

Date Received _____

**Annual Assessment Report Form
Basic Writing Annual Report 2008-09
Common Rubric for Writing**

Directions: Please complete a form for each of the programs within your Division. Each box that is attached to each of the sections is designed to adjust to varying lengths.

1. Program Information:

Division	Humanities and Fine Arts
Program	Basic Skills: Writing Program
Academic Year	2008-09
Report Submitted by	David L. Coleman, Ph.D.
Phone/email	(808) 735-4826
Date Submitted	May 20, 2009

2. According to the Assessment Plan for this program, what were the planned assessment activities for this Assessment Cycle?

Outcomes assessed for this academic year	How was the assessment performed	Where are these results stored
GE.WR.1 GE.WR.2 GE.WR.3 GE.WR.4 GE.WR.5 GE.WR.6 GE.WR.7 GE.WR.8 EN.1	Writing Standards were assessed by faculty using standards-based rubrics developed in LiveText. They were applied to writing work, including the final research paper in EN 101 and 102 during the fall and spring semester. Data was integrated for this report in May 2009.	The original data is stored on LiveText and the report on the data is available in the Exhibition Area. The aggregated data spreadsheet and report has been uploaded there as well. Report and data are also stored on the Division Assessment site and the WASC site.

3. Results, conclusions, and discoveries. What are the results of the planned activities listed above? What conclusions or discoveries were made from these results?

Results, conclusions, and discoveries
Appendix Two shows the outcomes-linked aggregated data collected across a variety of writing assignments constructed to demonstrate the students competence throughout

the writing program, including the final research paper in EN 102.

Appendix Three shows the outcomes-linked aggregated data collected from EN 101 course throughout the year.

Appendix Four shows the outcomes-linked aggregated data collected from EN 102 on the final research paper.

Statistical note: Excellent cases scored 5 points each; acceptable cases scored 3 points each; and unacceptable cases scored zero points. The sought-for level of successful demonstration is a mean of 3.00 or 85%.

Overall, students in this review showed **mastery** of WR1 (demonstrate paragraph and essay development in a written text: 4.174; 91.59% excellent or acceptable) and WR2 (show organizational development in a written text: 4.099; 91.36% excellent or acceptable); **above average achievement** on WR3 (competencies to edit a text with grammar, punctuation, word choice, mechanics, and sentence structure errors: 3.987; 86.78% excellent or acceptable), WR4 (competencies to identify an audience and articulate an argument specific to that audience: 3.962; 85.90% excellent or acceptable), WR5 (identify and apply rhetorical writing techniques: 3.962; 85.90% excellent or acceptable); **acceptable performance** in WR7 (research, draft, revise, and edit a research paper: 3.713; 82.00% excellent or acceptable), EN1 (demonstrate proficiency in writing through an analytical literary research paper: 3.707; 82.04% excellent or acceptable); and **less than acceptable performance** in WR6 (evaluate and synthesize research information: 3.253; 70.71% excellent or acceptable) and WR8 (demonstrate the correct use of MLA documentation: 2.857; 64.93% excellent or acceptable.)

The data from the EN 101 courses shows **relative mastery** of WR1 (4.468; 95.17%), WR2 (4.435; 95.16%), and WR3 (4.355; 93.55%). “Relative” because of the writing assignments assessed were self-contained shorter paragraphs and essays. Above **average achievement** was demonstrated in WR4 (3.923; 84.61%) and WR5 (3.923; 84.61%).

The data from EN 102 research papers shows **mastery** in WR 1 (4.110; 91.81%). It shows **above average results** in WR2 (3.983; 90.06%), WR4 (3.969; 85.15%), and WR5 (3.969; 85.15%). **Acceptable results** were demonstrated in WR3 (3.758; 83.01%), WR7 (3.678; 81.50%), and EN1 (3.671; 81.56%). **Unacceptable performance** was demonstrated on standards (outcomes) WR6 (evaluate and synthesize research information: 3.253; 70.71) and WR8 (demonstrate the correct use of MLA documentation: 2.857; 58.46%).

The process of gathering the aggregate program data, which required manual aggregation of the LiveText data as professors used their own adaptation of the common rubric criteria, demonstrated the need for a discipline developed rubric assigned values in the same way. The evaluation criteria was consistent, but each professor used a different numbering system which had to be converted in order to aggregate the data. This is being corrected for the Fall 2009/Spring 2010 assessment

cycle.

The results themselves suggest that the curriculum is doing well facilitating the desired learning for students and developing more complex skills among the students, leading to the goal of a successful literary research paper. The close correlation and relatively high level of success demonstrated between the General Education WR7 data and the English discipline EN1 outcomes shows the Writing Program is successful in achieving its primary outcome of the literary research paper that can be applied across the university curriculum in the students' chosen majors.

The weakness demonstrated by students in evaluating and synthesizing research information and difficulties encountered in actually applying MLA style to the research project suggest that a modification to the curriculum is needed. Initial discussions have suggested moving the introduction to these skills to EN 101 and applying them in shorter essay formats. This would give the students added time and practice in the skills. This will be discussed, piloted and re-assessed in 2009-10.

The use of the common rubric for the EN 102 papers is in its fourth semester. The faculty will come together this summer and go through an inter-rater reliability exercise and discussion of methods/techniques for applying the rubric in actual blind grading of selected papers with varying levels of achievement. This may lead to modifications in the rubric to be piloted in Fall 2009, assessed, and then implemented in Spring 2010. The discipline faculty will run training workshops for the AEOP adjuncts in Spring 2010 prior to implementation of rubric in the Spring Evening session that begins in April 2010. Evening faculty have already been participating in the EN102 common final. That data will also be reviewed and the common final (now in its sixth semester of use will be modified as several of the questions no longer apply and some questions will be modified because the data suggests the questions are either too obvious or misleading. Data from the common final is posted separate from this report.

4. Use of Results. Did the results lead to program changes? If so, describe the changes made. If not, describe why changes were not needed.

Changes are being articulated for piloting in Fall 2009 on the integrating MLA style information and research evaluation and synthesis into the EN 101 courses based on the

data available.

Based on the data gathered, the common final will be modified this summer and piloted in Fall 2009 with full implementation in the spring. AEOP adjuncts will be trained on the application of the common rubric for the EN 102 paper and data collected in Spring Evening 2010.

Signature assignments for EN 101 and EN 102 based on common rubrics will be developed during summer 2009 and applied via LiveText in Fall 2009. Use of LiveText will reach 90% in Fall 2009 in the Writing Program. Because of fee limitations, some adaptation of the assessment process, requiring manual entering of data into LiveText and discipline databases will be done as the assessment process is extended to the evening sessions.

5. Dissemination of results, conclusions, and discoveries. How and with whom were the results shared?

This report has been shared with the University community through the WASC website, with the fulltime faculty and day adjuncts, and will be shared with the rest of the division as part of the divisional assessment report in Fall 2009.