Read	Jeanne
187	Second Read	Jeanne
188	Second Read	Jeanne
189	Second Read	David
190	Second Read	Sung Ju
191	Second Read	Maggie
192	Second Read	David
193	Second Read	Kerri
194	Second Read	Sung Ju
195	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Ysamur
196	Second Read	Kerri
197	Second Read	David
198	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Ysamur
199	Second Read	Ysamur

	B	C
1	Select Read.	Your Name: (First)
200	Second Read	Sung Ju
201	Second Read	Sung Ju
202	Second Read	David
203	Second Read	Sung Ju
204	<b>Second Read</b>	<b>Sung Ju</b>
205	Second Read	Ysamur
206	Second Read	Maggie
207	Second Read	Maggie
208	Second Read	Maggie
209	Second Read	Maggie
210	Second Read	Ysamur
211	Second Read	Yael
212	Second Read	Yael
213	Second Read	Yael
214	Second Read	Yael
215	Second Read	Yael
216	Second Read	Yael
217	Second Read	Kerri
218	Second Read	Terry
219	Second Read	David
220	Second Read	Ysamur
221	Second Read	Terry
222	Second Read	Ysamur
223	Second Read	Sue
224	Second Read	Ysamur
225	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Yael
226	Second Read	Yael
227	Second Read	David
228	<b>Second Read</b>	<b>Yael</b>
229	Second Read	Kerri
230	Second Read	Yael
231	Second Read	David
232	Second Read	sue
233	Second Read	David
234	<b>Second Read</b>	<b>Sue</b>
235	Second Read	Yael
236	Second Read	Sung Ju
237	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Adam
238	Second Read	Sue
239	Second Read	Sung Ju

	B	C
1	Select Read.	Your Name: (First)
240	Second Read	Maggie
241	Second Read	Maggie
242	Second Read	Sung Ju
243	Second Read	FRAUKE
244	Second Read	Maggie
245	Second Read	Maggie
246	<b>Third Read</b>	<b>Claudia</b>
247	<b><i>Second Read</i></b>	<b><i>Terry</i></b>
248	Second Read	Frauke
249	Second Read	Terry
250	Second Read	David
251	Second Read	Terry
252	Second Read	Jeanne
253	<b><i>Second Read</i></b>	<b><i>jeanne</i></b>
254	<b><i>Third Read</i></b>	<b><i>jeanne</i></b>
255	Third Read	Jeanne
256	Third Read	jeanne
257	<b><i>Second Read</i></b>	<b><i>Frauke</i></b>
258	Second Read	Frauke
259	Second Read	Marlena
260	Second Read	Marlena
261	Second Read	Marlena
262	Second Read	Marlena
263	Second Read	Marlena
264	Second Read	Frauke
265	Second Read	Jessica
266	Second Read	Kerri
267	<b><i>Second Read</i></b>	<b><i>David</i></b>
268	Second Read	Marlena
269	Second Read	Marlena
270	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Jessica
271	Second Read	Marlena
272	Second Read	Jessica
273	Second Read	Terry
274	Second Read	Sung Ju
275	Second Read	David
276	Second Read	Kerri
277	Second Read	Frauke
278	Second Read	Sung Ju

	B	C
1	Select Read.	Your Name: (First)
279	Second Read	David
280	Second Read	Marlena
281	Second Read	Natalie
282	Second Read	Terry
283	Second Read	Sung Ju
284	Second Read	Natalie
285	<b>Second Read</b>	<b>Jessica</b>
286	<b>Second Read</b>	<b>David</b>
287	Second Read	Jessica
288	Second Read	Sung Ju
289	Second Read	Natalie
290	Second Read	David
291	Second Read	Terry
292	<b>Second Read</b>	<b>Natalie</b>
293	Second Read	Jessica
294	Second Read	Sung Ju
295	Second Read	Terry
296	Second Read	Kerri
297	Second Read	Natalie
298	Second Read	Natalie
299	Second Read	Natalie
300	Second Read	Natalie
301	Second Read	Natalie
302	Second Read	David
303	<b>Second Read</b>	<b>David</b>
304	Third Read	Heather
305	Third Read	Heather
306	Second Read	Debra
307	Second Read	Debra
308	Second Read	Debra
309	Second Read	Debra
310	Second Read	Debra
311	Second Read	Debra
312	Second Read	Adam
313	Second Read	Adam
314	Second Read	Adam
315	Second Read	Adam
316	Second Read	Adam
317	Second Read	Frauke
318	Second Read	Adam

	B	C
1	Select Read.	Your Name: (First)
319	Second Read	Adam
320	Second Read	Adam
321	Second Read	Adam
322	Third Read	David
323	<b>Third Read</b>	<b>David</b>
324	Second Read	Frauke
325	Second Read	Frauke
326	Second Read	Marsha
327	Second Read	Marsha
328	Second Read	Marsha
329	Second Read	Marsha
330	Second Read	Marsha
331	Second Read	Marsha
332	<b>Second Read</b>	<b>Marsha</b>
333	Second Read	Marsha
334	<b>Second Read</b>	<b>Marsha</b>
335	Second Read	Marsha
336	Second Read	Marsha
337	Second Read	Marsha
338	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Marsha
339	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Marsha
340	Second Read	Rocio
341	Second Read	Rocio
342	Second Read	Rocio
343	Second Read	Rocio
344	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Bridgette
345	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Bridgette
346	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Bridgette
347	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Bridgette
348	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Bridgette
349	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Bridgette
350	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Bridgette
351	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Bridgette
352	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Bridgette
353	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Bridgette
354	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Bridgette
355	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Bridgette
356	Second Read	Bridgette
357	Second Read	Bridgette

	B	C
1	Select Read.	Your Name: (First)
358	Second Read	Bridgette
359	Second Read	Bridgette
360	Second Read	Bridgette
361	Second Read	Bridgette
362	Second Read	Bridgette
363	Second Read	Bridgette
364	First Read (Instructor for Course)	D
365	First Read (Instructor for Course)	David
366	First Read (Instructor for Course)	David
367	First Read (Instructor for Course)	David
368	Second Read	Rocio
369	First Read (Instructor for Course)	David
370	First Read (Instructor for Course)	David
371	First Read (Instructor for Course)	David
372	Second Read	Rocio
373	First Read (Instructor for Course)	David
374	First Read (Instructor for Course)	David
375	First Read (Instructor for Course)	David
376	First Read (Instructor for Course)	David
377	First Read (Instructor for Course)	David
378	First Read (Instructor for Course)	David
379	Third Read	Jeanne
380	Second Read	Rocio
381	Second Read	Claudia
382	Second Read	Claudia
383	Second Read	Claudia
384	Second Read	Claudia
385	Second Read	Claudia
386	Second Read	Rocio
387	Second Read	Claudia
388	Second Read	Claudia
389	Second Read	Rocio
390	Second Read	Claudia
391	Second Read	Claudia
392	Second Read	Claudia
393	Third Read	Rocio
394	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Rocio
395	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Rocio
396	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Rocio
397	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Rocio
398	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Rocio

	B	C
1	Select Read.	Your Name: (First)
399	Second Read	Claudia
400	Third Read	Claudia
401	Third Read	Claudia
402	Second Read	Heather
403	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Rocio
404	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Natalie
405	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Rocio
406	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Rocio
407	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Rocio
408	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Rocio
409	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Rocio
410	Third Read	jeanne
411	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Rocio
412	Third Read	jeanne
413	Third Read	Jeanne
414	Second Read	Jeanne
415	Second Read	Jeanne
416	Second Read	Jeanne
417	Second Read	Kerri
418	Third Read	Heather
419	Second Read	Marlena
420	Second Read	Marlena
421	Second Read	Kerri
422	Second Read	Adam
423	Second Read	Adam
424	Second Read	Adam
425	Third Read	JM
426	First Read (Instructor for Course)	Terry
427		
428		
429		
430		
431		
432		
433		
434		
435		

	B	C
1	Select Read.	Your Name: (First)
436		
437		
438		
439		
440		
441		
442		
443		
444		
445		
446		
447		
448		
449		

	D	E	F
1	Your Name: (Last)	Student's Name: (First)	Student's Name: (Last)
2		Kevin	Ginsberg
3		Grace Jihye	Han
4		Joojin "JJ"	Hong
5		Amanda	Huynh
6		Chaz	Inouye
7		Maya	Jiminez
8		Marie	Lum
9		Mona	Masotta
10		King	Nigoza
11		Nina	Pereira
12		Sarah	Werber
13		Brijae	Morris
14		Joseph	Rubin
15		Bryan	Woo
16		Abdullah	Abdulwahed
17		Analicia	Benavides
18		Andrew	Arvan
19		Nicole	Chang
20		Bernard	Franklin
21		Bree	Miller
22		Jamie	Guan
23		Carovska	Natasha
24		Dasom	Chung
25		Patricia	Li
26		Greg	Bagdasaryan
27		Jeong	Baek
28		Claire	Lee
29		Ana	Molina Borboa
30		Liberace	Cruzee
31		Nataly	Menjivar
32		Kevin	Troyan
33		Gabby	Rios
34		Sinnamon	Thomas
35		Cheryl	Desvignes
36		Oliver	Borack
37		Delaney	Trione
38		Melissa	Leimer
39		Priscilla	Pusposuharto
40		Wen-Wei(christina)	li
41		Charlotte	Hitz

	D	E	F
1	Your Name: (Last)	Student's Name: (First)	Student's Name: (Last)
42		Cecilia	Barcenas
43	Ngo	Ibrahim	Ghulam
44	Ngo	Maegan	Iamjan
45	Ngo	Kelly	Lim
46	Ngo	Eunice	Park
47	Ngo	Jon	Yousef
48	Ngo	Andrew	Zamora
49	Samuel	Yoo Jung	Ahn
50	Samuel	Rachel	Avramenko
51	<b>Arps-Bumbera</b>	<b>Marla</b>	<b>Burke</b>
52	Samuel	Annie	Baek
53	Samuel	Alaura	Bernal
54	Samuel	Cindy	Garcia
55	Samuel	Hyojin	Kim
56	Samuel	Chloe	Maeng
57	Samuel	Maria	Nyren
58	Samuel	Hana	O' Regan
59	Samuel	Jonathan	Song
60	<b>Light</b>	<b>Yoon Sang "Joseph"</b>	<b>Kim</b>
61	<b>Samuel</b>	<b>Jung Ah "Jamie"</b>	<b>Song</b>
62	Samuel	Lin	Chang
63	Samuel	Esther	Choi
64	Samuel	Kevin	Choi
65	Samuel	Eunice	Ha
66	<b>Samuel</b>	<b>Michelle</b>	<b>Kuo</b>
67	Samuel	Anna	Miller
68	Arps-Bumbera	Antonio	Aiello
69	Samuel	Sujeong	Park
70	Samuel	Melad	Seddighi
71	Samuel	Jake	Webber
72	Samuel	Teobista	Seifu
73	Ahn	Daniah	Alsohaibi
74	Ahn	Summer	Alkharafi
75	Samuel	Angie	Lee
76	<b>Ahn</b>	<b>Alexandra</b>	<b>Felix</b>
77	Ahn	Cindy	Ho
78	Ahn	Jenny	Hyun
79	Ahn	Ash	Kim
80	Ahn	Yeo Jin	Lee

	D	E	F
1	Your Name: (Last)	Student's Name: (First)	Student's Name: (Last)
81	Ahn	Khadijah	Miralam
82	Ahn	Dane	Smith
83	<b>Ahn</b>	<b>Xinyang</b>	<b>Zhang</b>
84		Shiia	He
85	Hernandez Romero	Shenna	Artusio
86	<b>Romero</b>	<b>Alex</b>	<b>Barker</b>
87	Hernandez Romero	Erim Osman	Ayham
88	Bremer	Lanaea	Bowie
89	Bremer	Michael	Fiefer
90	Arps-Bumbera	Claudia	Cheng
91	Bremer	Tsz	Mang
92	Bremer	Bryan	Sanchez
93	Bremer	Catherine	Suh
94	Arps-Bumbera	Kylie	Cooney
95	Bremer	Jasmine	Ung
96	Bremer	Meng ying	Wang
97	Bremer	Dorothy	Young
98	<b>Arps-Bumbera</b>	<b>Gianna</b>	<b>Ciaramello</b>
99	Arps-Bumbera	Cindy "Yun Kyung"	Han
100	Arps-Bumbera	Noah San	Kim
101	Arps-Bumbera	Dylan	Lowden
102	<b>Arps-Bumbera</b>	<b>Clark</b>	<b>Lucero</b>
103	<b>Arps-Bumbera</b>	<b>Hongyu</b>	<b>Zhou</b>
104	Arps-Bumbera	Haobo	Tang
105	Hernandez Romero	Adam	Blish
106	Hernandez Romero	Clover	Clemans
107	Hernandez Romero	Tina	Cruz
108	Ngo	Bola	Lee
109	Hopkins	Adel	Aleali
110	Hopkins	Yongxun	An
111	Hopkins	Siana	Espinoza
112	Berg	Victoria	Ayad
113	Hopkins	Bryan	Feld
114	Berg	Megan	Reed
115	Berg	Margherita	Cicognani
116	Hopkins	Brendan	Gao
117	Hopkins	Rachel	Larkin
118	Berg	Dakota	Higgins
119	Berg	Katie	Hulstyn

	D	E	F
1	Your Name: (Last)	Student's Name: (First)	Student's Name: (Last)
120	Berg	Ashley	Kim
121	Berg	Griffin	Koelsch
122	Berg	Darrah	Matthews
123	Berg	April	Oh
124	Berg	Michelle	Peters
125	Berg	Adrian	Sanchez
126	<b>Hernández Romero</b>	<b>Jasmin</b>	<b>Druffner</b>
127	Hernandez Romero	Adam	Harris
128	<b>Hernandez Romero</b>	<b>Junie</b>	<b>Lee</b>
129	Hopkins	Magdalena	Lee
130	Hopkins	Kelsey	Lewin
131	Hopkins	Mimi	Park
132	Ahn	Nicholas	Dolcini
133	Ahn	Keely	Gallagher
134	Tecle	Jeremie	Carreon
135	Ahn	Yimei	Guo
136	Tecle	Kyungrock	Chun
137	Tecle	Gisela	Falcone
138	Tecle	Janet	Kim
139	Tecle	Vin	Kim
140	Tecle	Jayson	Lee
141	Tecle	Sol	Lee
142	Tecle	Christina	Liang
143	Tecle	Sonia	Morarka
144	Tecle	Daveion	Thompson
145	Tecle	Demetrius	Vasquez
146	Tecle	Antonio	Vilches
147	Ahn	Ryan	Liyanaralalage
148	Ahn	Merlin	Llamas
149	Steinberg	Jake	Webber
150	Bremer	Sara	Garcia Roca
151	Bremer	Hea Jung	Kwak
152	Ahn	Chie	Moon
153	Ahn	Ash	Kim
154	Ahn	Anjali	Read
155	Ahn	Joanna	Rubalcaba
156	Ahn	Anjali	Read
157	Ahn	Kailey	Stephen-Lane
158	Hopkins	Jae Won	Rim
159	Donohue	Cecilia	Arana

	D	E	F
1	Your Name: (Last)	Student's Name: (First)	Student's Name: (Last)
160	Donohue	Jessi	Baumsteiger
161	Donohue	Emmanuelle	Castellan
162	Donohue	Camille	Chorin
163	Donohue	Karissa	Taylor
164	Donohue	Jessica	Khumarga
165	Donohue	Alexis	Brazet
166	Donohue	Forouzan	Safari
167	Donohue	Juri	Umagami
168	Donohue	Amber	Gonzalez
169	Donohue	Irene	Lee
170	Bremer	Siana	Kim
171	Flores-Pena	Liberac	Cruzee
172	Light	Cece	Barcenes
173	Steinberg	Melad	Seddighi
174	Willette	Scott	Kriletich
175	Willette	Sonya	Henar
176	Willette	Michelle	Sin
177	willette	eric	douglas
178	Willette	Sara	Ji
179	Willette	Sharon	Kellerman
180	maberry	Hannah	Kim
181	Willette	Molly	Womack
182	Maberry	Aspen Lee	Komski
183	willette	Soyeun (Angie)	Yu
184	Maberry	Ryan	Liyanaralalage
185	Willette	Andrew	Arvan
186	Willette	Andrew	Arvan
187	Willette	Nicole	Chang
188	Willette	Bernard	Franklin
189	Bremer	Nicholas	Dolcini
190	Ahn	Adam	Blish
191	Light	Ollie	Bollack
192	Bremer	Keely	Gallagher
193	Steinberg	May	Reed
194	Ahn	Clover	Clemens
195	Flores Pena	Cindy	Ho
196	Steinberg	Natasha	Carovska
197	Bremer	Antonio	Aiello
198	flores pena	Jenny	Hyun
199	Flores Pena	Kelli	Lim

	D	E	F
1	Your Name: (Last)	Student's Name: (First)	Student's Name: (Last)
200	Ahn	Marie	Lum
201	Ahn	Sian Ruby	Espinosa
202	Bremer	Adam	Harris
203	Ahn	Bryan	Feld
204	<b>Ahn</b>	<b>Yoon Sang</b>	<b>Kim</b>
205	Flores Pena	Jenny	Hyun
206	Light	Alyse	Carter
207	Light	Lianna	England
208	Light	Anjali	Read
209	Light	Joanna	Rubalcaba
210	Flores Pena	Sujeong	Park
211	Samuel	Catherine	Suh
212	Samuel	Jasmine	Ung
213	Samuel	Joojin	Hong
214	Samuel	Amanda	Hyunh
215	Samuel	Eunice	Park
216	Samuel	Eric	Villegas-Nunez
217	Steinberg	Kevin	Troyon
218	Saunders	Daniah	Alsohaibi
219	Bremer	Kelsey	Lewin
220	Flores Pena	Teobista	Seifu
221	Saunders	Summer	Alkharafi
222	Flores Pena	Delaney	Trione
223	maberry	Merlin	Llamas
224	Flores Pena	Dylan	Lowden
225	Samuel	Nikia	Almanza
226	Samuel	Shenna	Artusio
227	Bremer	Hana	Choi
228	<b>Samuel</b>	<b>Alexander</b>	<b>Barker</b>
229	Steinberg	Cheryl	Des Vignes
230	Samuel	Augustin	Valencia
231	Bremer	Cindy	Chiang
232	Maberry	Chie	Moon
233	Bremer	Claudia	Cheng
234	<b>Maberry</b>	<b>Gianna</b>	<b>Ciaramello</b>
235	Samuel	Daniel	Choong
236	Ahn	Kevin	Ginsburg
237	Berg	Niaz	Yashar
238	maberry	Kylie	Cooney
239	Ahn	Grace	Han

	D	E	F
1	Your Name: (Last)	Student's Name: (First)	Student's Name: (Last)
240	Light	Kailey	Stephen-Lane
241	Light	Noah	Humes
242	Ahn	Sofia	Olivas
243	VON DER HORST	Bonnie Kristina	Cruz
244	Light	Megan "May"	Reed
245	Light	Kristina "Tina"	Mahagamage
246	<b>Hernandez Romero</b>	<b>Dylan</b>	<b>Cai</b>
247	<b>Saunders</b>	<b>Alexandra</b>	<b>Felix</b>
248	von der Horst	Brendan	Gao
249	Saunders	Maegan	Iamjan
250	Bremer	Lin	Chang
251	Saunders	Bora	Le
252	Willette	Tina	Cruz
253	<b>Willette</b>	<b>Dylan</b>	<b>Cai</b>
254	<b>Willette</b>	<b>Yoon Sang "Joseph"</b>	<b>Kim</b>
255	Willette	Nikia	Almanza
256	Willette	Liberace	Cruzee
257	<b>von der Horst</b>	<b>Jasmin</b>	<b>Druffner</b>
258	von der Horst	Rachel	Larkin
259	Sonohue	Victoria	Ayad
260	Donohue	Megan	Reed
261	Donohue	Dakota	Higgins
262	Donohue	Darrah	Matthews
263	Donohue	Margherita	Cicognani.
264	von der Horst	Hanah	O'Regan
265	Ngo	Jaewon	Rim
266	Steinberg	Ashley	Kim
267	<b>Bremer</b>	<b>Junie</b>	<b>Lee</b>
268	Donohue	Adrian	Sanchez
269	Donohue	Michelle	Peters
270	Ngo	Ashley	Vang
271	Donohue	Ashley	Kim
272	Ngo	Eunice	Ha
273	Saunders	Angie	Lee
274	Ahn	Chloe	Maeng
275	Bremer	Ana	Molina Borboa
276	Steinberg	Eunice	Kyung
277	von der Horst	Jonathan	Song
278	Ahn	Maria	Nyren

	D	E	F
1	Your Name: (Last)	Student's Name: (First)	Student's Name: (Last)
279	Bremer	Piscilla	Pusposuharto
280	Donohue	Katie	Hulstyn
281	Arps-Bumbera	Bryan	Woo
282	Saunders	Anna	Miller
283	Ahn	Rissa	Martinez
284	Arps-Bumbera	Khadijah	Miralam
285	<b>Ngo</b>	<b>Michelle</b>	<b>Kuo</b>
286	<b>Bremer</b>	<b>Jamie</b>	<b>Song</b>
287	Ngo	Abdullah	Abdulwahed
288	Ahn	Tze Cheuk	Mang
289	Arps-Bumbera	Dane	Smith
290	Bremer	Magdalena	Lee
291	Saunders	Gabrielle	Rios
292	<b>Arps-Bumbera</b>	<b>Xinyang "Sunny"</b>	<b>Zhang</b>
293	Ngo	Jeong	Baek
294	Ahn	Bryan	Sanchez
295	Saunders	Sinamon	Thomas
296	Steinberg	Yeo Jin	Lee
297	Arps-Bumbera	Jon Pierre	Yousef
298	Arps-Bumbera	Andrew	Zamora
299	Arps-Bumbera	Weijia	Cai
300	Arps-Bumbera	Michael	Chen
301	Arps-Bumbera	Tanner	Geertsen
302	Bremer	Yimei	Guo
303	<b>Bremer</b>	<b>Marla</b>	<b>Burke</b>
304	Joseph-Witham	Abdullah	Abdulwahed
305	Joseph-Witham	Dasom	Chung
306	Ballard	Greg	Bagdasryan
307	Ballard	Dasom	Chung
308	Ballard	Siana	Kim
309	Ballard	Hea Jung	Kwak
310	Ballard	Nataly	Menjivar
311	ballard	Bree	Miller
312	Berg	Cecilia	Arana
313	Berg	Jessi	Baumsteiger
314	Berg	Emmanuelle	Castellan
315	Berg	Camille	Chorin
316	Berg	Karissa	Taylor
317	von der Horst	Noah San	Kim
318	Berg	Forouzan	Safari

	D	E	F
1	Your Name: (Last)	Student's Name: (First)	Student's Name: (Last)
319	Berg	Juri	Umagami
320	Berg	Amber	Gonzalez
321	Berg	Irene	Lee
322	Bremer	Siana	Espinoza
323	<b>Bremer</b>	<b>Gianna</b>	<b>Caramello</b>
324	von der Horst	Mona	Masotta
325	von der Horst	King	Nigoza
326	Hopkins	Charlotte	Hitz
327	Hopkins	Melissa	Leimer
328	Hopkins	Izzy	Galler
329	Hopkins	Grace	Kang
330	Hopkins	Habini	Bae
331	Hopkins	Lanaea	Bowie
332	<b>Hopkins</b>	<b>Clark</b>	<b>Lucero</b>
333	Hopkins	Haobo	Tang
334	<b>Hopkins</b>	<b>Hongyu</b>	<b>Zhou</b>
335	Hopkins	Yoo Jung	An
336	Hopkins	Rae	Avramenko
337	Hopkins	Sung Yeun (Annie)	Baek
338	Hopkins	Ashley	Vang
339	Hopkins	Silvan Shaofeng	Li
340	Carlos	Tina	Lee
341	Carlos	Michael	Fiefer
342	Carlos	Sara	Garcia
343	Carlos	Alaura	Bernal
344	Robinson	WeiJa (VGA)	Cai
345	Robinson	Michael	Chen
346	Robinson	Hsin-Ti (Cindy)	Chiang
347	Robinson	Hana	Choi
348	Robinson	Tanner	Geertsen
349	Robinson	Hannah	Kim
350	Robinson	Aspen	Komski
351	Robinson	Sze Wah (Sarah)	Ng
352	Robinson	Kuan-Chiao (Tommy)	Peng
353	Robinson	Lila	Reynolds
354	Robinson	Augustin	Valencia
355	Robinson	Choong (Daniel)	Wi
356	Robinson	Ibrahim	Ghulam
357	Robinson	Esther	Choi

	D	E	F
1	Your Name: (Last)	Student's Name: (First)	Student's Name: (Last)
358	Robinson	Kevin	Choi
359	Robinson	Shaofeng (Silvan)	Li
360	Robinson	Soyoung (Mimi)	Park
361	Robinson	Nina	Pereira
362	Robinson	Sarah	Werber
363	Robinson	Natalie	Center
364	Bremer	Jeremie	Carreon
365	Bremer	Kyungrok	Chun
366	Bremer	Gisela	Falcone
367	Bremer	Janet	Kim
368	Carlos	Cindee	Garcia
369	Bremer	Vin	Kim
370	Bremer	Jason	Lee
371	Bremer	Sol	Lee
372	Carlos	Hyojin	Kim
373	Bremer	Christina	Liang
374	Bremer	Sonia	Morarka
375	Bremer	Daveion	Thompson
376	Bremer	Demetrius	Vasquez
377	Bremer	Antonio	Vilches
378	Bremer	Habini	Bae
379	Willette	Noah San	Kim
380	Carlos	Sze Wah (Sarah)	Ng
381	Hernandez Romero	Meng	Ying Wang
382	Hernandez Romero	Dorothy	Young
383	Hernandez Romero	Chloe	Mang
384	Romero	Maria	Nyren
385	Hernandez Romero	Shiia	He
386	Carlos	Kuan-Chiao (Tommy)	Peng
387	Hernandez Romero	Patricia	Li
388	Hernandez Romero	Adel	Aleali
389	Carlos	Lila	Reynolds
390	Hernandez Romero	Youngxun	An
391	Hernandez Romero	Chaz	Inouye
392	Hernandez Romero	Maya	Jimenez
393	Carlos	Jamie	Guan
394	Carlos	Alyce	Carter
395	Carlos	Lianna	England
396	Carlos	Bryce	Fisher
397	Carlos	Izzy	Galler
398	Carlos	Grace	Kang

	D	E	F
1	Your Name: (Last)	Student's Name: (First)	Student's Name: (Last)
399	Hernandez Romero	Brendan	Gao
400	Hernandez Romero	Brendan	Gao
401	Hernandez Romero	Bora	Lee
402	Joseph-Witham	Analicia	Benavides
403	Carlos	Jlna	Kwon
404	Arps-Bumbera	Haobo	Tang
405	Carlos	Anthony	Lee
406	Carlos	Lydia	Kim
407	Carlos	Rissa	Martinez
408	Carlos	Sofia	Olivas
409	Carlos	Eunice	Park
410	willette	Bryce	Fisher
411	Carlos	Eric	Villegas- Nuñez
412	willette	Anthony	Le
413	Willette	Jina	Kwon
414	Willette	Brijae	Morris
415	Willette	Lydia	Kim
416	Willette	Erim	Ayhan
417	Steinberg	Yun	Kyung
418	Joseph-Witham	Yung Kyung Cindy	Han
419	Donohue	April	Oh
420	Donohue	Griffin	Koelsch
421	Steinberg	Adel	Aleali
422	Berg	Alexis	Brazet
423	Berg	Natalie Rose	Nathan
424	Berg	Jessica	Khumarga
425	Venturini	Cindy	Han
426	Saunders	Luis	Ramirez
427			
428			
429			
430			
431			
432			
433			
434			
435			

	D	E	F
1	Your Name: (Last)	Student's Name: (First)	Student's Name: (Last)
436			
437			
438			
439			
440			
441			
442			
443			
444			
445			
446			
447			
448			
449			

	G	H
1	Student's Academic Department	Identify the Type of Capstone:
2	Digital Media	Normal
3	Digital Media	Normal
4	Product Design	Normal
5	Digital Media	Normal
6	Product Design	Normal
7	Digital Media	Normal
8	Digital Media	Normal
9	Digital Media	Normal
10	Digital Media	Normal
11	Communication Arts	Normal
12	Digital Media	Normal
13	Communication Arts	Normal
14	Digital Media	Normal
15	Communication Arts	Normal
16	Communication Arts	Normal
17	Communication Arts	Normal
18	Digital Media	Normal
19	Communication Arts	Normal
20	Communication Arts	Normal
21	Digital Media	Normal
22	Product Design	Alternative
23	Digital Media	Normal
24	Digital Media	Normal
25	Communication Arts	Normal
26	Product Design	Normal
27	Fashion Design	Normal
28	Communication Arts	Normal
29	Communication Arts	Normal
30	Digital Media	Normal
31	Digital Media	Normal
32	Communication Arts	Normal
33	Communication Arts	Normal
34	Fashion Design	Normal
35	Fashion Design	Alternative
36	Digital Media	Normal
37	Digital Media	Normal
38	Communication Arts	Normal
39	Communication Arts	Normal
40	Toy Design	Normal
41	Toy Design	Normal

	G	H
1	Student's Academic Department	Identify the Type of Capstone:
42	Fashion Design	Normal
43	Architecture/Landscape/Interiors	Normal
44	Architecture/Landscape/Interiors	Normal
45	Digital Media	Normal
46	Digital Media	Normal
47	Digital Media	Normal
48	Digital Media	Normal
49	Digital Media	Normal
50	Communication Arts	Normal
51	<b>Product Design</b>	<b>Normal</b>
52	Communication Arts	Normal
53	Communication Arts	Normal
54	Communication Arts	Normal
55	Communication Arts	Normal
56	Fashion Design	Normal
57	Communication Arts	Normal
58	Communication Arts	Normal
59	Digital Media	Normal
60	<b>Toy Design</b>	<b>Alternative</b>
61	<b>Digital Media</b>	<b>Normal</b>
62	Fashion Design	Normal
63	Product Design	Normal
64	Communication Arts	Normal
65	Product Design	Normal
66	<b>Fashion Design</b>	<b>Normal</b>
67	Product Design	Normal
68	Fine Arts	Normal
69	Fashion Design	Normal
70	Digital Media	Normal
71	Product Design	Normal
72	Architecture/Landscape/Interiors	Normal
73	Communication Arts	Normal
74	Communication Arts	Normal
75	Communication Arts	Normal
76	<b>Product Design</b>	<b>Alternative</b>
77	Communication Arts	Normal
78	Communication Arts	Normal
79	Digital Media	Normal
80	Fine Arts	Normal

	G	H
1	Student's Academic Department	Identify the Type of Capstone:
81	Architecture/Landscape/Interiors	Normal
82	Digital Media	Normal
83	<b>Communication Arts</b>	<b>Alternative</b>
84	Communication Arts	Normal
85	Fashion Design	Normal
86	<b><i>Product Design</i></b>	<b><i>Alternative</i></b>
87	Architecture/Landscape/Interiors	Normal
88	Digital Media	Normal
89	Digital Media	Normal
90	Fashion Design	Normal
91	Product Design	Normal
92	Digital Media	Normal
93	Digital Media	Normal
94	Product Design	Normal
95	Digital Media	Normal
96	Digital Media	Normal
97	Digital Media	Normal
98	<b><i>Product Design</i></b>	<b><i>Normal</i></b>
99	Communication Arts	Normal
100	Digital Media	Normal
101	Digital Media	Normal
102	<b>Communication Arts</b>	<b>Alternative</b>
103	<b><i>Digital Media</i></b>	<b><i>Normal</i></b>
104	Digital Media	Normal
105	Product Design	Normal
106	Toy Design	Normal
107	Product Design	Normal
108	Digital Media	Normal
109	Architecture/Landscape/Interiors	Normal
110	Fashion Design	Normal
111	Fashion Design	Normal
112	Fine Arts	Alternative
113	Product Design	Normal
114	Fine Arts	Alternative
115	Fine Arts	Normal
116	Digital Media	Normal
117	Product Design	Normal
118	Fine Arts	Normal
119	Fine Arts	Normal

	G	H
1	Student's Academic Department	Identify the Type of Capstone:
120	Fine Arts	Normal
121	Fine Arts	Normal
122	Fine Arts	Normal
123	Fine Arts	Normal
124	Fine Arts	Normal
125	Fine Arts	Normal
126	<b>Product Design</b>	<b>Normal</b>
127	Architecture/Landscape/Interiors	Normal
128	<b>Product Design</b>	<b>Alternative</b>
129	Fashion Design	Normal
130	Digital Media	Normal
131	Digital Media	Normal
132	Fashion Design	Normal
133	Fashion Design	Normal
134	Digital Media	Alternative
135	Digital Media	Normal
136	Digital Media	Alternative
137	Communication Arts	Alternative
138	Digital Media	Alternative
139	Digital Media	Alternative
140	Digital Media	Alternative
141	Digital Media	Alternative
142	Digital Media	Alternative
143	Digital Media	Alternative
144	Digital Media	Alternative
145	Digital Media	Alternative
146	Digital Media	Alternative
147	Digital Media	Normal
148	Digital Media	Normal
149	Product Design	Normal
150	Digital Media	Normal
151	Fashion Design	Normal
152	Digital Media	Normal
153	Digital Media	Normal
154	Fashion Design	Normal
155	Fashion Design	Normal
156	Fashion Design	Normal
157	Digital Media	Normal
158	Digital Media	Normal
159	Fine Arts	Normal

	G	H
1	Student's Academic Department	Identify the Type of Capstone:
160	Fine Arts	Normal
161	Fine Arts	Normal
162	Fine Arts	Normal
163	Fine Arts	Normal
164	Fine Arts	Normal
165	Fine Arts	Normal
166	Fine Arts	Normal
167	Fine Arts	Normal
168	Fine Arts	Normal
169	Fine Arts	Normal
170	Fashion Design	Normal
171	Not Clear	Normal
172	Fashion Design	Normal
173	Digital Media	Normal
174	Not Clear	Normal
175	Not Clear	Normal
176	Fine Arts	Normal
177	Fine Arts	Normal
178	Not Clear	Normal
179	Not Clear	Normal
180	Fashion Design	Normal
181	Toy Design	Normal
182	Product Design	Normal
183	Toy Design	Normal
184	Digital Media	Normal
185	Digital Media	Normal
186	Digital Media	Normal
187	Not Clear	Normal
188	Not Clear	Normal
189	Fashion Design	Normal
190	Product Design	Normal
191	Digital Media	Normal
192	Fashion Design	Normal
193	Fine Arts	Alternative
194	Toy Design	Normal
195	Communication Arts	Normal
196	Digital Media	Normal
197	Communication Arts	Normal
198	Not Clear	Normal
199	Digital Media	Normal

	G	H
1	Student's Academic Department	Identify the Type of Capstone:
200	Digital Media	Normal
201	Fashion Design	Normal
202	Architecture/Landscape/Interiors	Normal
203	Product Design	Normal
204	<b>Toy Design</b>	<b>Alternative</b>
205	Not Clear	Normal
206	Architecture/Landscape/Interiors	Normal
207	Communication Arts	Normal
208	Fashion Design	Normal
209	Fashion Design	Normal
210	Fashion Design	Normal
211	Fashion Design	Normal
212	Digital Media	Normal
213	Not Clear	Normal
214	Digital Media	Normal
215	Digital Media	Normal
216	Digital Media	Normal
217	Communication Arts	Normal
218	Communication Arts	Normal
219	Not Clear	Normal
220	Architecture/Landscape/Interiors	Normal
221	Not Clear	Normal
222	Not Clear	Normal
223	Digital Media	Normal
224	Not Clear	Normal
225	Digital Media	Normal
226	Fashion Design	Normal
227	Not Clear	Normal
228	<b>Product Design</b>	<b>Alternative</b>
229	Fashion Design	Alternative
230	Digital Media	Normal
231	Fashion Design	Normal
232	Not Clear	Normal
233	Fashion Design	Normal
234	<b>Not Clear</b>	<b>Normal</b>
235	Digital Media	Normal
236	Digital Media	Normal
237	Fine Arts	Normal
238	Not Clear	Normal
239	Not Clear	Normal

	G	H
1	Student's Academic Department	Identify the Type of Capstone:
240	Digital Media	Normal
241	Communication Arts	Normal
242	Not Clear	Normal
243	Product Design	Normal
244	Not Clear	Normal
245	Not Clear	Alternative
246	<b>Fashion Design</b>	<b>Alternative</b>
247	<b>Product Design</b>	<b>Alternative</b>
248	Not Clear	Normal
249	Architecture/Landscape/Interiors	Normal
250	Not Clear	Normal
251	Not Clear	Normal
252	Not Clear	Normal
253	<b>Fashion Design</b>	<b>Normal</b>
254	<b>Not Clear</b>	<b>Normal</b>
255	Not Clear	Normal
256	Not Clear	Normal
257	<b>Product Design</b>	<b>Normal</b>
258	Product Design	Normal
259	Fine Arts	Normal
260	Fine Arts	Normal
261	Fine Arts	Normal
262	Fine Arts	Normal
263	Fine Arts	Normal
264	Communication Arts	Normal
265	Digital Media	Normal
266	Digital Media	Normal
267	<b>Product Design</b>	<b>Alternative</b>
268	Fine Arts	Normal
269	Fine Arts	Normal
270	Digital Media	Normal
271	Fine Arts	Normal
272	Product Design	Normal
273	Product Design	Normal
274	Fashion Design	Normal
275	Not Clear	Normal
276	Digital Media	Normal
277	Digital Media	Normal
278	Communication Arts	Normal

	G	H
1	Student's Academic Department	Identify the Type of Capstone:
279	Not Clear	Normal
280	Fine Arts	Normal
281	Not Clear	Normal
282	Product Design	Normal
283	Not Clear	Normal
284	Architecture/Landscape/Interiors	Normal
285	<b>Fashion Design</b>	<b>Normal</b>
286	<b>Digital Media</b>	<b>Normal</b>
287	Not Clear	Normal
288	Product Design	Normal
289	Digital Media	Alternative
290	Fashion Design	Normal
291	Not Clear	Normal
292	<b>Communication Arts</b>	<b>Normal</b>
293	Fashion Design	Normal
294	Digital Media	Normal
295	Fashion Design	Normal
296	Fine Arts	Normal
297	Fine Arts	Normal
298	Digital Media	Normal
299	Fashion Design	Normal
300	Architecture/Landscape/Interiors	Normal
301	Not Clear	Normal
302	Digital Media	Normal
303	<b>Not Clear</b>	<b>Normal</b>
304	Not Clear	Normal
305	Not Clear	Normal
306	Product Design	Normal
307	Digital Media	Normal
308	Fashion Design	Normal
309	Fashion Design	Normal
310	Digital Media	Normal
311	Digital Media	Normal
312	Fine Arts	Normal
313	Fine Arts	Normal
314	Fine Arts	Normal
315	Fine Arts	Normal
316	Fine Arts	Normal
317	Digital Media	Normal
318	Fine Arts	Normal

	G	H
1	Student's Academic Department	Identify the Type of Capstone:
319	Fine Arts	Normal
320	Fine Arts	Normal
321	Fine Arts	Normal
322	Not Clear	Normal
323	<b>Not Clear</b>	<b>Alternative</b>
324	Digital Media	Normal
325	Digital Media	Normal
326	Toy Design	Normal
327	Communication Arts	Normal
328	Product Design	Normal
329	Digital Media	Normal
330	Digital Media	Normal
331	Digital Media	Normal
332	<b>Communication Arts</b>	<b>Normal</b>
333	Digital Media	Normal
334	<b>Digital Media</b>	<b>Normal</b>
335	Product Design	Normal
336	Communication Arts	Normal
337	Communication Arts	Normal
338	Communication Arts	Normal
339	Product Design	Normal
340	Toy Design	Normal
341	Digital Media	Normal
342	Digital Media	Normal
343	Not Clear	Alternative
344	Fashion Design	Normal
345	Architecture/Landscape/Interiors	Normal
346	Fashion Design	Normal
347	Fashion Design	Normal
348	Architecture/Landscape/Interiors	Normal
349	Fashion Design	Normal
350	Product Design	Normal
351	Architecture/Landscape/Interiors	Normal
352	Architecture/Landscape/Interiors	Normal
353	Product Design	Normal
354	Digital Media	Normal
355	Digital Media	Normal
356	Architecture/Landscape/Interiors	Normal
357	Product Design	Normal

	G	H
1	Student's Academic Department	Identify the Type of Capstone:
358	Communication Arts	Normal
359	Product Design	Normal
360	Digital Media	Normal
361	Communication Arts	Normal
362	Digital Media	Normal
363	Communication Arts	Alternative
364	Digital Media	Alternative
365	Digital Media	Alternative
366	Communication Arts	Alternative
367	Digital Media	Alternative
368	Not Clear	Normal
369	Digital Media	Alternative
370	Digital Media	Alternative
371	Digital Media	Alternative
372	Not Clear	Normal
373	Digital Media	Alternative
374	Digital Media	Alternative
375	Digital Media	Alternative
376	Digital Media	Alternative
377	Digital Media	Alternative
378	Digital Media	Normal
379	Not Clear	Normal
380	Not Clear	Normal
381	Product Design	Normal
382	Not Clear	Normal
383	Fashion Design	Normal
384	Communication Arts	Normal
385	Communication Arts	Normal
386	Not Clear	Normal
387	Communication Arts	Normal
388	Architecture/Landscape/Interiors	Normal
389	Product Design	Normal
390	Fashion Design	Normal
391	Product Design	Normal
392	Communication Arts	Normal
393	Not Clear	Alternative
394	Fine Arts	Normal
395	Fine Arts	Normal
396	Fine Arts	Normal
397	Fashion Design	Normal
398	Digital Media	Normal

	G	H
1	Student's Academic Department	Identify the Type of Capstone:
399	Not Clear	Normal
400	Not Clear	Normal
401	Digital Media	Normal
402	Not Clear	Normal
403	Digital Media	Normal
404	Digital Media	Normal
405	Digital Media	Normal
406	Digital Media	Normal
407	Fashion Design	Normal
408	Communication Arts	Normal
409	Digital Media	Normal
410	Not Clear	Normal
411	Fine Arts	Normal
412	Digital Media	Normal
413	Digital Media	Normal
414	Not Clear	Normal
415	Digital Media	Normal
416	Architecture/Landscape/Interiors	Normal
417	Communication Arts	Normal
418	Not Clear	Normal
419	Fine Arts	Normal
420	Fine Arts	Normal
421	Architecture/Landscape/Interiors	Normal
422	Fine Arts	Normal
423	Fine Arts	Normal
424	Fine Arts	Normal
425	Fine Arts	Normal
426	Not Clear	Normal
427		<b>Average</b>
428		
429		<b>Mode</b>
430		
431		
432		
433		
434		
435		

	G	H
1	Student's Academic Department	Identify the Type of Capstone:
436		
437		
438		
439		
440		
441		
442		
443		
444		
445		
446		
447		
448		
449		

	I	J
1	Written Communication. 25%	Critical Thinking. 35%
2	4	3.5
3	3.2	3.2
4	2	2.9
5	3.4	3.7
6	3.8	3.5
7	2.9	3.5
8	3.8	3.3
9	3.4	3.4
10	3.6	3.4
11	3.9	3.8
12	3.5	3.6
13	3	3.7
14	4	3.6
15	3.8	3.9
16	2	2.5
17	3	2.8
18	3.5	4
19	1.8	4
20	1.8	2.8
21	3	4
22	3.6	3.8
23	4	4
24	1	2
25	4	4
26	3	3
27	1	2.5
28	4	4
29	4	4
30	2.7	3.8
31	3.7	4
32	3.8	4
33	4	4
34	4	4
35	3.7	4
36	4	4
37	2.3	1.6
38	4	3.7
39	2	1.5
40	3	3
41	3	3

	I	J
1	Written Communication. 25%	Critical Thinking. 35%
42	3.7	3.3
43	3.7	3.7
44	3.4	3.7
45	3.6	3.6
46	3.5	3.6
47	3	3
48	3.8	3.5
49	4	4
50	4	4
51	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>
52	3.7	3.7
53	4	4
54	4	4
55	4	4
56	4	4
57	4	4
58	4	4
59	4	4
60	<b>2</b>	<b>3.7</b>
61	<b>2.7</b>	<b>2.7</b>
62	3	2.7
63	2.7	2.7
64	2.7	2.7
65	3.3	2.7
66	<b>2.3</b>	<b>2.3</b>
67	4	4
68	4	4
69	3	1.7
70	3.3	4
71	2.7	2
72	3	3
73	4	3.7
74	4	3.8
75	3.3	3.3
76	<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.8</b>
77	3	4
78	3.2	3.7
79	2.9	3.3
80	3.2	3.8

	I	J
1	Written Communication. 25%	Critical Thinking. 35%
81	2	3
82	3.8	3.8
83	<b>2</b>	<b>2.5</b>
84	2	1.8
85	3	3.5
86	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>
87	4	3
88	4	4
89	3.5	2.8
90	2.7	2.7
91	3.2	2.5
92	3.2	2.8
93	3.8	3.5
94	3.7	4
95	2	2
96	2.5	2.3
97	3.3	2
98	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.7</b>
99	3.3	3.3
100	2.7	2.7
101	3.7	4
102	<b>2.3</b>	<b>3.3</b>
103	<b>2.7</b>	<b>3</b>
104	3.7	3.7
105	3	3
106	2.5	3
107	4	2
108	3.5	3
109	4	3
110	3	3
111	2	3
112	4	3
113	4	3
114	4	4
115	3	3
116	4	4
117	4	4
118	4	4
119	4	3

	I	J
1	Written Communication. 25%	Critical Thinking. 35%
120	3	3
121	4	3
122	3	3
123	2	3
124	4	3
125	3	4
126	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>
127	2.5	2
128	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>
129	3	4
130	4	4
131	4	4
132	2	2.5
133	3	2.8
134	2.8	3.1
135	2	3.4
136	3	3.5
137	2.8	3
138	3.2	3.8
139	3.2	3.5
140	2.7	3.6
141	3.8	4
142	3.2	3.3
143	3.7	4
144	3.7	3.9
145	3	3.3
146	3.8	3.7
147	3.8	3.4
148	3.8	2.5
149	2.3	2.3
150	2.8	2
151	3	2.8
152	3.7	3.8
153	2.5	2.8
154	3.7	3.1
155	3.8	3.2
156	3.7	2.6
157	3.7	3
158	3	3
159	3.8	3

	I	J
1	Written Communication. 25%	Critical Thinking. 35%
160	3.8	3.8
161	3	2.5
162	3	2
163	3.6	3.6
164	2.7	2
165	3	2.5
166	2.7	2.7
167	3.8	3.3
168	3	3.2
169	3	3.8
170	2.8	2.7
171	2	1
172	2.5	2
173	3	3
174	3	2.7
175	3	3
176	3.7	3.7
177	4	4
178	3.7	3.7
179	3	2.7
180	3	2.5
181	3.7	3.3
182	4	2
183	3.7	3.7
184	3.5	3
185	3.3	3
186	3.3	3
187	3	3.7
188	3	3
189	3	2.5
190	3	2
191	3.5	3.3
192	3.2	3
193	3.7	4
194	3.8	3.2
195	3	3
196	4	4
197	4	4
198	4	4
199	4	4

	I	J
1	Written Communication. 25%	Critical Thinking. 35%
200	2.7	2
201	1.8	1
202	2	1
203	3.5	2
204	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>
205	4	4
206	3.3	3.2
207	3.6	3.6
208	3.5	3.5
209	3.3	3.3
210	1	2
211	3	3
212	2	2
213	2	2
214	4	4
215	4	4
216	4	4
217	2.5	2.5
218	3.8	4
219	4	3.5
220	3	3
221	3.9	3.5
222	2	1
223	4	3.5
224	4	3
225	2	2.5
226	4	4
227	3	1.5
228	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>
229	3.7	3.7
230	3	2
231	2	1.5
232	4	4
233	2.5	2
234	<b>3</b>	<b>1.5</b>
235	3	3
236	3.5	2.8
237	3	2
238	2	1.5
239	3	2.8

	I	J
1	Written Communication. 25%	Critical Thinking. 35%
240	3	2.9
241	3.3	3.5
242	3.7	2
243	1.5	1
244	3	3
245	3.7	3.7
246	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
247	<b>3.8</b>	<b>4</b>
248	1.5	1.5
249	2.3	2.3
250	3.4	2.2
251	1	1.7
252	3	3
253	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3</b>
254	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.7</b>
255	2.3	2.1
256	2	2.7
257	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>
258	3	4
259	2.8	2.6
260	4	3.8
261	4	4
262	2.8	2.8
263	3	2.7
264	2	2
265	3.2	3.1
266	1	2.3
267	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
268	3	3
269	3.5	2
270	3.4	3.5
271	3.5	3
272	3.1	3
273	1.5	1
274	2.8	2.3
275	2.5	2.5
276	2	2
277	3	3
278	3.8	3

	I	J
1	Written Communication. 25%	Critical Thinking. 35%
279	3	3.2
280	2.5	2.5
281	2	1.7
282	3.8	4
283	3.8	2
284	4	4
285	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.1</b>
286	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.7</b>
287	2.4	1
288	3.8	3.7
289	3.7	4
290	3	3
291	2.3	2.5
292	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.5</b>
293	2.4	2.2
294	3.8	3.9
295	1	1.7
296	3.3	3.7
297	2	2
298	2.3	2
299	2.3	2.5
300	3.3	3.3
301	2	1.7
302	3	3.3
303	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.8</b>
304	2	1
305	2	1
306	3	2
307	2.8	1.5
308	4	3
309	2.8	2.5
310	4	4
311	4	4
312	3	2
313	4	3
314	3	3
315	3	3
316	4	4
317	1	1
318	3	3

	I	J
1	Written Communication. 25%	Critical Thinking. 35%
319	4	2
320	3	2
321	3	4
322	2	0.5
323	<b>2</b>	<b>0.5</b>
324	3	3
325	3	4
326	2	2
327	4	4
328	3	2
329	4	4
330	3	3
331	4	4
332	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>
333	3	2
334	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>
335	4	4
336	4	3
337	2	4
338	3	3
339	3	3
340	3	3
341	4	3
342	2	2
343	3	2
344	2	3
345	3.5	4
346	2.5	2
347	3	2.5
348	2.5	3.5
349	2.5	1.5
350	4	4
351	3	4
352	2.5	3
353	4	4
354	2	3
355	3	3
356	3	4
357	3	3

	I	J
1	Written Communication. 25%	Critical Thinking. 35%
358	2.5	2
359	2	2.5
360	4	4
361	4	3.5
362	3.5	3.5
363	3.5	3.5
364	2	3.5
365	3	3.4
366	2.5	3
367	3.3	3.5
368	2	2
369	3.5	3.2
370	2.7	3.5
371	3.5	4
372	4	4
373	3	3.5
374	3.5	4
375	3.6	4
376	3	3.5
377	3.7	3.7
378	3	3
379	3	1
380	3	2
381	2.5	3
382	4	3
383	3	2
384	3.5	3
385	3	2
386	3	2
387	3	4
388	2	3
389	3	3
390	2.5	2
391	2	3
392	2	4
393	2	2
394	4	4
395	4	4
396	3	2
397	3	2
398	4	3

	I	J
1	Written Communication. 25%	Critical Thinking. 35%
399	1.5	2
400	1.5	2
401	1.5	2
402	4	3
403	3	2
404	2.7	3
405	3	2
406	3	2
407	2	3
408	3	3
409	4	3
410	3	2
411	3	2
412	2	2
413	2	1
414	2.7	2.3
415	2.7	2
416	2	2.7
417	1	1
418	2	1
419	3.8	3.8
420	3.8	3.8
421	1	1
422	3	2
423	3	4
424	3	3
425	2	2.5
426	3.3	2.7
427	<b>3.093176471</b>	<b>2.987058824</b>
428		
429	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
430		
431		
432		
433		
434		
435		

	I	J
1	Written Communication. 25%	Critical Thinking. 35%
436		
437		
438		
439		
440		
441		
442		
443		
444		
445		
446		
447		
448		
449		

	K	L
1	Information Literacy. 20%	Visual Literacy. 10%
2	3.6	3.6
3	3.7	3.6
4	3.1	3.4
5	3.6	3.9
6	3.5	3.3
7	3.2	3
8	3.5	3.5
9	3.2	3.2
10	3.6	3.5
11	3.8	3.6
12	3.5	3.6
13	4	4
14	4	3.7
15	4	4
16	1.7	3
17	4	4
18	4	4
19	4	4
20	4	4
21	4	4
22	4	4
23	4	4
24	3.3	2
25	4	4
26	1	3.5
27	4	1
28	4	3.5
29	4	4
30	1.5	0
31	4	4
32	4	3.7
33	4	4
34	3.7	4
35	4	4
36	4	4
37	0.5	1
38	4	4
39	1	4
40	3.7	3
41	3.7	3.4

	K	L
1	Information Literacy. 20%	Visual Literacy. 10%
42	4	3.5
43	3.7	3.7
44	3.3	4
45	4	3.9
46	3.1	3.3
47	3	3
48	2.8	3.6
49	4	4
50	4	4
51	<b>4</b>	<b>3.9</b>
52	3.7	3.7
53	4	4
54	4	4
55	4	4
56	4	4
57	4	4
58	4	4
59	4	4
60	<b>3</b>	<b>3.5</b>
61	<b>3</b>	<b>3.3</b>
62	3	3.3
63	1	2.7
64	3	3.7
65	3.3	3.3
66	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
67	4	4
68	4	3.9
69	1.7	2.7
70	3.3	3.7
71	1.7	3.3
72	1.7	3.3
73	3.6	3.7
74	3.8	4
75	3.3	4
76	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.7</b>
77	3.9	4
78	4	3.8
79	1	2
80	4	3.8

	K	L
1	Information Literacy. 20%	Visual Literacy. 10%
81	3.6	3
82	3.8	3.8
83	<b>2</b>	<b>3.2</b>
84	2.3	3.3
85	4	2.5
86	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
87	3	4
88	3	3.5
89	3.5	3.5
90	1	3.3
91	2.8	3.8
92	2.8	3
93	3.5	4
94	4	4
95	2	2
96	4	4
97	2.5	3
98	<b>1</b>	<b>2.7</b>
99	3.7	4
100	2.7	3.7
101	3.7	3.7
102	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.3</b>
103	<b>2.7</b>	<b>2.7</b>
104	1	3.7
105	3	0
106	2.5	2
107	3	4
108	2	3
109	2	3
110	4	3
111	4	3
112	4	3
113	4	3
114	4	4
115	4	4
116	2	4
117	4	4
118	4	4
119	4	4

	K	L
1	Information Literacy. 20%	Visual Literacy. 10%
120	3	4
121	4	4
122	4	4
123	4	4
124	3	3
125	4	4
126	<b>4</b>	<b>2.5</b>
127	4	2
128	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>
129	4	3
130	4	4
131	4	4
132	3.7	3
133	3.5	3
134	3.5	4
135	3.3	3.5
136	2	3.5
137	3.5	4
138	3.5	4
139	3.5	4
140	3.3	3.5
141	4	4
142	3.6	4
143	3.8	4
144	4	4
145	3	3
146	3.7	4
147	3.7	3.8
148	1	3.8
149	1.7	3
150	2.5	3
151	3	4
152	3.7	3.4
153	1	2
154	3.7	3.5
155	3.8	3.3
156	3.7	3.5
157	3.5	3.8
158	4	4
159	3.5	3.9

	K	L
1	Information Literacy. 20%	Visual Literacy. 10%
160	3.9	3.8
161	2.5	2.5
162	3.8	3.9
163	3.6	3.6
164	2.5	2.5
165	2.8	4
166	2.7	4
167	3.9	4
168	3.6	3.5
169	3.6	3.2
170	3.3	3
171	1	0
172	2	3.3
173	2	3
174	2.7	3.7
175	3	3.7
176	3	1
177	3	3
178	2.7	3.7
179	2.7	2.3
180	2	4
181	2.3	3
182	1	4
183	3	2.3
184	1.8	3.5
185	2.7	3.3
186	2.7	3.3
187	2.7	3.7
188	2.3	3.7
189	3.5	3
190	3.3	0
191	3.5	3.1
192	3.7	3.5
193	1	4
194	3	2
195	4	4
196	3.3	4
197	4	4
198	4	4
199	4	4

	K	L
1	Information Literacy. 20%	Visual Literacy. 10%
200	3.8	3.8
201	3.3	2
202	2	2
203	3	2
204	<b>2</b>	<b>3.5</b>
205	4	4
206	3.3	2.8
207	3.4	3.2
208	3.3	3.5
209	3	3.5
210	3	3
211	3	3
212	2	2
213	2	2
214	4	4
215	4	4
216	3.5	3.5
217	1.7	3.5
218	4	4
219	3.5	3
220	2	3
221	4	3.8
222	2	0
223	1	4
224	4	4
225	1	2.7
226	4	4
227	2	2
228	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>
229	4	4
230	1	1
231	2	2
232	1	4
233	3	2.5
234	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>
235	1	2
236	3.7	2.8
237	3	3
238	1.9	3
239	3.7	3

	K	L
1	Information Literacy. 20%	Visual Literacy. 10%
240	3.1	3.4
241	3.6	3.5
242	3.8	3.8
243	1	2
244	3	3.4
245	3.7	3.5
246	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>
247	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>
248	0	3.5
249	3	3.3
250	3.7	3
251	2.2	2
252	2.7	3
253	<b>2.7</b>	<b>2.7</b>
254	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
255	2.7	3
256	1	1
257	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>
258	2	4
259	2.5	3.9
260	3.8	4
261	4	4
262	2.8	2.5
263	2.7	3
264	4	3
265	3.2	3
266	0	3
267	<b>4</b>	<b>2.5</b>
268	2.8	3.7
269	2	2.9
270	3.3	3.1
271	3.4	3.8
272	2.4	3.3
273	2	2
274	3.6	2.5
275	3	3
276	1	2
277	1.5	4
278	3.8	3.2

	K	L
1	Information Literacy. 20%	Visual Literacy. 10%
279	1.5	3.2
280	2.6	3.5
281	2.3	3.7
282	4	3.5
283	3.8	3.8
284	4	4
285	<b>3.2</b>	<b>2.9</b>
286	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>
287	0.5	2
288	3.9	3.4
289	4	4
290	3.5	4
291	2.7	3
292	<b>3.3</b>	<b>2.3</b>
293	2.4	0
294	3.3	3
295	2	3
296	4	4
297	1.7	2
298	2	2.3
299	2.3	2.7
300	4	4
301	1.7	1.7
302	3.2	3.3
303	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.8</b>
304	0	2
305	2	1
306	2.5	2
307	2.8	3
308	4	4
309	4	3.5
310	4	4
311	4	4
312	2	2
313	3	4
314	3	4
315	4	4
316	4	4
317	0	2
318	3	3

	K	L
1	Information Literacy. 20%	Visual Literacy. 10%
319	4	4
320	3	3
321	3	4
322	2	1.5
323	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
324	1	2
325	4	4
326	1	2
327	1	4
328	1	2
329	4	3
330	1	2
331	3	4
332	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>
333	0	4
334	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
335	4	4
336	3	3
337	2	3
338	4	4
339	4	4
340	3	3
341	3	4
342	2	2
343	3	4
344	2.5	4
345	3.5	4
346	2	4
347	3	4
348	1.5	4
349	3.5	4
350	4	4
351	4	4
352	3	4
353	4	4
354	3	3.5
355	3.5	4
356	3.5	4
357	3.5	4

	K	L
1	Information Literacy. 20%	Visual Literacy. 10%
358	3	3
359	2	4
360	4	4
361	4	4
362	2.5	4
363	4	3
364	3.5	3
365	1.8	3
366	3.5	3
367	3.5	3.5
368	2	2
369	3	4
370	3.3	3.5
371	4	4
372	4	4
373	3.5	3
374	4	3
375	3.6	3
376	2.7	3
377	3.7	4
378	1	3
379	1	3
380	3	4
381	3	2
382	4	2
383	3	1.5
384	4	3
385	3	1
386	2	1
387	4	1.5
388	0	1
389	3	3
390	3.5	1
391	3	3
392	4	1.5
393	2	4
394	4	4
395	3	2
396	3	4
397	3	3
398	4	4

	K	L
1	Information Literacy. 20%	Visual Literacy. 10%
399	1.5	1
400	1.5	1
401	1.5	1
402	4	4
403	3	4
404	1	4
405	3	3
406	3	3
407	3	3
408	4	2
409	4	3
410	2	3
411	2	3
412	1.7	2
413	2	3
414	2	3
415	2	2
416	2.3	2
417	1.3	2.3
418	3	2
419	3.8	3.8
420	3.8	3.8
421	1	1
422	2	3
423	3	2
424	3	2
425	3	3
426	2.3	3.7
427	<b>2.994117647</b>	<b>3.217411765</b>
428		
429	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>
430		
431		
432		
433		
434		
435		

	K	L
1	Information Literacy. 20%	Visual Literacy. 10%
436		
437		
438		
439		
440		
441		
442		
443		
444		
445		
446		
447		
448		
449		

	M	N
1	Related Outcomes. 10%	Overall Weighted Score (GPA Style).
2	3.7	3.68
3	3.5	3.37
4	3	2.78
5	3.3	3.59
6	3.6	3.57
7	3.4	3.23
8	3.3	3.49
9	3.4	3.34
10	3.4	3.5
11	3.5	3.78
12	3.3	3.53
13	4	3.65
14	3.6	3.79
15	4	3.92
16	3.5	2.37
17	2	3.13
18	4	3.88
19	1.5	3.2
20	4	3.03
21	4	3.75
22	4	3.83
23	4	4
24	2	2.01
25	4	4
26	3	2.65
27	3	2.33
28	3.5	3.9
29	4	4
30	3.9	2.7
31	4	3.93
32	4	3.92
33	4	4
34	4	3.94
35	4	3.93
36	4	4
37	4	1.74
38	4	3.9
39	3	1.93
40	4	3.24
41	4	3.28

	M	N
1	Related Outcomes. 10%	Overall Weighted Score (GPA Style).
42	4	3.63
43	3.7	3.7
44	3.7	3.58
45	3.8	3.73
46	4	3.49
47	4	3.1
48	4	3.5
49	4	4
50	4	4
51	<b>4</b>	<b>3.99</b>
52	4	3.73
53	4	4
54	4	4
55	4	4
56	4	4
57	4	4
58	4	4
59	4	4
60	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.11</b>
61	<b>2</b>	<b>2.75</b>
62	2	2.83
63	1	2.19
64	4	2.99
65	3	3.06
66	<b>2</b>	<b>1.98</b>
67	3.7	3.97
68	4	3.99
69	2.7	2.23
70	4	3.66
71	3.3	2.38
72	3.8	2.85
73	3	3.69
74	3.7	3.86
75	4	3.44
76	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.65</b>
77	4	3.73
78	3.8	3.66
79	3	2.58
80	3.5	3.66

	M	N
1	Related Outcomes. 10%	Overall Weighted Score (GPA Style).
81	2.7	2.84
82	3.2	3.74
83	<b>3.5</b>	<b>2.45</b>
84	1	2.02
85	3	3.33
86	<b>4</b>	<b>3.45</b>
87	4	3.45
88	4	3.75
89	4	3.31
90	3.3	2.48
91	4	3.02
92	4	3.04
93	4	3.68
94	0	3.53
95	3	2.1
96	4	3.03
97	4	2.73
98	<b>4</b>	<b>3.09</b>
99	1	3.22
100	4	2.93
101	4	3.84
102	<b>3</b>	<b>3.02</b>
103	<b>3</b>	<b>2.84</b>
104	0	2.79
105	2.5	2.65
106	1	2.48
107	1	2.8
108	3.1	2.94
109	4	3.15
110	4	3.3
111	3	2.95
112	4	3.55
113	4	3.55
114	4	4
115	4	3.4
116	3	3.5
117	4	4
118	4	4
119	4	3.65

	M	N
1	Related Outcomes. 10%	Overall Weighted Score (GPA Style).
120	3	3.1
121	3	3.55
122	4	3.4
123	3	3.05
124	3	3.25
125	4	3.75
126	<b>4</b>	<b>2.9</b>
127	4	2.73
128	<b>4</b>	<b>3.65</b>
129	4	3.65
130	3	3.9
131	2	3.8
132	1	2.52
133	1.8	2.91
134	4	3.29
135	3	3
136	3	3.03
137	4	3.25
138	4	3.63
139	4	3.53
140	3.5	3.3
141	4	3.95
142	4	3.48
143	4	3.89
144	4	3.89
145	3	3.11
146	4	3.79
147	1	3.36
148	2	2.61
149	3	2.32
150	3	2.5
151	4	3.13
152	3	3.64
153	2.8	2.29
154	3	3.4
155	3.2	3.48
156	3	3.23
157	3	3.36
158	4	3.4
159	4	3.49

	M	N
1	Related Outcomes. 10%	Overall Weighted Score (GPA Style).
160	3.8	3.82
161	2.5	2.63
162	3.6	2.96
163	3.8	3.62
164	3.8	2.51
165	3.5	2.94
166	3.9	2.95
167	4	3.69
168	3.5	3.29
169	3.8	3.5
170	4	3.01
171	2	1.25
172	3.3	2.39
173	2.7	2.77
174	3	2.91
175	3	3.07
176	3	3.22
177	4	3.7
178	2	3.33
179	2.3	2.7
180	4	2.83
181	4	3.24
182	4	2.7
183	4	3.45
184	4	3.04
185	4	3.15
186	4	3.15
187	2	3.16
188	3	2.93
189	3	2.93
190	0.5	2.16
191	3	3.34
192	4	3.34
193	4	3.33
194	1.5	3.02
195	3	3.3
196	4	3.86
197	4	4
198	4	4
199	3	3.9

	M	N
1	Related Outcomes. 10%	Overall Weighted Score (GPA Style).
200	1.8	2.7
201	0	1.66
202	3	1.75
203	2	2.58
204	<b>0</b>	<b>1.53</b>
205	4	4
206	2.8	3.17
207	2	3.36
208	3.5	3.46
209	2	3.13
210	3	2.15
211	3.5	3.05
212	2	2
213	2	2
214	3	3.9
215	4	4
216	3.5	3.8
217	2	2.39
218	4	3.95
219	4	3.63
220	2	2.7
221	3	3.68
222	1	1.35
223	4	3.23
224	3	3.55
225	2	2.05
226	4	4
227	3	2.18
228	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>
229	4	3.82
230	3	2.05
231	3	1.93
232	4	3.4
233	3	2.48
234	<b>2</b>	<b>1.68</b>
235	3	2.5
236	2	3.08
237	4	2.75
238	1	1.81
239	0	2.77

	M	N
1	Related Outcomes. 10%	Overall Weighted Score (GPA Style).
240	3.4	3.07
241	3	3.42
242	0	2.77
243	4	1.53
244	3.4	3.08
245	3.7	3.68
246	<b>2.5</b>	<b>2.5</b>
247	<b>4</b>	<b>3.95</b>
248	1	1.35
249	2.7	2.58
250	3	2.96
251	1	1.59
252	3	2.94
253	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.16</b>
254	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.79</b>
255	1.7	2.32
256	2.7	2.02
257	<b>4</b>	<b>3.9</b>
258	4	3.35
259	2.5	2.75
260	3.8	3.87
261	4	4
262	3	2.79
263	2.9	2.83
264	0	2.3
265	3.8	3.21
266	3	1.66
267	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>
268	2.8	3.01
269	2	2.47
270	3.6	3.41
271	3.5	3.34
272	3.5	2.99
273	1	1.43
274	1	2.58
275	3	2.7
276	2.5	1.85
277	4	2.9
278	3.8	3.46

	M	N
1	Related Outcomes. 10%	Overall Weighted Score (GPA Style).
279	4	2.89
280	3	2.67
281	2.3	2.16
282	4	3.9
283	1	2.89
284	4	4
285	<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.18</b>
286	<b>3</b>	<b>2.22</b>
287	0	1.25
288	3.4	3.71
289	4	3.93
290	4	3.3
291	3	2.59
292	<b>2.3</b>	<b>3.27</b>
293	3.6	2.21
294	0	3.28
295	2.3	1.78
296	4	3.72
297	2.3	1.97
298	2.7	2.18
299	3	2.48
300	4	3.58
301	1	1.71
302	4	3.28
303	<b>4</b>	<b>3.82</b>
304	0	1.05
305	0	1.35
306	1	2.25
307	1	2.19
308	4	3.65
309	4	3.13
310	4	4
311	4	4
312	2	2.25
313	4	3.45
314	4	3.2
315	3	3.3
316	3	3.9
317	4	1.2
318	3	3

	M	N
1	Related Outcomes. 10%	Overall Weighted Score (GPA Style).
319	3	3.2
320	3	2.65
321	3	3.45
322	2	1.43
323	<b>3</b>	<b>1.38</b>
324	1	2.3
325	1	3.45
326	1	1.7
327	4	3.4
328	0	1.85
329	3	3.8
330	2	2.4
331	4	3.8
332	<b>2</b>	<b>2.45</b>
333	0	1.85
334	<b>2</b>	<b>2.7</b>
335	1	3.7
336	4	3.35
337	1	2.7
338	4	3.4
339	2	3.2
340	3	3
341	4	3.45
342	2	2
343	1	2.55
344	4	2.85
345	4	3.78
346	4	2.53
347	4	3.03
348	4	2.95
349	4	2.65
350	4	4
351	4	3.75
352	4	3.08
353	4	4
354	4	2.9
355	4	3.3
356	4	3.65
357	2.5	3.15

	M	N
1	Related Outcomes. 10%	Overall Weighted Score (GPA Style).
358	4	2.63
359	4	2.58
360	4	4
361	4	3.83
362	3	3.3
363	4	3.6
364	3	3.03
365	3	2.9
366	3	2.98
367	3	3.4
368	2	2
369	3	3.3
370	3	3.21
371	4	3.88
372	4	4
373	3	3.28
374	4	3.78
375	4	3.72
376	3	3.12
377	3	3.66
378	3	2.6
379	4	2
380	3	2.75
381	2.5	2.73
382	2	3.25
383	3	2.5
384	4	3.43
385	1	2.25
386	1	2.05
387	0	3.1
388	0	1.65
389	2	2.9
390	1	2.23
391	3	2.75
392	4	3.25
393	3	2.3
394	4	4
395	2	3.4
396	3	2.75
397	3	2.65
398	3	3.55

	M	N
1	Related Outcomes. 10%	Overall Weighted Score (GPA Style).
399	2	1.68
400	1	1.58
401	2	1.68
402	1	3.35
403	3	2.75
404	1.7	2.5
405	3	2.65
406	3	2.65
407	3	2.75
408	4	3.2
409	3	3.45
410	4	2.55
411	2	2.35
412	2.7	2.01
413	2	1.75
414	3	2.48
415	3	2.28
416	3	2.41
417	2	1.29
418	0	1.65
419	3.5	3.77
420	3.8	3.8
421	1.7	1.07
422	2	2.35
423	3	3.25
424	3	2.9
425	2	2.48
426	2.5	2.85
427	<b>3.059058824</b>	<b>3.0468</b>
428		
429	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>
430		
431		
432		
433		
434		
435		

	M	N
1	Related Outcomes. 10%	Overall Weighted Score (GPA Style).
436		
437		
438		
439		
440		
441		
442		
443		
444		
445		
446		
447		
448		
449		

	O
1	Select Final Grade (GPA Style).
2	3.7
3	3.3
4	2.7
5	3.7
6	3.7
7	3
8	3.7
9	3.7
10	3.7
11	4
12	3.3
13	3.7
14	3.7
15	4
16	2.3
17	3
18	4
19	3
20	3
21	3.7
22	4
23	4
24	2
25	4
26	2.7
27	2.3
28	4
29	4
30	2.7
31	4
32	4
33	4
34	4
35	4
36	4
37	2
38	4
39	2
40	3
41	3

	O
1	Select Final Grade (GPA Style).
42	3.7
43	3.7
44	3.3
45	3.7
46	3.3
47	3
48	3.3
49	4
50	4
51	<b>4</b>
52	3.7
53	4
54	4
55	4
56	4
57	4
58	4
59	4
60	<b>3</b>
61	<b>2.7</b>
62	2.7
63	2
64	3
65	3
66	<b>2</b>
67	4
68	4
69	2
70	3.7
71	2.3
72	3
73	3.3
74	3.7
75	3.3
76	3.3
77	3.7
78	3.3
79	2.3
80	3.3

	O
1	Select Final Grade (GPA Style).
81	2.7
82	3.7
83	<b>2.3</b>
84	2
85	3.3
86	3.3
87	3.3
88	3.7
89	3.3
90	2.3
91	3
92	3
93	3.3
94	3.3
95	2
96	3
97	2.7
98	<b>3</b>
99	3.3
100	3
101	3.7
102	<b>3</b>
103	<b>2.7</b>
104	2.7
105	2.7
106	2.3
107	3
108	2.7
109	3
110	3.3
111	2.7
112	3.3
113	3.7
114	4
115	3.3
116	3.7
117	3.7
118	4
119	3.7

	O
1	Select Final Grade (GPA Style).
120	3
121	3.3
122	3.3
123	3
124	3
125	3.7
126	<b>3</b>
127	2.7
128	3.3
129	3.3
130	4
131	3.7
132	2.3
133	2.7
134	3
135	3
136	3
137	3.3
138	3.7
139	3.7
140	3.3
141	4
142	3.3
143	4
144	4
145	3
146	3.7
147	3.3
148	2.3
149	2
150	2.3
151	3
152	3.3
153	2
154	3.3
155	3.3
156	3
157	3.3
158	3.3
159	2.7

	O
1	Select Final Grade (GPA Style).
160	3.7
161	2.7
162	3
163	3.3
164	2.7
165	3
166	3
167	3.7
168	3
169	3.3
170	3
171	1
172	2.3
173	2.7
174	2.7
175	3
176	3
177	3.7
178	3
179	2.3
180	3
181	3
182	3
183	3
184	3.3
185	3
186	3
187	2.7
188	2.7
189	3
190	2
191	3.7
192	3.3
193	3.3
194	3
195	3.3
196	4
197	4
198	4
199	3.7

	O
1	Select Final Grade (GPA Style).
200	2.7
201	1
202	1.7
203	2.3
204	<b>1</b>
205	4
206	3
207	3.3
208	3.7
209	3
210	2
211	3
212	2
213	2
214	4
215	4
216	4
217	2.3
218	4
219	3.7
220	2.7
221	3.3
222	1.7
223	3.3
224	3.7
225	2
226	4
227	2
228	<b>4</b>
229	4
230	2
231	1.7
232	3.7
233	2.3
234	<b>1</b>
235	2.3
236	3
237	2.7
238	1.7
239	2.7

	O
1	Select Final Grade (GPA Style).
240	3
241	3.7
242	2.7
243	1
244	3.3
245	4
246	<b>2.3</b>
247	<b>4</b>
248	1
249	2.7
250	3
251	1
252	2.7
253	<b>2.7</b>
254	<b>1</b>
255	2
256	1.7
257	<b>4</b>
258	3.7
259	2.7
260	4
261	4
262	2.7
263	2.7
264	3.3
265	3
266	1.7
267	<b>3</b>
268	3
269	2
270	3.3
271	3.3
272	2.7
273	1.7
274	2.3
275	2.7
276	2
277	2.3
278	2.3

	O
1	Select Final Grade (GPA Style).
279	3
280	2.3
281	2
282	4
283	2.7
284	4
285	<b>3</b>
286	<b>2.3</b>
287	1
288	3.7
289	4
290	3.3
291	2.7
292	3.3
293	2
294	3
295	1.7
296	3.7
297	1.7
298	2
299	2.3
300	3.3
301	1.7
302	3.3
303	3.7
304	1
305	1
306	2.3
307	2.3
308	3.7
309	3
310	4
311	4
312	2.7
313	3.7
314	3.3
315	3.3
316	3.7
317	1
318	3

	O
1	Select Final Grade (GPA Style).
319	3
320	2.7
321	3.3
322	1
323	<b>1</b>
324	2.3
325	3.7
326	1.7
327	3.3
328	1.7
329	3.7
330	2.3
331	3.7
332	<b>2.3</b>
333	1.7
334	<b>2.7</b>
335	3.7
336	3.3
337	2.7
338	3.3
339	3
340	3
341	3.3
342	2
343	2.7
344	2.7
345	3.7
346	2.3
347	3
348	2.7
349	2.3
350	4
351	3.7
352	3
353	4
354	2.7
355	3.3
356	3.7
357	3

	O
1	Select Final Grade (GPA Style).
358	2.7
359	2.7
360	4
361	3.7
362	3.3
363	3.7
364	3
365	3
366	3
367	3.3
368	2
369	3.3
370	3.3
371	4
372	4
373	3.3
374	3.7
375	3.7
376	3
377	3.7
378	2.7
379	2
380	2.7
381	2.7
382	3
383	2.3
384	3.3
385	2
386	2
387	3
388	1
389	3
390	2
391	2.7
392	3.3
393	2.3
394	4
395	3.3
396	2.7
397	2.7
398	3.7

	O
1	Select Final Grade (GPA Style).
399	1
400	1
401	1
402	3.3
403	2.7
404	2.7
405	2.7
406	2.3
407	2.7
408	3.3
409	3.3
410	2.7
411	2.3
412	1.7
413	1.7
414	2.3
415	2
416	2
417	1
418	1
419	3.7
420	3.7
421	1
422	2.3
423	3
424	2.7
425	2.3
426	3
427	<b>2.969176471</b>
428	
429	<b>3</b>
430	
431	
432	
433	<b>A= 59</b>
434	
435	<b>A- = 60</b>

	O
1	Select Final Grade (GPA Style).
436	
437	<b>B+ = 69 (3.3)</b>
438	
439	<b>B= 74</b>
440	
441	<b>B-= 7</b>
442	
443	<b>C+ = 37</b>
444	
445	<b>C= 31</b>
446	
447	<b>C-= 15</b>
448	
449	<b>D= 21</b>

**Paper with a grade of D, all must be notified to take the one unit capstone, please. 8 people total.**

Aleali, Adel - X20126247 (Hopkins class)

Espinoza, Siana Ruby - X20114011 (Hopkins)

Gao, Brendan W - X20114915 (Hopkins)

Lee, Bo La - X20108307 (Ngo)

Ciaramello, Gianna (Arps-Bumbera)

Han, Cindy (Arps-Bumbera)

Abdulwahed, Abdullah (Saunders)

Kim, Yoon Sang (Light)

## **F grades**

Lee, Rachel (Samuel)

Asatoorian, Wyatt-Earp (Berg)

Hendren, Evan (Berg)

Lamotte, Benny: dropped but on list (Donohue)

Chang, Nayungkhumia (Ahn)

Lin, Matthew (Ahn)

## **Incomplete**

Li, Tammy (Saunders)

Yamamoto, Kristy (Hernandez-Romero)

# ENGL 107 / Signature Assignment Rubric

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Category	Exemplary (A)	Proficient (B)	Somewhat Proficient (C)	Needs Improvement (D)	Incomplete (F)	Score
<b>Context and Purpose for Communication (15 % of grade)</b>	Demonstrates clear understanding of context, audience, thesis/purpose which focus the elements of the work. The work demonstrates a good understanding of the rhetorical situation, and is responsive to the assigned task, demonstrating effective rhetorical choices.	Demonstrates mostly clear understanding of context, audience, thesis/purpose which focus the elements of the work. The work demonstrates an adequate understanding of the rhetorical situation, and is mostly responsive to the assigned task, demonstrating some effective rhetorical choices.	Demonstrates generally clear understanding of context, audience, thesis/purpose which focus some of the elements of the work though there may be some distractions. The work demonstrates a basic understanding of the rhetorical situation, and shows some responsiveness to the assigned task though some areas may lack explicit ties to the purpose.	Demonstrates minimal understanding of context, audience, thesis/purpose is unclear, and elements are unfocused. Demonstrates a minimal understanding of the rhetorical situation and task. Some parts appear unconnected and confusing. Shows little responsiveness to the assigned task.	Did not meet the minimum requirements.	__ / 15
<b>Content Development / Organization (20 % of grade)</b>	Uses appropriate, relevant, content, tone, and sources in a very organized way to demonstrate a good understanding of the subject with text and multimedia that consistently contributes to the purpose. Writer has used rhetorical possibilities the possible modes have to offer.	Uses mostly appropriate and relevant content, tone and sources in an organized way to demonstrate an understanding of the subject with text and multimedia that contributes to the purpose. Writer has used some appropriate rhetorical possibilities.	Uses some appropriate content, tone, and sources in a mostly organized way to show some understanding of the subject with text and multimedia. Writer explored some rhetorical possibilities, some successful, some not.	Uses mostly inappropriate content, tone, and sources and in a somewhat disorganized way to show some understanding of the subject. Writer unsuccessfully explored rhetorical possibilities.	Did not meet the minimum requirements.	__ / 20
<b>Critical Thinking (20% of grade)</b>	Issue/problem to be considered critically is clear. Ideas are taken from quality sources and there is good evaluation/ interpretation/ questioning of the ideas. Identifies assumptions and contexts. Addresses some multiple viewpoints with sound reasoning. Critical thinking can also be judged by how the writer chose and used each mode (text and multimedia) to support her/his position.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is generally clear with little ambiguity. Ideas are taken from quality sources and there is mostly good evaluation/ interpretation/ questioning of the ideas. Generally identifies assumptions and contexts. Goes beyond a single viewpoint with mostly sound reasoning. Critical thinking can also be judged by how the writer chose and used modes (text and multimedia) to support his/her position.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is somewhat clear, though with some ambiguity. Ideas are taken from quality sources and there is some interpretation/evaluation of the ideas, and some questioning. Identifies some assumptions and contexts and attempts to go beyond a single viewpoint although the reasoning may be basic. Critical thinking can also be seen in some of the basic mode choices (both text and multimedia) the writer used to support her/his position.	Issue/ problem to be considered is very ambiguous. Ideas are not always taken from quality sources and there is very little interpretation/evaluation or little questioning of the ideas. Does not identify assumptions and contexts. Does not go beyond a single viewpoint and the reasoning is often faulty. Critical thinking is not evident in the mode choices (text and multimedia) the writer made to support his/her position.	Did not meet the minimum requirements.	__ / 20
<b>Information Literacy (20% of grade)</b>	At least <b>ONE evaluative annotation</b> for a book or substantial article (preferably peer reviewed) found through the Otis Library databases.  Annotation must include: 1. <b>author credentials</b> 2. a description of the <b>type of source (audience)</b> 3. a discussion about purpose/bias/ <b>point of view</b>	At least <b>ONE evaluative annotation</b> for a book or substantial article (preferably peer reviewed) found through the Otis Library databases.  Annotation must include: 1. <b>author credentials</b> 2. a description of the <b>type of source (audience)</b> 3. an explanation about why the source is <b>relevant</b> to the	At least <b>ONE evaluative annotation</b> for a book or substantial article (preferably peer reviewed) found through the Otis Library databases.  Annotation must include: 1. <b>author credentials</b> 2. explanation about why the source is <b>relevant</b> to the project/paper  A works cited page is required and must include at least <b>2 QUALITY sources</b> that	<b>Any of the following:</b> • inferior or missing annotations • author credentials missing • relevance is missing • works cited page missing • fewer than 2 <b>QUALITY</b> sources • too many free web sources or low-quality, inadequate or inferior sources are used • sources not incorporated in paper	Did not meet the minimum requirements.	__ / 20

	<p>4. an explanation about why the source is <b>relevant</b> to the project/paper.</p> <p>A works cited page is required and must include at least <b>4 QUALITY sources</b> that are incorporated into paper/project found through the Otis Library databases.</p>	<p>project/paper.</p> <p>A works cited page is required and must include at least <b>3 QUALITY sources</b> that are incorporated into paper/project found through the Otis Library databases.</p>	<p>are incorporated into paper/project found through the Otis Library databases.</p>			
<b>Control of Syntax / Mechanics (10%)</b>	Using language (grammar, syntax, mechanics) with minimal errors, the work clearly communicates meaning to readers.	Using language (grammar, syntax, mechanics) that may have errors, the work clearly communicates meaning to readers.	Using language (grammar, syntax, mechanics) that may have errors, the work communicates meaning to readers.	Using language (grammar, syntax, mechanics) that has many errors, the work only somewhat communicates meaning to readers.	Did not meet minimum requirements.	__ / 10
<b>Design / Visual Literacy (15% of grade)</b>	Appropriate multimedia and textual choices, arrangement and emphasis (consistency, parallelism, typography, spacing, layout, use of color, etc.) match purpose and audience needs. Where used, efficient placement of text, media, headings, links, etc. work.	Mostly appropriate multimedia and textual choices, arrangement, and emphasis (consistency, parallelism, typography, spacing, layout, use of color, etc.) mostly match purpose and audience needs. Where used, good placement of text, multimedia headings, links, etc. work.	Some appropriate multimedia and textual choices and arrangement, (consistency, parallelism, typography, spacing, layout, use of color, etc.) match audience purpose and needs though they may be inconsistently used. Where used, placement of text, multimedia, headings, links mostly work.	Inappropriate multimedia and textual choices and arrangement that erratically match audience needs. Lacks appropriate placement of text, multimedia, headings, has broken links.	Did not meet the minimum requirements.	__ / 15

**Total Points:                    / 100**

**Comments:**

Category	A	B	C	D	F	%	Grade
<b>Written Communication</b>	Using language (grammar, syntax, mechanics) with <b>virtually no errors</b> , the work is <b>extremely well organized</b> and quite clearly communicates meaning while using <b>excellent, relevant, and compelling content</b> and sources to illustrate an excellent understanding of the subject. The work <b>expertly addresses the context</b> , audience, and purpose of the assignment.	Using language (grammar, syntax, mechanics) with <b>almost no errors</b> , the work is <b>very well organized</b> and very clearly communicates meaning while using <b>very good, relevant, and compelling content</b> and sources to illustrate good understanding of the subject. The work <b>very competently addresses the context</b> , audience, and purpose of the assignment.	Using language (grammar, syntax, mechanics) with <b>minimal errors</b> , the work is <b>well organized</b> and very clearly communicates meaning while using <b>appropriate, relevant, and compelling content</b> and sources to illustrate good understanding of the subject. The work <b>addresses the context</b> , audience, and purpose of the assignment.	Using language (grammar, syntax, mechanics) that <b>has many errors</b> , the work is <b>somewhat organized</b> and may somewhat communicate meaning or is unclear while generally <b>not using appropriate, relevant and compelling content</b> and sources to illustrate a general understanding of the subject. The work <b>does not always address the context</b> , audience and purpose of the assignment.	Using language (grammar, syntax, mechanics) that has <b>too many errors</b> , the work is <b>poorly organized</b> and does not communicate meaning. It is very unclear and generally <b>does not use appropriate, relevant and compelling content</b> and sources to illustrate a general understanding of the subject. The work <b>does not address the context</b> , audience and purpose of the assignment.	25%	
<b>Critical Thinking</b>	Issue/problem to be considered critically is <b>very comprehensive and very clear</b> . Ideas are taken from quality sources with <b>thorough interpretation/evaluation/questioning</b> of the ideas. <b>Very clearly identifies key assumptions</b> and contexts. <b>Very clearly addresses multiple viewpoints</b> . Very clearly distinguishes between most of own and others' contexts and assumptions. <b>Very clearly Integrates</b> own and others' points <b>with thoroughly sound reasoning</b> .	Issue/problem to be considered critically is <b>comprehensive and clear</b> . Ideas are taken from quality sources with <b>mostly thorough interpretation/evaluation/questioning</b> of the ideas. <b>Clearly identifies key assumptions</b> and contexts. <b>Clearly addresses multiple viewpoints</b> . Clearly distinguishes between most of own and others' contexts and assumptions. <b>Clearly integrates</b> own and others' points with <b>very sound reasoning</b> .	Issue/problem to be considered critically is <b>clear</b> . Ideas are taken from quality sources and there is <b>strong interpretation/evaluation/questioning</b> of the ideas. <b>Identifies key assumptions and contexts. Addresses multiple viewpoints</b> . Distinguishes between own and others' contexts and assumptions. <b>Integrates</b> own and others' points <b>with sound reasoning</b> .	Issue/problem to be considered critically is <b>somewhat clear</b> . Ideas are taken from quality sources with <b>some interpretation/evaluation/questioning</b> of the ideas. <b>Somewhat identifies key assumptions</b> and contexts. <b>Does not always address multiple viewpoints</b> or distinguish between some of own and others' contexts and assumptions. <b>Somewhat integrates</b> own and others' complex points with <b>mostly sound reasoning</b> .	Issue/problem to be considered critically is <b>not clearly stated</b> . Most ideas are not taken from quality sources and there is <b>little interpretation/evaluation/questioning</b> of the ideas. <b>Does not identify key assumptions and contexts. Does not address multiple viewpoints</b> or distinguish between some of own and others' contexts and assumptions. <b>Does not integrate</b> own and others' complex points with <b>somewhat sound reasoning</b> .	35%	
<b>Information Literacy</b>	Information literacy skills are demonstrated through at least THREE evaluative annotations for books or substantial articles (preferably peer reviewed) found through the Otis Library databases. Annotations must include: 1. author credentials 2. a description of the type of source (audience) 3. a discussion about purpose/bias/ point of view 4. a discussion of currency of source 5. an explanation about why the source is relevant to the project/paper. A works cited page is required and must include at least 6 QUALITY sources that are incorporated into paper/project.	Information literacy skills are demonstrated through at least THREE evaluative annotations for books or substantial articles (preferably peer reviewed) found through the Otis Library databases. Annotations must include: 1. author credentials 2. a description of the type of source (audience) 3. a discussion about purpose/bias/ point of view 4. a discussion of currency of source 5. an explanation about why the source is relevant to the project/paper. A works cited page is required and must include at least 5 QUALITY sources that are incorporated into paper/project.	Information literacy competency is demonstrated through at least THREE evaluative annotations for books or substantial articles (preferably peer reviewed) found through the Otis Library databases. Annotations must include: 1. author credentials 2. a description of the type of source (audience) 3. a discussion about purpose/bias/ point of view 4. an explanation about why the source is relevant to the project/paper. A works cited page is required and must include at least 4 QUALITY sources that are incorporated into paper/project.	Any of the following: - inferior or missing annotations - author credentials missing - type of source/audience missing - purpose/bias/point of view missing - relevance is missing - works cited page missing - fewer than 4 QUALITY sources - too many free web sources or low- quality, inadequate or inferior sources are used - sources not incorporated in paper	Any of the following: - inferior or no annotations - no works cited page - fewer than 3 QUALITY sources - only free web sources or low- quality, inadequate or inferior sources are used - sources not incorporated in paper  <b>A QUALITY source is not necessarily the first or easiest found. Should be peer-reviewed or substantial material that considers multiple points of view and relies on evidence, logic, and research to create a context. It has at least one named author and is up to date.</b>	20%	

<b>Visual Literacy</b>	Student uses visual imagery of any kind (i.e., charts, maps, texts, images, photographs, animations, graphs, videos) to skillfully represent and communicate key concepts, narratives and arguments. Visual imagery is strategically placed for effect and clarity. The organization of space, text (including headings), and appropriate visual imagery significantly enhances the content and appearance of the work. However, if there is rationale to not use imagery, then this is acceptable.	Student uses visual imagery of any kind (i.e., charts, maps, texts, images, photographs, animations, graphs, videos) to represent and communicate key concepts, narratives and arguments. The organization of space, text (including headings), and visual imagery generally helps the content of the paper. However, if there is rationale to not use imagery, then this is acceptable.	Student uses some visual imagery (i.e., charts, maps, texts, images, photographs, animations, graphs, videos) to represent and communicate some key concepts, narratives and arguments. There is some inconsistency in the organization of space, text (including headings), and appropriate visual imagery. However, if there is rationale to not use imagery, then this is acceptable.	Student used some visual imagery (i.e., charts, maps, texts, images, photographs, animations, graphs, videos) but the choices do not effectively represent and communicate key concepts, narratives and arguments. Imagery often seems to be an “add on”. There are serious inconsistencies in the organization of space, text (including headings), and appropriate visual imagery. However, if there is rationale to not use imagery, then this is acceptable.	No visual imagery of any kind was used and there was no rationale for that choice.	10%	
<b>Related Outcomes</b>	Compelling discussion in paper with a very clear explanation of the relationship or importance of the topic to the student. The discussion is very specifically related to the student in terms of their field, art, practice, identity, education, cultural perspective, or other concept related to the student’s journey as an artist/designer.	Good discussion in paper or with a clear explanation of the relationship or importance of the topic to the student. There is some discussion about how this issue is related to the student in terms of their field, art, practice, identity, education, cultural perspective, or other concept related to the student’s journey as an artist/designer.	In paper, there is a brief explanation or statement of the relationship or importance of the topic to the student. There are very general connections made regarding the subject matter in the paper and the perspectives or practice of the student.	Minimal connections made regarding the subject matter in the paper and the perspectives or practice of the student.	No connections made regarding the subject matter in the paper and the perspectives or practice of the student.	10%	