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Executive Summary:

The English Department and the Assessment Office conducted a pilot study of the FW writing process outcome—SLO #2: *Students will be able to provide evidence of strategies for generating, revising, editing, and proofreading a text in order to produce finished prose.* The goals of the project were as follows: a) test the rubric, b) determine the type of evidence that needs to be collected, and c) establish a baseline standard for SLO #2.

The assessment team collected student work from eight FW sections in spring 2011 and a faculty team evaluated the student work (from 24 students) using a rubric. The student work included prewriting, drafts, and final versions from a single writing assignment. The rubric was drafted by the English Department Assessment Committee and revised during a spring 2012 English Department faculty meeting.

Results

a) The rubric worked well; several modifications were suggested to align the rubric with the revised SLO.

b) The student work that was submitted was adequate. Better labeling of the pieces (e.g., “draft 1,” “final version”) will aid future assessments.

c) The results can be used as a baseline:
   - 67% of the students provided sufficient evidence of idea generating,
   - 63% provided evidence of revising, and
   - 71% provided evidence of editing and proofreading.
OUTCOME ASSESSED:

SLO #2: Students will be able to provide evidence of strategies for generating, revising, editing, and proofreading a text in order to produce finished prose.

1. Assessment Question(s) and/or Goal(s) of Assessment Activity
   What did the program want to find out?
   
a) Does the rubric provide useful information?
b) What evidence needs to be collected to investigate student achievement on this outcome?
c) How well are students achieving the outcome? To what extent do students provide written evidence of generating, revising, editing and proofreading.

2. Method(s) to Gather Evidence
   The English Department Assessment Coordinator recruited 10 instructors teaching a spring 2011 FW section. She asked them to submit students’ prewriting, drafts, and final versions for the purpose of program assessment. The Assessment Office randomly selected three students from each of their FW sections. Eight instructors (3 professors, 4 lecturers, and 1 teaching assistant) of the ten recruited submitted student work (total of 24 sets of student work) and their assignment guidelines via email or drop-off at the department office. The Assessment Office redacted the student work and assigned each student a number.

3. Method to Evaluate
   Rubric. An initial rubric was created by the English Department Assessment Committee, which was revised after the SLO was modified during a department meeting in April 2012. (Appendix A contains the rubric; Appendix B contains the meeting notes and SLO modification.)

   Scoring session. The Assessment Office faculty specialist facilitated the scoring session in spring 2012. The faculty scoring team (including lecturers and a graduate teaching assistant) practiced scoring and discussed two sets of student work before scoring independently. Two scorers independently scored each set of student work. When the scorers disagreed, a third person scored and the outlier was discarded.

4. Program Size & Sampling Technique
   Program size=1,600 students annually complete the FW course
   Sample size=24 sets of student texts (3% of FW-enrolled students in spring 2011)
   Sampling = faculty members were recruited and volunteered; students from each of their sections were randomly selected

5. Criteria for Success
   No criteria for success were established prior to this pilot study.
6. **Results**

   a) The rubric does provide useful information regarding the SLO; the scorers suggested several modifications (see below).
   
   b) The evidence submitted for this study was adequate; the scorers suggested better labeling for future assessments of SLO #2 (see below).
   
   c) Student achievement on the outcome:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Students (N=24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   See also Appendix C.

7. **Met/Not met (the criteria for success)**

   This pilot study has helped set a baseline for future studies of SLO #2.

8. **Conclusions and Discoveries**

   a) **Labeling submissions is needed.** Students and instructors submitted materials without clearly labeling each item which caused confusion and slowed the scoring process. Labels such as “prewriting,” “draft 1,” and “final version” should be required.
   
   b) **Rubric revisions were needed** and made during the scoring session. Aspects of the rubric were inconsistent with the revised SLO. References to the quality of the revision and editing were removed. See suggested revisions below.
   
   c) **Evidence of editing and proofreading:** in cases where sentence-level clarity was high, the faculty scoring team agreed to score editing and proofreading as “Yes” even if no written evidence existed such as proofreading marks. The rationale is that the student must have edited and proofread during the writing process in order to produce clear prose.
   
   d) The faculty scoring team agreed that everyone teaching FW courses should be able to require students to produce evidence of generating, revising, editing, and proofreading for at least one assignment. Additional evidence such as a “tracked changes” version was not needed; asking for students’ prewriting, draft, and final version provided enough information on which to score.
   
   e) Some faculty scorers felt that the revising dimension on the rubric was the most important of the three dimensions.

9. **Distribution and Discussion of Results**

   a) *Who distributed the results and who received results?*
   
   b) *How did the distribution take place?*
   
   c) *How and when did the discussion of the results take place?*

   The Assessment Office compiled and distributed the results to the English Dept. Assessment Committee and Curriculum Committee.
10. **Use of Results/Program Modifications**

The English Department Assessment Committee and Curriculum Committee will discuss what was learned from the pilot project and how the results can be used to improve the FW program and improve assessment procedures.

11. **Assessment Modifications**

   a) Label and clarify submission elements: the items submitted were not labeled “prewriting,” “first draft,” “final version,” etc., which slowed scoring and caused confusion amongst the scorers.

   b) Rubric modifications: remove references to quality because the modified outcome states that students will provide evidence of a writing process.

Suggested revisions to the rubric (additions underlined; deletions strikethrough)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>Sufficient Evidence Of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generating a draft</strong></td>
<td>Prewriting <em>such as</em> clusters, outlines, freewriting, very rough draft, or any method taught by the instructor or accepted by the instructor as prewriting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revising a draft</strong></td>
<td>Global modifications; <em>changes to improve or enhance clarity of</em> purpose or thesis/thesis statement; <em>revising to improve</em> changes to paragraph cohesion (e.g., <em>addition of transition statements</em>); <em>addition/deletion of evidence and ideas</em>; <em>re-ordering the sequence of ideas</em>; style integration; may include student producing very different draft/paper/thesis, as long as the <em>new draft stays on is on the same-topic</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Editing and proofreading</strong></td>
<td>Sentence-level changes <em>to improve or enhance clarity</em>. Note: Scored as “Yes, sufficient” if the final level of sentence-level quality is high, which suggests editing and proofreading had taken place during the writing process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. **Other Important Information**

    None at this time.
APPENDIX A: RUBRIC

Foundations Written Communication
Initial Rubric
May 2012

Student Learning Outcome #2: Students will be able to provide evidence of strategies for generating, revising, editing, and proofreading a text in order to produce finished prose.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>Sufficient Evidence Of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generating a draft</td>
<td>Prewriting: clusters, outlines, freewriting, very rough draft, or any method taught by the instructor or accepted by the instructor as prewriting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revising a draft</td>
<td>Global modifications; improves or enhances clarity of purpose or thesis/thesis statement; revising to improve paragraph cohesion; style integration; may include student producing very different draft/paper/thesis, as long as the draft stays on topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing</td>
<td>Sentence-level changes to improve or enhance clarity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Foundations Written Communication SLO #2
REvised RUBRIC
5/14/2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>Sufficient Evidence Of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generating a draft</td>
<td>Prewriting such as clusters, outlines, freewriting, very rough draft, or any method taught by the instructor or accepted by the instructor as prewriting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revising a draft</td>
<td>Global modifications; changes to purpose or thesis/thesis statement; changes to paragraph cohesion (e.g., addition of transition statements); addition/deletion of evidence and ideas; re-ordering the sequence of ideas; style integration; may include student producing very different draft/paper/thesis, as long as the new draft is on the same-topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing and proofreading</td>
<td>Sentence-level changes. Note: Scored as “Yes, sufficient” if the final level of sentence-level quality is high, which suggests editing and proofreading had taken place during the writing process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: DEPARTMENT MEETING NOTES

Dept. of English
Foundations Written Communication SLO #2
Meeting Notes
4/12/2012

Summary
The faculty looked at student work that showed writing process (collected during spring 2011). The faculty at the meeting confirmed the importance of SLO #2. They suggested deleting the word “effective” from SLO #2. They suggested simplifying the draft rubric to include two levels of quality.

REVISED SLO #2
SLO: provide evidence of effective strategies for generating, revising, editing, and proofreading a text in order to produce finished prose.

IDEAS/ISSUES DISCUSSED

- To determine effective revision, need to compare drafts word for word
- Much depends on the comments of the teacher that are aimed to spur a particular type of revision, proofreading, etc.
- Who are the comments on these drafts from? Cannot tell from what’s submitted but maybe can guess
- Generating is YES/NO. Exists or does not exist.
- Why is generating part of the SLO? [Response: it’s part of writing process]. “Generating” seems redundant
- Imposing one invention process on students is not appropriate; introduce students to multiple methods; let students undertake their own invention process
- Much feedback is not visible: e.g., conferences, etc.
- Students know the writing process/revision strategies but some do not do it because it’s time consuming
- It’s not worth the effort to see if a writing process took place
- Revision is the most important; don’t need to see editing or proofreading
- If evaluating this is too mechanical, get rid of the outcome
- Students can ignore professor feedback and so it can be difficult to see if progress is made during the revision process
- What’s the goal of this outcome? To show that writing process is good for students or that the professor incorporates writing process as part of the course?
  - It’s not “student learning activity”, it’s “student learning outcome”
- What kind of authentic writing experience is this if we ask for a specific writing process? Rarely do other profs ask for the process.
- Giving students tools for effective revision, getting feedback, etc., should be done in ENG 100 and should be an outcome
- Seeing the writing process helps professor understand “where” the paper came from; gives the professor knowledge that student ownership of the language exists and that student CAN write a good paper
  - Addresses plagiarism issue and demonstrates that SLO 1 & 3 were accomplished by the student
  - Addresses the ownership issue
  - Measures whether the work belongs to the student in an authentic way
  - It’s important for the instructor to see the paper trail
- Recurring issue for the department: ENG 100 is a “grab bag” – no consistent assignments, pedagogy, across sections and this makes assessment difficult
  - Need something more universal across sections/varied methods
• Is there a way to see if students are incorporating feedback? Some can use a course management software. Some profs remember what feedback they gave students.
• Require students to use software to track changes because that would make changes visible
  o Would not want to require students to do this
  o What if student starts over from scratch (i.e., no changes would appear)
• Is it too difficult to track the changes made?
  o Would professors require students to use track changes?
  o Portfolios could work for a course or for one paper
• Asks students to explain their changes: what was done and why
• “Effective” is nearly impossible to judge and so remove it from the SLO
• Use a yes/no checklist or determine quality of revision/process?
• Student motivation has an effect on how well and to what extent feedback is used
• This SLO should be considered in the context of the other two SLOs
• Bottom line: did anything learned in ENG 100 transfer to later situations or did students use what they learned in later courses?
• Looking at the writing process via student work, the department would see if there was a problem with course design overall
  o This was the result of the first assessment projects the department did: assignment design was poor, that appeared to lead to poor student performance, and that led to changes in how the course was taught

What should be on a rubric?

• Modify the rubric so there are two levels of quality: Exists and Does Not Exist; Meets SLO and Does Not Meet SLO; Inadequate and Adequate

RUBRIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>Insufficient Evidence Of</th>
<th>Sufficient Evidence Of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generating draft</td>
<td>Prewriting: clusters, outlines, freewriting, very rough draft, or any method taught by the instructor or accepted by the instructor as prewriting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revising draft</td>
<td>Global modifications; improves or enhances clarity of purpose or thesis/thesis statement; revising to improve paragraph cohesion; style integration; may include student producing very different draft/paper/thesis, as long as the draft stays on topic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing</td>
<td>Sentence-level changes to improve or enhance clarity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Draft is a text that is read and commented on by instructor and/or peer reviewer

Respectfully submitted by Monica Stitt-Bergh, Assessment Office
APPENDIX C: RESULTS

Foundations Written Communication
Pilot Study Results SLO 2
May 2012

SLO 2: Students will be able to provide evidence of strategies for generating, revising, editing, and proofreading a text in order to produce finished prose.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent of Students who Provided Sufficient Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generating</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revising</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing/Proofreading</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=24

**Generating**: evidence of prewriting such as clusters, outlines, freewriting, very rough draft, etc.

**Revising**: evidence of global modifications such as changes to the thesis statement, paragraph cohesion, style integration, organization, evidence/explanation; may include student producing a very different paper provided that the new paper is on the same topic

**Editing and proofreading**: evidence of sentence-level changes (note: deemed sufficient if the final draft had sentence-level quality that suggested editing and proofreading had taken place during the writing process)