Millikin University
Report on Student Learning in IN 150 and 151
(Critical Writing, Reading and Research I and II)
Academic Year 2015-2016
Dr. Carmella Braniger, IN 150/151 Coordinator
July 1, 2016

Executive Summary

Critical Writing, Reading, and Research (CWRR) I and II—also designated as IN 150 and 151 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 PACE—IN 150 and 151 are vital to Millikin's ongoing Writing---Across---the---Curriculum initiative (i.e. IN 250, 251, and 350), while also working to support university---wide learning goals. Specifically, our four learning goals—critical reading, writing, research, and reflection—mirrors Millikin University's ongoing goal of fostering student's 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 IN 150), a reading response (collected in IN 151), and a research essay (also collected in IN 151). 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 IN 150/151 coordinator, goes through a rigorous norming session (lead by the IN 150/151 coordinator) and then, using a rubric designed specifically for each artifact, assesses a percentage of the artifacts submitted (usually 10% of submitted reflections, reading responses, and research essays respectively).

The 2015-2016 assessment of the CWRR program reveals that our students can use more help with all the artifacts. Assessment of the three student artifacts clearly indicates that students are performing at adequate levels, as all three artifacts were scored **Yellow**. There will be more on this in section three.

The following 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 2015-2016 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 data
4. Suggestions for 2015-2016
5. Appendices—Rubrics

Section 1: Overview of CWRR
The learning outcome goals of the two-course sequence of IN 150 and 151 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 IN 150 or IN 151. In IN 150, 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 IN 151, 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: there is an emphasis on reading, writing, research, and reflection that we believe are 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 IN 150 and 151 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 (oft 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're continually offering "Performance Based Learning" opportunities in the form of the Millikin Premier Writer contest and through the annual Celebrations of Scholarship.

Section 2: Overview of 2015–2016 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 2014---2015.

Class Size
Table 3: Fall 2014 Overview

Type of Course	Number of Sections Offered	Average Class Size
PACE 150	1	5
Traditional 150	17	18.1
"Enhanced" 150	3	12.6
Honors 150	5	17.6
PACE 151	1	15
Traditional (Off–Semester) 151	2	21

Table 4—Spring 2015 Overview

Type of Course	Number of Sections Offered	Average Class Size
PACE 150	1	7
Traditional (Off--Semester) 150	2	18.5
PACE 151	1	10
Traditional 151	16	18
Honors 151	5	16

Table 5—Trends in Class Sizes

	2015--2016	2014--2015	2013--2014	2012--2013	2011--2012	2010--2011	2009--2010	2008--2009	2007--2008	2006--2007
Average Class Size	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 English Departments (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 IN 150 and IN 151—closely follows the guidelines put forth by 4Cs and not have any writing courses exceed 20 students, and more specifically, not having our "Enhanced" or off---semester sections (akin to remedial writing courses) exceed 15 students.

The data collected on course sizes for 2015-2016 reveals that the writing program did an exemplary job of holding class sizes down in IN 151. In fact, table five reveals that the good work we did in holding class sizes down in IN 151 helped us produce our lowest class average for the academic year over the last seven data collection periods.

Last year, there was some difficulty maintaining a reasonable class size in IN 150. While class size was not an issue for the PACE and Honors sections of IN 150, this was an issue for the traditional, off---semester, and, most egregiously, "enhanced" sections of IN 150. We made progress on this issue in 2015-2016. Consider: "enhanced" sections of IN 150 in the Fall of 2015 had an average of 12.6 students. Given the writing difficulties our "E" students have, it is absolutely essential for their success to keep a firm cap of 15 students, and we did just that. In fact, no one sector showed average class size any higher than 21.

Suggestions to Continue to Keep Class--Sizes Down for 2016--2017
- Following Orientation and Registration, the first---year writing coordinator will check class

sections of 150 and 151, 18 students for Honors sections of 150 and 151, and 15 students for "Enhanced" and off---semester sections of 150.

- 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 IN 150 or IN 150 (E) if enrollment exceeds projections.
- Similarly, though, if enrollment falls short of projections, the first---year writing coordinator will work with the aforementioned parties to consolidate courses in an 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. By only offering two sections of IN 150 "E," two outcomes are possible. First, the sections could become over enrolled. Second, several students who would benefit from an "E" section—and would have been placed in an "E" section if not for the course cap—are placed in a traditional 150.
    - o As such, the first year writing coordinator suggests identifying several "bubble" courses for "E" and "Honors." These are sections that will be listed as "E" or "Honors" but should we not need those additional sections, be converted back to "Traditional."

Faculty and Facilities

Table 6: Breakdown of Faculty and Facilities Fall 2015

Faculty Name	Faculty Type (Full or Part Time)	Type of Course Taught	Rooms Taught In
Banerjee, Purna	FT	Traditional 150 (3)	SH311, 318, 418
Braniger, Carmella	FT	Honors 150 (1)	Lib 29
Brown, Jason	PT	Traditional 150 (2)	SH 316, 412
Cook, Michael	FT	Traditional 150 (1)	SH 310
Crowe, Judi	FT	Traditional 150 (2) Honors 150 (1)	Lib 29, 23 SH 315
Frech, Stephen	FT	Enhanced 150 (1)	SH 319
Gilpin, Vicky	PT	Traditional 150 (1)	SH 420, Lib18
George, Michael	FT	Traditional 150 (1)	SH 302
Kirchoff, Jeff	FT	Enhanced 150 (2)	SH 318, Lib 18
Lambert, Scott	FT	Traditional 150 (2)	SH 315, 312

Magana, Tony	FT	Honors 150 (1)	SCO 309
Matthews, Andy	PT	Traditional 150 (1)	SH 412
Matthews, Anne	FT	PACE 150 (1) Traditional 150 (2)	SCO 005, SH 319, SH412
O'Conner, Michael	FT	Honors 150 (2)	SCO 213, Lib 29
Patricio, Danielle	PT	Traditional 150 (1)	SH 310
Zorn, Bill	PT	Traditional 150 (1)	SH 315

Table 7—Breakdown of Faculty and Facilities Spring 2016

Faculty Name	Faculty Type (Full or Part Time)	Type of Course Taught	Rooms Taught In
Braniger, Carmella	FT	Traditional 150 (2)	SCO 005
Brown, Jason	PT	Traditional 151 (3)	SH 310, 320, 420
Cook, Michael	FT	Traditional 151 (2)	SH 316, 312
Crowe, Judi	FT	Traditional 151 (1) Honors 151 (2)	SCO 213, 313, K 128
Frech, Stephen	FT	Traditional 151 (1)	SH 320
George, Michael	FT	Honors 151 (1)	SH 418
Kirchoff, Jeff	FT	Traditional 151 (1)	SH 422
Lambert, Scott	FT	Traditional 151 (1)	SH 418
Magana, Tony	FT	Traditional 151 (2)	SH 315
Matthews, Anne	FT	PACE 151 (1) Traditional 151 (2)	SH 308, 323, 420
O'Conner, Michael	FT	Honors 151 (2)	SH 323
Zorn, Bill	PT	Traditional 151 (3)	SH 422

Table 8—Trends in Staff

Faculty Type	SP 16	FA 15	SP 15	FA 14	SP 14	FA 13	SP 13	FA 12	SP 12	FA 11	2011–2012	SP 10	FA 09	SP 09	FA 08	SP 08	FA 07	SP 07	FA 06
Full Time faculty	10	11	11	10	10	11	11	11	10	11	DM	12	12	11	11	11	11	11	12
Part---time adjunct Faculty	2	5	5	6	5	4	5	6	5	6	DM	5	4	2	3	2	2	2	2
Total	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 2015-2016. It should be noted that the Spring of 2016 marked the departure of a full time faculty.

Moving forward, it remains important to a) keep the support of full time faculty instructors for 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/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 there is current faculty development put in place by the first year writing coordinator, including:

- 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 provide feedback.
- Mentorship. Though run through the English Department/English Department chair, each faculty member has a mentor/partner to share ideas with.
- Syllabi review. This is required of all new faculty.
- Regular meetings. Lead by the first-year writing coordinator, the meetings cover a range of topics. These will be more focused on new and part time faculty in 2016--2017.

In 2014---2015, CWRR courses were taught in the following locations: Shilling Hall, Staley Library, Kirkland Fine Arts Center, and ADM---Scovill Hall. 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 fully implemented last year's pilot of a new kind of CWRR course: the Electronic Learning Community. These courses, which require all students enrolled to bring a fully charged laptop to every class, reduces some of the strain on CWRR faculty requesting a limited number of computer labs for class. In the Fall of 2015, six sections of Wireless Environment (WE) sections were offered, mostly to the Honors sections. In Spring 2016, we offered 11 sections across Honors and Traditional sections.

Suggestions for Faculty and Facilities 2015–2016
- Continue to ensure full–time faculty buy–in for the first year writing program
- 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.
- Moreover, the first-year writing coordinator will continue to encourage faculty to submit documents to the "repository" started on Moodle.
- The first---year writing coordinator commits to collecting syllabi from all first---year writing faculty to ensure learning goals are met.
- Continue to support "WE" sections to reduce the number of computer lab requests. Work with IT Committee to ensure students can secure laptops at an affordable price. Work with IT Committee to ensure Millikin has enough wireless access points.
  - Similarly, continue to try and secure computer labs for non–WE sections

Initiatives From 2015–2016
4Cs Certificate of Excellence for Writing Programs
- At the beginning of the Fall semester (2014), Dr. Kirchoff (first---year writing coordinator) proposed Millikin's CWRR program consider pursuing one of the 4C's certificate of excellence for writing programs. Though the idea was met with widespread enthusiasm, applying for the certificate is on hiatus for now, as we need to strengthen the program before considering application (see section five for more on this). Specifically, placement protocol needs to be more authentic and reliable, and learning goals need to be revisited to align with NCTE's first---year writing learning goals.

"WE" sections
- Last year, Dr. Cook and Dr. Kirchoff piloted two sections of an "Electronic Learning Community" (since re-designated as "Wireless Environments") in IN 151. These sections were labeled as laptops-required courses, and students were told up-front that they would be asked to bring laptops (fully charged) to each and every class. The students responded positively to the environment. In the Fall of 2015, we will offer six "WE" sections and Spring 2016, 11 sections. As we continue moving forward, "WE" sections seem like viable alternatives to computer labs. However, we must ensure that our students have access to affordable laptops should we wish to expand "WE" sections further. Moreover, we need to ensure that Millikin's wireless internet is capable of so many people accessing the network at one time. Thus, the number (and strength) of access points should be re-visited.

Assignment Repository
- In an effort to share resources and ideas—supporting the notion that all instructors are life-long learners—an assignment and lesson-plan repository has been established on Moodle. This repository is available to all first year writing faculty and contains successful lesson plans and assignment sheets used by others within the program. Efforts will be made to sustain this initiative in 2016---2017 and beyond.

Millikin Premier Writers

- It should be noted that Dr. Braniger and students Caitlin Husted and Brittany Mytnik continued to refine the MPW contest/initiative. In particular, they worked hard to make the contest open to all CWRR students (not just IN 151 students); additionally, they're also actively addressing the faculty concerns of affordability of the text, editor training, and submission assessment. To that end, they received a performance-based learning grant from Millikin University to continue their fine efforts. We look forward to seeing how the initiative grows; it is to our credit that we have a way to celebrate the work our first year writers are doing.

- The MPW helps meets the first year writing goal of writing for a public audience, as students are asked to work closely with a student editor to revise their work for a new audience. It also supports Millikin's broader performance based learning commitment.

Section 3: Assessment Data and Analysis

<u>Overview of Artifact Assessment</u>

As indicated earlier in this document, IN 150/IN 151 uses authentic assessment, which means that a team of IN 150/151 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 2015-2016, 295 (out of 439) students submitted a reflection essay (67%), 215 (out of 387) submitted a reading response (55%), and 243 (out of 382) submitted a research essay for artifact collection (64%). As such, we had the best response for the reflection 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 2015/2016, the two faculty who assessed student artifacts were Dr. Carmella Braniger (Coordinator of First Year Writing) and Dr. Julie Bates (future Coordinator of First Year Writing). 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 collected artifact receives a performance indicator using the following scale:

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 IN 150 and 151 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 2009-2016

Academic Year	Identification and articulation of self---awareness	Critical Examination and Evaluation of Self--- Awareness 1-5 pts	Presentation of Self awareness to public audience 1-5 pts	Total Points (out of 15)
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
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%)

Table 11: Reading Response Performance 2009-2016

Academic Year	Reading 1---5 pts	Critiquing 1---5 pts	Writing 1---3 pts	Total Points (out
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
2012-2013	3.8 (76%)	3.4 (68%)	2.1 (70%)	9.3
2011-2012	3.6 (72%)	3.1 (62%)	2.5 (83%)	9.2
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 2014-2016

NOTE: A revised rubric is now in use for this artifact.

Academic Year	Research 1---5 pts	Organization 1---5 pts	Audience 1---3 pts	Polished 1---2 pts	Total Points (out
2015-2016	3.60 (90%)	3.36 (84%)	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%)
2011-2012	3.7 (74%)	3.6 (72%)	2.4 (80%)	1.5 (75%)	11.1 (74%)

2010-2011	Data Missing	Data Missing	Data Missing	Data Missing	**Data Missing**
2009-2010	3.87 (77.4%)	3.625 (72.5%)	2.428 (80.9%)	1.642 (82.1%)	**11.57 (77.13%)**

Artifact Analysis

An analysis of the data indicates that 2015-2016 yielded higher artifact scores than last year. While each artifact remained in the yellow, this year's scores show a slight incline overall in terms of artifacts meeting performance goals. The research and reflection goals increased the most in terms of the average artifact score, at around 6% each. Reading response increased by about 4%. All goals are at 70% 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. 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 2015-2016 report

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

1. Changing Placement Protocol

Our old placement protocol did not look at every student's writing. Instead, only students who earned a composite score of 18 on the English and Reading portions of the ACT were asked (not mandated) to produce a writing sample (usually a response to a prompt). These students were then placed into either an "E" section or a traditional IN 150 section. Any student who did not submit a writing sample was subject to placement by the Office of Student Success and the Registrar—usually using a formula that includes variables such as student GPA and ACT score. Under this system, misplacement became a concern. Several faculty—tenured/tenure track and adjunct alike—indicated that there were several students in their traditional IN 150s that should be placed in an IN 150E. Since 2010, over 60+ students (the equivalent of three traditional IN 150 sections) earned a grade of D+ or lower in IN 150. While we cannot solely rely on grades as an indicator, because there are several other factors that go into the grade a student earns, misplacement is certainly one factor that could go into this.

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. Now, so all non-honors students are asked to submit a short response to a question when they sign up for Orientation and Registration. CWRR Coordinator then assembles a placement team—which receives a small monetary stipend— and assesses 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), and it worked well to help rectify the misplacement factor for IN150 in Fall 2016. In the future, we will be asking all students to submit the Writing portion of the ACT/SAT as the sample the placement team will review.

2. IAI Transfer

The Illinois Articulation Initiative exists so that students can more easily transfer from one institution to another. Though we do not want to encourage students to leave Millikin, joining this consortium will serve to attract more transfer students to Millikin University.

As such, the first year writing program will work to become "IAI compliant." This means that if a student comes from an IAI approved school/first year writing curriculum and has already successfully completed their former school's writing sequence, that student will not need to take IN 150 and IN 151. It is of note that many of our peer institutions are already IAI compliant. Additionally, it is a goal of the Provost to have all our general education courses IAI approved. We already meet most of the IAI requirements. The biggest change this will require is adjusting the passing grade of IN 150 and IN 151 from a D to a C (a requirement already put in place for Nursing and Education majors).

Note: this will impact our course offerings each year, as more students will need to re-take IN 150 and IN 151. Consider the following numbers:

> IN 150
> 2009: 38 earned between a C- and a D
> 2010: 36 earned between a C- and a D
> 2011: 33 earned between a C- and a D
> 2012: 29 earned between a C- and a D
> 2013: 36 earned between a C- and a D
> Average = 34.4, or 2 (more than likely) additional off-semester courses.

> IN 151
> 2010: 39 earned between a C- and a D
> 2011: 25 earned between a C- and a D
> 2012: 41 earned between a C- and a D
> 2013: 46 earned between a C- and a D
> 2014: 46 earned between a C- and a D
> Average = 39.4, or 2 to 3 additional IN 151 off-semester courses.

So if we were to pursue IAI, it would most likely mean the hiring of an additional adjunct—and adding some additional courses to the books. This is, of course, a budgetary concern. This proposal will be brought to council on curriculum in Fall 2015. First year writing faculty will be given periodic updates.

3. IN 151 Course Titles

Many faculty choose to theme their IN 151 courses. At the request of the registrar and students, we will aim to provide the registrar with *titles* (not descriptions) for all our spring IN 151 courses. Naturally, if there is no theme, no title needs to be provided.

4. Continuing WE Initiative

As mentioned throughout this document, we should continue to support and strengthen the Wireless Environment Initiative. At present, this means continuing to work with various committees to secure partnerships that will allow students to purchase laptops at a discounted rate.

This initiative is important because a) it allows students to write *every day* using a tool that they are most familiar with and b) it will better support multimodal literacies (see below).

5. Continue revitalizing presence on website: including teacher philosophies

In an effort to aide in the recruitment process, we should actively consider our visibility digitally. 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

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 point]	A nominal reading response demonstrates the student did not attempt to proofread and edit his work. [1 points]	

Total Points for this Student:
Final Signal Rating:

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

Research Essay Artifact Assessment Rubric
(Revised 2015)
Millikin University
Critical Writing, Reading and Research Program
Student Learning Evaluation

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 IN 151)**
Evaluation by: Self-Study Assessment Team Member

	EXCELLENT (GREEN—GO)	ADEQUATE (YELLOW—CAUTION)	NOMINAL (RED—STOP)	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:

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

Reflection Artifact Assessment Rubric
(revised in 2009, 2013, and 2015)
Millikin University
Critical Writing, Reading and Research Program
Student Learning Evaluation

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 IN 150).**

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 points]	

Total Points for this Student:

Final Signal Rating:

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