

Millikin University
Report on Student Learning in IN150 and IN151
(Critical Writing, Reading and Research I and II)
Academic Year 2016-2017
Dr. Carmella Braniger, IN150/151 Coordinator
July 1, 2017

Executive Summary

Critical Writing, Reading, and Research (CWRR) I and II—also designated as IN150 and IN151 respectively—are part of the sequential requirements in the Millikin Program of Student Learning (MPSL). Housed in our University Studies’ interdepartmental sequential curriculum required of all students—including traditional, enhanced, honors, and accelerated—IN 150 and 151 are vital to Millikin’s ongoing Writing-Across-the-Curriculum initiative (i.e. IN 250, 251, and 350) and also support university-wide learning goals. Specifically, our four learning goals—critical reading, writing, research, and reflection—mirror Millikin University’s ongoing goal of fostering students’ ability to critically think and read in an effort to conduct ongoing inquiry.

To best assess how the CWRR program helps students meet the four learning goals outlined above, we use authentic artifact assessment of student-produced writing. Specifically, all CWRR students are required to submit three different pieces of writing for programmatic assessment: a reflection (collected in IN150), a reading response (collected in IN151), and a research essay (also collected in IN151). Because we believe in instructor autonomy, we do not have a standardized assignment sheet for each artifact, but, rather, we ask that instructors adhere to our learning goals and incorporate these goals into their classes and writing projects. An assessment team, put together by the IN150/151 coordinator, goes through a rigorous norming session (lead by the IN150/151 coordinator) and then, using a rubric designed specifically for each artifact, assesses a percentage of the artifacts submitted (usually 10% each of submitted reflections, reading responses, and research essays).

The 2016–2017 assessment of the CWRR program reveals that our students can use more help with all artifacts. Assessment of the three student artifacts clearly indicates that students are performing at adequate and excellent levels, as **two of the three artifacts were scored adequate and the third scored excellent**. Two of the three artifacts were within 0.5 points of being scored excellent. There will be more data and a detailed analysis on these artifacts in Section 3.

This document contains the following sections:

1. An overview of the CWRR program and how the collected artifacts are used to assess our learning goals
2. An overview of the 2016–2017 CWRR program, paying particular attention to staffing, class sizes, classrooms, and initiatives undertaken during the academic year
3. Assessment data of the three artifacts collected and analysis of that data
4. Suggestions for 2017–2018
5. Appendices—Rubrics

Section 1: Overview of CWRR

The learning outcome goals for the two-course sequence of IN150 and IN151 are as follows:

1. Read critically to comprehend, analyze and evaluate texts
2. Write polished, informed essays for personal, public and/or specialized audiences
3. Conduct research to participate in academic inquiry
4. Reflect on engagements with critical reading, writing and research to acquire, examine and present self-awareness about those engagements.

The following table describes how our learning goals are assessed through our data collection process (described above in the Executive Summary).

Table 1: Learning Goals/Artifacts

Data	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3	Goal 4
Reading Response	X	X		
Research Essay	X	X	X	
Reflection		X		X

What is unique to Millikin University's first-year writing sequence is that every student is required to take BOTH courses; there is no testing out of IN150 or IN151. In IN150, students broadly explore academic inquiry through formal and informal essay writing. Naturally, there is an emphasis on the relationship between critical reading and writing, but how that relationship is taught varies widely from instructor to instructor. In IN151, students continue their intellectual inquiry and growth by investigating and researching a topic of their choice. Both classes emphasize skills we deem to be imperative for academic and professional success (as shown in Table 2). We believe our focus on reading, writing, research, and reflection is applicable across disciplines.

Table 2: Curriculum Map

	Goal #1	Goal #2	Goal #3	Goal #4
CWRR I	X	X	X	X
CWRR II	X	X	X	X

The CWRR learning outcomes also help deliver the university-wide goals, articulated below:

1. Professional success
2. Democratic citizenship in a global environment
3. A personal life of meaning and value.

The program contributes primarily to *professional success preparation* and the *development of a personal life of meaning and value*. Specifically, CWRR's first, second, and third learning goals (see above) help prepare students for *professional success* by introducing students to:

- Academic inquiry (supplanted by information literacy instruction)
- The ability to identify with and write for a specialized, public audience
- The ability to carefully and thoughtfully read and analyze a variety of text types.

Asking students to reflect on the uses of reading and writing (the fourth goal) prepares students for a life of *personal meaning and value*. While there are opportunities for IN150 and IN151 to contribute to the development of democratic citizenship in a global environment, it is not a main focus of the program.

The four learning outcomes of the CWRR program also help deliver the following MPSL student learning outcome goals:

1. Learn to access, read deliberately, critically evaluate, reflect on, integrate, and use appropriate resources for research and practical application
2. Utilize qualitative inquiry as tools in decision making and creative problem solving
3. Demonstrate general technological literacy
4. Develop an understanding of themselves and the ability to reflect on and express their thoughts and feelings responsibly.

Additionally, the CWRR program works to introduce students to Millikin’s adherence to the theory into practice model (often referred to as “Performance Based Learning”) by asking students to put the writing/reading theories discussed in class into practice (in the form of essay writing). Moreover, we are actively looking to offer students the opportunity to write for “real” audiences. For example, we continually offer “Performance Based Learning” opportunities in the form of the Millikin Premier Writers contest and through the annual Celebration of Scholarship.

Section 2: Overview of 2016–2017 CWRR

This “snapshot” aims to show the number of courses offered per semester, the types of courses offered per semester, an understanding of who is teaching our courses, class sizes, facilities used, partnerships external to the program, and initiatives undertaken by the program during 2016–2017.

Class Size

Table 3: Fall 2016 Overview

Type of Course	Students Enrolled	Number of Sections	Average Class Size
Traditional/Accelerated 150	322	17	19
“Enhanced” 150	37	4	9.25
Honors 150	85	5	17
Traditional/Accelerated (Off-Semester) 151	65	4	16.25
Total	509	30	17

Table 4: Spring 2017 Overview

Type of Course	Students Enrolled	Number of Sections	Average Class Size
Traditional/Accelerated (Off-Semester) 150	38	3	12.7
Traditional/Accelerated 151	304	16	19
Honors 151	78	5	15.6
Total	420	24	17.5

Table 5: Trends in Class Sizes

	2016– 2017	2015– 2016	2014– 2015	2013– 2014	2012– 2013	2011– 2012	2010– 2011	2009– 2010	2008– 2009	2007– 2008	2006– 2007
Average Class Size	17.2	14.4	17.3	18.3	17.7	19.5	Data Missing	19	18.58	18.07	18.6

Class Size: Data Analysis

According to a special committee formed by the Conference on College Composition and Communication (4Cs)—a subsidiary of the National Council of Teachers of English and one of the major governing bodies for first-year writing policies—traditional first-year writing classes should not exceed 20 students. Basic, or remedial, writing courses, should not exceed 15 students. This position statement, entitled “Principles for the Postsecondary Teaching of Writing,” was originally crafted in 1989, but was actually revised at the 2015 Conference on College Composition and Communication (held in Tampa, FL). It is of note, perhaps, that the Association of Departments of English (ADE) has adopted 4Cs guidelines and thus asserts that maintaining these class sizes should be part of a writing program’s mission. Given Millikin’s mandate to provide first-rate education for its students, it is imperative that the first-year writing program—including both IN150 and IN151—closely follows the guidelines put forth by 4Cs and not have any writing courses exceed 20 students. Additionally, “Enhanced” or off-semester sections (akin to remedial writing courses) should not exceed 15 students.

The data collected on course sizes for 2016–2017 reveals that the writing program did an exemplary job of holding class sizes down in both IN150 and IN151, while also ensuring that the courses were not under-enrolled, which helps with the budget. In fact, Table 5 reveals the consistent work we do in holding class sizes down in IN150 and IN151.

Suggestions to Continue to Keep Class Sizes Down for 2017–2018

- Following Registration days, the first-year writing coordinator will check class sizes on a weekly basis in an effort to keep a firm cap of 20 students for Traditional sections of 150 and 151, 18 students for Honors sections of 150 and 151, and 15 for “Enhanced” and off-semester sections of 150 & 151.
- To that end, the first-year writing coordinator will stay in close contact with the English Department chair, the Dean overseeing University Studies, and the Registrar to ensure that course caps are enforced. The first-year writing coordinator will attempt to open new sections of IN150 or IN150 (E) if enrollment exceeds projections.
- Similarly, though, if enrollment falls short of projections, the first-year writing

effort to not waste university resources, while still maintaining the mandated course caps.

- The first-year writing coordinator will aim to increase the number of “E” sections offered. In past years, only two sections of IN 150 “E” were available. In 2016–2017, three “E” sections were offered. For 2017–2018, four sections are scheduled, and the first-year writing coordinator identified several “bubble” courses for “E” and “Honors,” in case the need for additional placement in those sections exceeds the number of courses currently designated as such.

Faculty and Facilities

Table 6: Breakdown of Faculty and Facilities Fall 2016

Faculty Name	Faculty Type (Full or Part Time)	Type of Course Taught	Rooms Taught In
Bates, Julie	FT	Enhanced 150 (2)	SH 412, 407
Braniger, Carmella	FT	Honors 150 (1)	SCO 005, 213
Brown, Jason	PT	Traditional 150 (3)	SH 303, 309
Childers, Jeremiah	PT	Traditional 150 (2)	SH 302, 311
Crowe, Judi	FT	Traditional 150 (2) Honors 150 (1)	SH 311
Douglas, Philip	PT	Traditional 150 (2)	LTSC 422, SH 409
Frech, Stephen	FT	None	None
Garner, Cliff	PT	Traditional 150 (2)	SH 318,
Hollis-George, Michael	FT	Enhanced 150 (1)	SH 412
Lambert, Scott	FT	Traditional 150 (2) Traditional 151 (2)	GRIS 227, SH 412, SCO 005
Magana, Tony	FT	Honors 150 (1)	SCO 309
Matthews, Anne	FT	None–London	
O’Conner, Michael	FT	Honors 150 (2)	SCO 213, 309
Patricio, Danielle	PT	Traditional 150 (1) Traditional 151 (2)	SH 319
Tanta, Gene	PT	Traditional 150 (1)	LTSC 302, LTSC 208
Zorn, Bill	PT	Traditional 150 (2)	SH 311,

Table 7: Breakdown of Faculty and Facilities Spring 2017

Faculty Name	Faculty Type (Full or Part Time)	Type of Course Taught	Rooms Taught In
Bates, Julie	FT	Traditional 151 (2)	SH 318, 422
Braniger, Carmella	FT	Traditional 150 (2)	SCO 005
Childers, Jeremiah	PT	Traditional 151 (1)	SCO 313
Crowe, Judi	FT	Honors 151 (2)	SCO 309, 211, 313 K 128
Douglas, Phillip	PT	Traditional (2)	SH 303, 312
Frech, Stephen	FT	None	
Hollis-George, Michael	FT	Honors 151 (1)	SH 308
Lambert, Scott	FT	Traditional 151 (1)	SH 311
Magana, Tony	FT	Traditional 151 (2)	SH 412
Matthews, Anne	FT	Traditional 151 (2)	SH 310
O'Conner, Michael	FT	Honors 151 (2)	SH 323
Patricio, Danielle	PT	Traditional 151	SH310, 412
Tanta, Gene	PT	Traditional 151 Traditional 150	SH 316, Online (150)
Zorn, Bill	PT	Traditional 151 (3)	SH 308

Table 8: Trends in Staff

Faculty Type	SP 17	FA 16	SP 16	FA 15	SP 15	FA 14	SP 14	FA 13	SP 13	FA 12	SP 12	FA 11	FA 10, SP 11	SP 10	FA 09	SP 09	FA 08	SP 08	FA 07	SP 07	FA 06
Full-Time faculty	8	7	10	11	11	10	10	11	11	11	10	11	DM	12	12	11	11	11	11	11	12
Part-Time Adjunct Faculty	5	6	2	5	5	6	5	4	5	6	5	6	DM	5	4	2	3	2	2	2	2
Total	13	13	12	16	16	16	15	15	16	17	15	17	DM	17	16	13	14	13	13	13	14

Faculty and Facilities: Analysis

Millikin University commits to having its full-time faculty teach first-year writing courses. This, however, is not to trivialize the significant contributions part-time instructors make to our first-year writing program. However, past program reports have asserted that an ongoing goal is to ensure full-time faculty teach first-year writing; we have continued to do this in 2016–2017.

It should be noted that:

- Dr. Mike Cook took another position late last year, and we were not able to replace him with a full-time faculty member for 2016–2017. We have hired someone for his position for next year and will be back to 10 full-time faculty members in the department.
- Dr. Stephen Frech was needed to teach courses in Fall 2016 taught by departing faculty Dr. Cook. And after working to obtain a course release for future English Department chairs,

- Dr. Anne Matthews taught abroad in London Fall 2016 and was not able to teach CWRR that semester.
- All other full-time English department faculty taught at least one course of CWRR each semester, and most taught two.

Moving forward, it remains important to a) keep supporting full-time faculty instructors in our first-year writing program and b) respect and value the contributions made by part-time instructors. To that end, it is imperative that we keep the first-year writing course load manageable: no more than two FYC courses per semester for tenured/tenure-track faculty and no more than three FYC courses per semester for non-tenured/non-tenure-track faculty. This will allow our faculty to invest the proper amount of time for meeting with students, assessing student work, and prepping lessons for the course itself.

It should be noted that the first-year writing coordinator has implemented the following faculty development:

- Observations. The first-year writing coordinator observes all new faculty and provides feedback; upon request, the first-year writing coordinator will also observe any returning faculty and provides feedback.
- Mentorship. The English Department/English Department chair assigns each faculty member a mentor/partner to share ideas with.
- Syllabi review. This is required of all new faculty.
- Regular meetings. Led by the first-year writing coordinator, the meetings cover a range of faculty development topics.

In 2016–2017, CWRR courses were taught in the following locations: Shilling Hall, Kirkland Fine Arts Center, and ADM-Scovill Hall. Staley Library was unavailable this year as it was under construction. Following the trend in past years, the majority of the sections were taught in Shilling Hall and ADM-Scovill. Most CWRR faculty request facilities equipped with educational technology stations, and many ask for a computer lab. We believe that teaching writing using technology is imperative to student success in the 21st century—a belief that mirrors many in first-year writing. According to the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) “Position Statement on Teaching, Learning, and Assessing Writing in Digital Environments,” “[I]ncreasingly, classes and programs in writing require that students compose digitally.” The CWRR Program continues to move in the direction of these priorities and seeks an increasing number of facilities for teaching CWRR courses in electronic lab classrooms. To that end, we continue to offer Electronic Learning Community sections of CWRR. These courses, which require all students enrolled to bring a fully charged laptop to every class, reduce some of the strain on CWRR faculty requesting a limited number of computer labs for class. In Fall 2016, seven sections of Wireless Environment (WE) sections were offered, mostly to the Honors sections. In Spring 2016, we offered only 4 sections to Honors sections.

Suggestions for Faculty and Facilities 2017–2018

- Support all faculty teaching first-year writing by increasing the number of *workshops* offered during the semester. These workshops will not mandate assignments or lesson plans, but will rather serve to offer ideas for new projects to all the faculty teaching first-year writing. Thus, the first-year writing coordinator may ask full-time and/or part-time faculty to lead or co-lead a workshop at some point during the Fall or Spring semesters.
- Continue to encourage faculty to submit documents to the “repository” started on

- Collect syllabi from all first-year writing faculty to ensure learning goals are met.
- Since all incoming first-year students are now required to come to campus with laptops, we can continue to encourage “WE” sections to reduce the number of computer lab requests. This requires working with the IT Committee to ensure that Millikin has enough wireless access points. Similarly, we will continue to try and secure computer labs for non-WE sections, especially for off semester and enhanced sections, which often enroll at risk students who may not always be able to afford a laptop on the first day of class.

Honors and Enhanced Updates and Suggestions

Although the majority of Millikin students who take IN150/IN151 are enrolled in traditional/accelerated sections, a number of students enroll in either “Honors” or “Enhanced” sections of IN150/IN151. This subsection provides updates and suggestions specific to these courses.

This year, the Honors program decided to change the prefix of Honors sections of CWRR to HN instead of IN. The reason for this change had to do with clarity in enrolling the correct students in the right courses. However, this designation change causes problems on several levels. It makes it more difficult for the CWRR Coordinator to monitor and ensure proper enrollment in all CWRR courses, as these courses now appear under a different designation in Banner. It will also make it more difficult to collate data on these courses, when writing the annual assessment reports. Changing the designation also spreads the workload of English Faculty out over three different departments now: English, University Studies, and Honors, making it more difficult to assess the English department faculty contributions and load. Because of these problems, the CWRR Coordinator did not support the change made by the Honors Program.

Honors suggestions for 2017–2018:

- The change in designation did not come along with changes in goals or curriculum. While the CWRR Coordinator would argue that the goals remain the same across ALL sections of CWRR, the Coordinator also encourages Honors Program Director and Faculty to reconsider the ways in which they deliver these goals to students. Honors students already have a different curriculum requirement in IN151, as they are required to present their final research essay in the Spring semester at Celebrations of Scholarship. This is called the Freshman Focus project. However, students increasingly are not prepared for such a presentation after only a few months of studying their subject matter. At the English Department retreat in August 2017, the CWRR Coordinator will suggest that English/Honors faculty revisit the way they structure the curriculum of HN150/HN151 to better prepare students for the responsibility of publically presenting their work each Spring. Students would be better served if they were able to launch their projects in the Fall semester and would have more time to present complete and presentable projects in the Spring, projects of which they would feel proud and which would have required a much more considerable investment of their time.
- Work with Honors Director to put back into place a review and selection process for faculty teaching Honors CWRR.

In 2016–2017, we offered three sections of “Enhanced” 150, an increase of one course from 2015–2016. Students in the “Enhanced” sections benefit from smaller class sizes and increased attention from their professors in order to assist them in developing their critical reading, writing, and research skills so they are prepared for the academic writing they will be expected to do during their time at Millikin. Students in “E” sections of IN150 still work to meet all of the same learning goals and

In 2016–2017, students were placed in “E” sections based on assessment of a writing sample conducted by a team of CWRR faculty (for more on the placement protocol, please see Section 4 below). Students in the “E” sections who pass IN150 in the Fall then take a traditional IN151 in spring. Some “E” section students also receive additional assistance from student interns (usually English Education majors) who assist faculty teaching “E” sections during class time and by holding their own office hours.

“Enhanced” suggestions for 2017–2018:

- Work to revise the placement protocol to ensure we are (as accurately as possible) placing students who would benefit from additional attention in “E” sections
- Offer more support to faculty teaching “E” sections, particularly through sharing of best practices and resources. This will become particularly important if the number of “E” sections increases and more faculty who have not taught “E” sections before are tapped to do so
- Continue to limit “E” class sizes to no more than 15 to ensure students get the individualized attention they need.

Section 3: Assessment Data and Analysis

Overview of Artifact Assessment

IN150/IN151 uses authentic assessment, which means that a team of IN150/IN151 faculty examines actual student writing. Specifically, the faculty use rubrics (see appendices) to assess a random 10% of each collected artifact from the past academic year. These rubrics are calibrated to the performance goals that are embedded in the three student artifacts collected (see Table 9). To facilitate this process, students are asked to upload each artifact to a Moodle shell.

In 2016–2017, 251 (out of 470) students submitted a reflection essay (53%), 189 (out of 419) submitted a reading response (45%), and 287 (out of 419) submitted a research essay for artifact collection (66%). We had the best response for the research essay. In general, though, it is encouraging to see such a large percentage of our students submitting their artifacts for programmatic assessment. One goal for next year would be to increase our numbers even more and strive to have at least 75% of all enrolled students submit their essays to Moodle.

In 2016–2017, the faculty who assessed student artifacts were Dr. Carmella Braniger (Coordinator of First-Year Writing), Julie Bates (future Coordinator of First-Year Writing), and Dr. Mike Hollis-George (new English Department Chair). For the annual assessment, the assessment team members met for a pre-assessment norming meeting, where they discussed the rubrics, scored sample artifacts using the rubrics, and then compared their scores with each other. They then discussed the similarities and discrepancies among the three scores and used this discussion as a way to generate consensus about using the rubrics.

Assessment team members individually score the artifacts assigned to them at random by Cindie Zelhart; these scores are then given to the Coordinator of First-Year Writing. The Coordinator collects the assessment results, graphically depicts the data, analyzes and assesses the data, and writes the annual report. A draft is shared first among the Assessment Team before being shared with the entire CWRR faculty.

It should be noted that we are currently using “traffic signal” performance indicators to evaluate and assess: the rubrics are aligned with these performance indicators and performance goals. Each

CWRR Artifact Performance Indicators (Scale Based on Percentages):

Nominal (Red—Stop)	Adequate (Yellow—Caution)	Excellent (Green—Go)
0–52%	53–74%	75–100%

Green : A high level indicating clear movement in the right direction, not requiring any immediate change in course of action. Continuing support should be provided.

Yellow: An average, acceptable level indicating either some improvement, but not as quickly as desired, or indicating a slight decline in performance. Strategies and approaches should be reviewed and appropriate adjustments made to reach an acceptable level or desired rate of improvement.

Red: An unacceptable status or direction of change. Immediate, high-priority actions should be taken to address this area.

A Reminder of Performance Goals

The learning outcome goals of the two-course sequence of IN150 and IN151 are as follows:

1. Read critically to comprehend, analyze and evaluate texts
2. Write polished, informed essays for personal, public and/or specialized audiences
3. Conduct research to participate in academic inquiry
4. Reflect on engagements with critical reading, writing and research to acquire, examine and present self-awareness about those engagements.

Table 9: Learning Goals/Artifacts

Data	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3	Goal 4
Reading Response	X	X		
Research Essay	X	X	X	
Reflection		X		X

Artifact Collection Data

Table 10: Reflection Performance 2009–2017

Academic Year	Identification & articulation of self-awareness 1–5 pts	Critical examination & evaluation of self-awareness 1–5 pts	Presentation of self awareness to public audience 1–5 pts	Total Points (out of 15)
2016–2017	3.65 (73%)	3.38 (68%)	3.16 (63%)	10.19 (68%)
2015–2016	3.75 (75%)	3.47 (69%)	3.41 (68%)	10.63 (71%)
2014–2015	3.66 (73%)	3.39 (68%)	2.7 (54%)	9.77 (65%)
2013–2014	3.5 (70%)	3.3 (66%)	3 (60%)	9.78 (65%)
2012–2013	4.3 (86%)	3.9 (78%)	3.9 (78%)	12 (80%)
2011–2012	4.1 (82%)	3.8 (76%)	4.1 (82%)	12.02 (80%)
2010–2011	Data Missing	Data Missing	Data Missing	Data Missing
2009–2010	2.65 (53%)	2.88 (57.6%)	2.68 (53.6%)	8.74 (58.2%)

Academic Year	Reading 1–5 pts	Critiquing 1–5 pts	Writing 1–3 pts	Total Points (out of 13)
2016–2017	4 (80%)	3.45 (69%)	2.37 (79%)	9.83 (76%)
2015–2016	3.50 (70%)	3.10 (62%)	2.40 (80%)	9.00 (70%)
2014–2015	3.03 (61%)	3.36 (67%)	2.26 (75%)	8.65 (66.5%)
2013–2014	3.8 (76%)	3.6 (72%)	2.5 (83%)	9.88 (76%)
2012–2013	3.8 (76%)	3.4 (68%)	2.1 (70%)	9.3 (72%)
2011–2012	3.6 (72%)	3.1 (62%)	2.5 (83%)	9.2 (71%)
2010–2011	Data Missing	Data Missing	Data Missing	Data Missing
2009–2010	3.86 (77%)	3.43 (68.6%)	2.52 (84%)	9.82 (75.5%)

Table 12: Research Performance 2014–2017

NOTE: A revised rubric has been used with this artifact since 2014–2015.

Academic Year	Research 1–5 pts	Organization 1–5 pts	Audience 1–3 pts	Polished 1–2 pts	Total Points (out of 15)
2016–2017	3.27 (65%)	3.29 (66%)	2.25	1.35 (75%)	10.15 (68%)
2015–2016	3.60 (72%)	3.36 (67%)	2.14 (71%)	1.34 (67%)	10.50 (70%)
2014–2015	3.3 (66%)	3.07 (61%)	1.9 (63%)	1.29 (64.5%)	9.56 (63.7%)

Table 13: Research Performance 2009–2014

Academic Year	Research 1–5 pts	Informed 1–5 pts	Audience 1–3 pts	Polished 1–2 pts	Total Points (out of 15)
2013–2014	3.5 (70%)	3.5 (70%)	2.4 (80%)	1.2 (60%)	10.4 (69%)
2012–2013	3.4 (68%)	3.3 (67%)	2.1 (70%)	1 (51%)	9.8 (65%)
2011–012	3.7 (74%)	3.6 (72%)	2.4 (80%)	1.5 (75%)	11.1 (74%)
2010–2011	Data Missing				
2009–2010	3.87 (77.4%)	3.625 (72.5%)	2.428 (80.9%)	1.642 (82.1%)	11.57

Artifact Analysis

An analysis of the data indicates that 2016–2017 yielded similar artifact scores as last year. Although each artifact remained in the yellow, this year’s scores show a slight incline overall in terms of artifacts meeting performance goals. The reading and writing goals increased the most in terms of the average artifact score, at around 6%, putting the reading response artifact in the green for the first time since 2013–2014. The reflection and research artifacts decreased by only 2–3%. All goals are at 68% or better. We will continue to work to move scores back into the green, the threshold percentage of which is 75%.

Notes on each artifact:

Research Essay—The improved rubric for this artifact has helped clarify an important missing element in the evaluation of research essays: organization. This revised rubric should continue to be used to teach and assess this artifact.

Reflection Essay—Assessors recommend that faculty come to a greater consensus about how we teach and assess this artifact. Students seem to struggle especially with the public audience goal for this essay. One assessor noted that “Some of the reflection artifacts read more like analyses of texts/films and/or argumentative essays—they weren't really focused on the self and/or reading, writing, etc. However, as far as I could tell they weren't actually reading responses, more like some sort of hybrid between genres.” Faculty are encouraged to share their prompts with one another and work to better define what we mean when we ask students to reflect. Faculty might also reevaluate the goal connected to this artifact (Goal #4) to ensure the goal is assessable.

Reading Response—Assessors agree that student artifacts resemble critical annotations (which do not fully meet the goals of this artifact) rather than reading response essays. Faculty are encouraged to revisit the goal associated with this artifact (Goal #2) and the rubric used to assess it in order to better clarify expectations for teaching and assessing this artifact.

Section 4: Suggestions Based 2016–2017 Report

Below are goals for the first-year writing program moving forward.

1. Change First-Semester Placement Protocol

In 2017–2018, the current procedure for placing incoming students into the appropriate sections of IN150 must be revisited and revised to ensure reasonable faculty workload and as accurate as possible placement of all incoming students for Fall 2018. How this process takes shape will depend, in part, on how Orientation and Registration will be approached during Spring and Summer 2018.

Previous to 2016–2017, not all students admitted to Millikin were asked to submit writing samples as a part of placing them in either traditional or enhanced sections of CWRR. Only students with a composite score of 18 or below on the English and Reading portions of the ACT were invited to submit a writing sample. Because the best practices mandate that placement is a) authentic and b) demonstrates inter-rater reliability, previous CWRR Coordinator Dr. Kirchoff made arguments to change placement protocol. For 2016–2017, all non-honors students were asked to submit a short response to a question when they signed up for Orientation and Registration. The First-Year Writing Coordinator then assembled a placement team—which receives a small monetary stipend—and assessed writing samples two weeks before Orientation and Registration. This new system was piloted in Summer of 2016 (Dr. Carmella Braniger, Dr. Anne Matthews, Judi Crowe, and Dr. Scott Lambert comprised the team). This system worked well to help rectify the misplacement factors for IN150 in Fall 2016.

However, the system for registering new students changed dramatically in Spring/Summer 2017. As a result, the first-year writing team decided to revert to previous protocols in order to better align with Millikin’s changing approach to registration while also ensuring proper placement of students in appropriate sections of IN150.

This year, due to changing timetables for Orientation and Registration, which started in April (rather than June) and ended in July, faculty determined it would be impossible to look at every student’s writing this year. Given the demands of our 4/4 load, especially at the end of the Spring semester, when most English faculty are teaching two sections of IN151 and, therefore, reading over 40 final research essays, it was unreasonable to ask faculty to read, in addition, over 500 submissions from newly admitted students. Instead, only students who earned a composite score of 20 on the English and Reading portions of the ACT were asked (not mandated) to produce a writing sample based on a prompt written by the writing team. These students were then placed into either an “E” section or a traditional IN150 section, based on inter-rater reliability. Four faculty members (Dr. Anne Matthews, Dr. Carmella Braniger, Julie Bates, and Judi Crowe) read every submission and rated each one. The team met several times between April and June to review ratings and place students accordingly. More than 127 students were initially identified as needing to take the sample. Of those students invited, 107 students submitted essays, and 47 were placed in “E” sections.

After the last O&R session in June, Coordinator Dr. Carmella Braniger met with registrar Jason

who had not submitted a sample. Most of these students had ACT sub-scores of 16 or below. They also discussed how to handle rolling admits, which the registrar expected to be between 40–70 students. Based on factors including ACT scores, GPA, and placement in the EDGE program, Dr. Braniger and Wickline determined that remaining students and new admits with a 16 or below on the English and Reading portions of the ACT would automatically be placed by the registrar's office into an "E" section. With three of the four planned "E" sections already full from placements made by the writing placement team, 25 students registered with an ACT sub-score of 16 or below who had not submitted a sample, and knowing that many of the late admits are often at-risk students, Wickline and Dr. Braniger determined it in the best interest of the incoming students to open the "E" section on the bubble as well as an additional "E" section. With the support of English chair Mike Hollis-George, IN140 Coordinator Robert Money, and Dean Randy Brooks, the writing program currently will run a total of 6 open "E" sections, with a seventh on the bubble.

2. Continue Revitalizing Presence on Website: Including Teacher Philosophies

In an effort to aide in the recruitment process, we should actively consider our digital visibility. As such, it may be useful to follow the lead of other writing programs (e.g. Bowling Green State University, among others) and have all first-year writing instructors provide teaching philosophies that can be posted on our website. This will allow students (and parents) to better get to know our program, our faculty, and our commitment to student success.

3. Continue Faculty Support

We will continue to offer faculty development opportunities to all tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty, with particular attention paid to sharing resources and best practices with new full-time and part-time faculty. Additionally, we will offer more support to tenure-track faculty teaching "E" sections.

Although the learning goals for "E" sections are the same as the learning goals for traditional sections of IN150, faculty who teach these classes generally approach the semester a bit differently to ensure students receive more instruction on reading and writing fundamentals, extra one-on-one attention, and additional feedback on written work. Faculty who have taught "E" and off-semester sections of IN150 have identified a number of important strategies to support "E" section students' growth as critical readers, writers, and researchers to prepare them for integration into traditional sections of IN151. Because four full-time faculty will be teaching six "E" sections in Fall 2017, we will offer additional opportunities for "E" section faculty to discuss pedagogical approaches and share resources and best practices.

4. Revisions of Artifacts

The 2016–2017 assessment of the CWRR writing program revealed the need for revision to the Reflection Essay and Reading Response artifacts. Thus, in 2017–2018 we will discuss with and gather input from faculty on possible approaches to revamping the teaching and/or assessment of these two artifacts. This may include soliciting greater faculty consensus on approaches to assigning these artifacts, clarifying what we mean by "reflection essay" and "reading response," reevaluating the learning goals connected to these artifacts to ensure the goals are assessable, and/or refining the rubrics associated with each artifact.

Appendix A: Rubrics for Assessment
Reading Response Artifact Assessment Rubric
(revised in 2007; 2015)
 Millikin University
 Critical Writing, Reading and Research Program

Evaluation of CWRR Goal 1 and 2

- “read and critique texts actively, deliberately, and carefully”
- “write . . . polished essays for personal, public, and/or specialized audiences”

Item Evaluated: **Reading Response (Collected in IN 151)**. Please note that the “reading” can also include a **website, film, or other text type determined by the instructor**.

Evaluation by: Self-Study Assessment Team Member

	Excellent (Green—Go)	Adequate (Yellow—Caution)	Nominal (Red—Stop)	Points
Reading	An excellent reading response contains a detailed and careful summary of the major aspects of the reading. Student demonstrates that s/he understands the structure and strategy of the text’s argument and/or play of ideas. [5 points]	An adequate reading response may contain a summary that is slightly confusing or too long/short. The student shows an understanding of the text, but does not actively engage with the structure or strategy of the text’s argument and/or play of ideas. [3 points]	A nominal reading response contains an incomplete summary or misunderstanding of the major aspects of the reading. [1 point]	
Critiquing	An excellent reading response contains careful, well-supported, and well-positioned judgments; similarly, an excellent reading response contains thoughtful, well-reasoned insights about the reading. [5 points]	An adequate reading response contains only some careful, supported and positioned judgments and/or insights regarding the reading. [3 points]	A nominal response contains no judgments or insights about the reading. [1 point]	
Writing	An excellent reading response demonstrates the student’s ability to proofread and edit his or her work. [3 points]	A good reading response demonstrates the student’s attempt to proofread and edit his or her work. [2 points]	A nominal reading response demonstrates the student did not attempt to proofread and edit his work. [1 point]	

Total Points for this Student:

Final Signal Rating:

Excellent (Green—Go)	Adequate (Yellow—Caution)	Nominal (Red—Stop)
10.5–13	7–10.4	1–6

**Research Essay Artifact Assessment Rubric
(Revised 2007; 2015)**

Millikin University
Critical Writing, Reading and Research Program

Evaluation of CWRR Goal 2 and 3

- Conduct research to participate in academic inquiry”
- “write polished, informed essays for personal, public, and/or specialized audiences”

Item Evaluated: **Research Essay (Collected in IN151)**

Evaluation by: Self-Study Assessment Team Member

	EXCELLENT (GREEN—	ADEQUATE (YELLOW—	NOMINAL (RED—	POINTS
Research	An excellent research essay demonstrates the student’s abilities to discuss, find, fairly use and synthesize a variety of reliable, academic sources in order to make judgments, analyze, and/or provide insights in ongoing academic conversations and inquiries. [5 points]	An adequate research essay demonstrates inconsistent attempts to find and synthesize a variety of reliable sources. There is an attempt to enter academic conversations. [3 points]	A nominal research essay demonstrates little or no attempt to use and synthesize multiple sources to enter an ongoing academic conversation. [1 point]	
Organization	An excellent research essay demonstrates the student’s abilities to formulate a well- positioned and well-supported argument through strong organization (e.g. clear, relevant introduction, accurate thesis statement or focus, logical transitions, conclusion etc.) [5 points]	An adequate research essay demonstrates the student’s inconsistent attempt to formulate an argument or opinion through moments of confusing organization (e.g. some paragraphs may be lacking topic sentences, the introduction’s attention getter is not clearly tied into the essay’s subject, etc.). [3 points]	Nominal essay demonstrates difficulty in basic organizational skills: no thesis statements, difficult topic sentences, challenging transitions, etc. [1 point]	
Audience	An excellent research essay demonstrates the student’s strong awareness of expectations and interests of specialized or public audiences. [3 points]	An adequate research essay demonstrates the inconsistent awareness of expectations of specialized or public audiences. [2 points]	A nominal essay demonstrates little/no awareness of expectations and interests of specialized/public audiences. [1 point]	
Polished	An excellent research essay demonstrates the student’s ability to compose a properly- documented and carefully edited piece. [2 points]	An adequate research essay reveals a student’s inconsistent documentation and/or a handful of grammatical errors. [1 point]	A nominal research essay demonstrates little or no attempt to edit and to document. [0 points]	

Total Points for this Student:

Final Signal Rating:



**Reflection Artifact Assessment Rubric
(Revised 2009, 2013, and 2015)**

Millikin University

Critical Writing, Reading and Research Program

Evaluation of CWRR goals 2 and 4

- “write . . . for personal, public and/or specialized audiences.”
- “reflect on the uses of reading and writing in their public and personal lives to better understand themselves, their communities and the world”

Item Evaluated: **Reflection Essay (Collected in IN150)**

Evaluation by: Self-Study Assessment Team Member

	EXCELLENT (GREEN—GO)	ADEQUATE (YELLOW—CAUTION)	NOMINAL (RED—STOP)	POINTS
Identification and articulation of Self-awareness	An excellent reflection demonstrates students’ ability to clearly identify and articulate new knowledge about the self and/or reading, writing, and research processes. [5 points]	An adequate reflection demonstrates the student’s attempt to clearly identify and articulate new knowledge about the self and/or reading, writing, and research processes, [3 points]	A nominal reflection lacks attempt to identify and articulate new knowledge about the self and/or reading, writing, and research processes. [1 point]	
Critical examination and evaluation of self-awareness	An excellent reflection demonstrates the student’s ability to critically analyze and evaluate the new knowledge about the self and/or reading, writing, and research processes. [5 points]	An adequate reflection demonstrates the student’s attempt to critically analyze and evaluate the new knowledge about the self and/or reading, writing, and research processes. [3 points]	A nominal reflection lacks attempt to critically analyze and evaluate the new knowledge about the self and/or reading, writing, and research processes. [1 point]	
Presentation of self awareness to a public audience	An excellent reflection demonstrates the student’s ability to present new knowledge about the self to a public audience. [5 points]	An adequate reflection demonstrates the student’s attempt to present new knowledge about the self to a public audience. [3 points]	A nominal reflection lacks attempt to present new knowledge about the self to a public audience. [1 point]	

Total Points for this Student:

Final Signal Rating:

Excellent (Green—Go)	Adequate (Yellow—Caution)	Nominal (Red—Stop)
12–15	8–11	1–7