Millikin University
Student Learning in Critical Writing, Reading and Research I & II (CWRR I & II)
IN 150 & IN 151 MPSL First-Year Writing Requirement

by Critical Writing, Reading and Research Self-Study Committee
Carmella Braniger, Anne Matthews and Peiling Zhao
Student Research Assistant, Greer Williams
June 01, 2006

1. Goals

Student Learning Outcome Goals

As part of the Critical Writing, Reading and Research (CWRR) Program's engagement in assessment, faculty who teach the two-course sequence have reviewed expectations and values for student writing, reading and research. Through full-faculty participation in workshop settings, we have constructed and agreed upon student learning outcomes for the two-semester sequence. By the end of CWRR I (IN 150) and CWRR II (IN 151) students will able to:

1. read and critique texts actively, deliberately and carefully;
2. write polished, informed essays for personal, public and/or specialized audiences;
3. conduct research to participate in academic inquiry; and
4. reflect on the uses of reading and writing in their public and personal lives to better understand themselves, their communities and the world.

Curriculum Map

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

Connections to University-Wide Learning Outcome Goals

Our new CWRR learning outcome goals help deliver the university-wide learning goals:

1. professional success;
2. democratic citizenship in a global environment; and
3. a personal life of meaning and value.

The program's two-course sequence contributes primarily to professional success and significantly to development of a personal life of meaning and value. Asking students to read and critique texts actively, deliberately and carefully, and to write polished, informed essays for personal, public and/or specialized audiences helps prepare them for professional success. The additional emphasis on research in CWRR II (IN 151), specifically research conducted to participate in academic inquiry, further prepares students for professional success. Asking students to reflect on the uses of reading and writing in their public and personal lives to better understand themselves, their communities and the world prepares them for a life of personal meaning and value. While there are opportunities for CWRR I & II to contribute to democratic citizenship in a global environment, particularly through students' reflections on their relationship to the community and the world, it is not a main focus of the two-course sequence.

2. Snapshot

Brief Overview of Our Current Situation

The CWRR Program currently offers between 28-34 sections of either CWRR I or CWRR II each semester. We teach traditional, Honors, Enhanced and PACE students. The courses are staffed by full-time and part-time English Department faculty. The courses are taught in a variety of learning environments, including electronic and otherwise technologically equipped classrooms. The average class size for any one section is 19.51 students. We coordinate instruction and resources with a variety of other programs and departments, including the Staley Library, University Seminar faculty and the Writing Center.

Staff (See Appendix A)

CWRR I & II are part of Millikin's five University Studies sequential courses required of all students: IN 140, IN 150, IN 151, IN 250 and IN 350. Although CWRR I & II are taught only by English faculty, the sequential courses are designated as interdepartmental courses because they are taken by students from all departments. Millikin has made a strong commitment to the quality of faculty teaching in the sequential courses. Most of the faculty teaching CWRR are full-time faculty. For the Fall 2005 semester, there were 13 full-time and 3 part-time adjunct faculty. For the Spring 2006 semester, there were 13 full-time and 2 part-time adjunct faculty.

Our faculty are committed to adapting teaching styles, methods and pedagogies to all types of learners, from at-risk students to adult learners studying at an accelerated pace. 70% of the staff teaching traditional, Honors, Enhanced and PACE is composed of full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty with terminal degrees. 22% of the staff teaching these courses is composed of full-time, contractual faculty without terminal degrees. Only 8% of our staff are part-time faculty without terminal degrees. Our dedication to full-time faculty teaching is outstanding. 92% of the CWRR I & II courses taught since 2001 have been taught by full-time English Department faculty.

Types of Courses Taught and Students Served (See Appendices A, B, C and D)

Millikin has a strong commitment to a comprehensive first-year learning experience for all students, requiring two semesters of intensive critical writing, reading and research instruction. English Department faculty at Millikin teach both courses in both the Fall and Spring semesters, offering more sections of CWRR I in the Fall and more sections of CWRR II in the Spring. From 2001-2006, CWRR faculty taught 330 sections of Critical Writing, Reading and Research I & II, 169 sections of which were CWRR I, and 161 sections of which were CWRR II. These courses are offered in a variety of forums, taken by a variety of students and taught by a variety of instructors. 78% of CWRR sections offered are taken by the traditional student body. 79% of CWRR I courses and 78% of CWRR II courses are taught to traditional students. These students generally come to Millikin straight from high school and live in the dorms on campus. Traditional first-year students take CWRR I in the Fall of their initial year and CWRR II in the Spring of their initial year. One of the traditional student's first university encounters is with a CWRR faculty member.   64% of traditional CWRR courses are taught by full-time, tenured or tenure-line faculty with terminal degrees; 25% of these sections are taught by full-time, contractual faculty without terminal degrees; 11% are taught by part-time adjunct faculty.

Traditional students accepted into the Millikin Honors Program have the opportunity to have an advanced and more intense CWRR experience. 15% of CWRR courses offered are Honors sections. 13% of CWRR I courses and 17% of CWRR II courses are taught to Honors students. These sections are generally taught by seasoned and established full-time faculty. 92% are taught by full-time, tenured or tenure-line faculty with terminal degrees

and 8% are taught by full-time, contractual faculty without terminal degrees. No Honors sections are taught by part-time adjunct faculty.

In addition to serving the traditional student body, the CWRR Program also makes a special effort to address the needs of incoming first-year students who are considered at-risk with regard to their academic success. The Enhanced sections of CWRR I provide these at-risk students with a chance to become accustomed to the academic setting at a slower pace and prepare them for enrolling in and successfully completing the second-semester course. Enhanced CWRR I is the only course offered as a developmental writing course.   Two sections have been offered each Fall since 2003. Because this opportunity is new to the program and limited to CWRR I, only 2% of CWRR courses offered are Enhanced sections. 4% of CWRR I courses are taught to at-risk students. 50% of the sections are taught by full-time, tenured or tenure-line faculty with terminal degrees and 50% are taught by full-time, contractual faculty without terminal degrees.

Finally, CWRR courses are offered through the university's Professional Adult Comprehensive Education (PACE) Program. PACE offers accredited programs for professionals in a variety of fields, from nursing to education. The program offers four-year degrees in four areas: organizational leadership, early childhood education, elementary education and nursing. Adult learners completing such degrees are required to meet the same general education requirements as traditional students. Our program offers accelerated courses in CWRR in order to serve the needs of the PACE Program. We have been teaching PACE courses since the Fall of 2003. 5% of CWRR courses offered are PACE sections. 4% of CWRR I courses and 5% of CWRR II courses are taught to PACE students. 87% of the sections are taught by full-time, tenured or tenure-line faculty with terminal degrees. 13% of the sections are taught by full-time, contractual faculty without terminal degrees.

Number of Courses Taught (See Appendix E)
Our program offers between 28 and 34 sections of either CWRR I or CWRR II each semester. We teach between 28-31 sections of CWRR I in the Fall semester and between 2-4 sections in the Spring semester. We teach between 28-32 sections of CWRR II in the Spring semester and between 1-5 during the Fall semester. On average we teach 33 sections of CWRR I and/or II each semester.

Class Size and Staff Workload (See Appendix F)
According to the guidelines, policies and recommendations of the professional groups in the field, the Association of Departments of English (ADE) and the Modern Language Association (MLA), the number of students in each section of any writing course "should be fifteen or fewer, with no more than twenty students in any case" (*ADE Bulletin 2002*, 73). These guidelines also state that "class size should be no more than fifteen in developmental (remedial) courses" (*ADE Bulletin 2002*, 73). In our program, the average number of students per class between 2001-2006 is 19.51. This average is taken from the total number of students enrolled in traditional, Honors, Enhanced and Pace CWRR I & II courses. The most students in any one course was 25 and the least 5. The highest average was 20.41 in Fall 2002 and the lowest 17.45 in Spring 2005. Since 2003, we have offered a total of six sections of the Enhanced CWRR I course, the equivalent of a developmental or remedial writing course. The average class size for the Enhanced sections of CWRR I is 16 students. While our average CWRR class size exceeds the recommended fifteen or fewer, it does reflect ADE and MLA's recommendation that there be "no more than twenty students" (*ADE Bulletin 2002*, 73). We are also advancing toward the mark with our Enhanced class size, on average being only one student over the recommended number.

In addition to making recommendations concerning class size, the ADE and MLA also recommend that "College English teachers should not teach more than three sections of composition per term" (*ADE Bulletin 2002*, 73). With one exception in Fall 2001, none of our faculty have ever taught more than three sections of CWRR in one semester. The average number of CWRR courses taught by full- and part-time faculty is two per semester.

Facilities (See Appendix A)
CWRR courses are taught in a variety of learning spaces, ranging from rectangular or L-shaped rooms with traditional chair-desks, blackboard, chalk and lectern, to full electronic lab classrooms, where instructor and all students have access to computers. The range of buildings in which CWRR courses are taught include the following: Shilling Hall, Staley Library, the Millikin Institute, Leighty Tabor Science Center, ADM-Scovill Hall and the Kirkland Fine Arts Center. Because Shilling Hall houses the English Department, the faculty of which teach the courses, 86% of CWRR courses are taught in this building. Interactions with library staff, the Mueller and Mac computer labs and the multi-media capabilities of the library basement classrooms also bring CWRR faculty to the Staley Library. 8% of CWRR courses are taught in the Staley Library building. The majority of PACE courses are taught at the Millikin Institute as a convenience for adult learners. The classrooms in this facility contain comfortable furnishings for accelerated classes that meet for extended hours. These learning spaces are also fully equipped with technology for teaching.

The ADM-Scovill facilities and Shilling 323 are attractive spaces for teaching CWRR. 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." This document uses the phrase "compose digitally" to mean writing "that occurs when students compose at a computer screen, using a word processor, so that they can submit the writing in print," but also to mean "participating in an online discussion trough a listserv or bulletin board . . .[,] creating compositions in presentations software . . .[,] participation in chat rooms or creating web pages . . .[or] creating a digital portfolio." CCCC sees the future focus of first-year writing programs moving toward two types of literacy: "a literacy of print and a literacy of the screen." The position statement argues that each "medium is used to *enhance learning* in the other" (italics mine). The CWRR Program is moving in the direction of these priorities, providing an increasing number of facilities for teaching CWRR courses in electronic lab classrooms. The program should continue to advocate for more provision of such facilities.

There are clear advantages for students who are able to learn writing and research skills in a computer-lab learning environment. Since 2001, 3% of CWRR courses were taught in such an environment. In 2001, no CWRR courses were taught in rooms with computer technology available to either instructor, students or both. We have seen a gradual increase in the needs of our faculty to teach in electronic classrooms with technology available to students and instructor alike. The 2005-2006 academic year saw a significant increase in the number of sections taught using technology in the classroom. 52% of CWRR courses were offered in a learning space with basic or advanced technology which could be used for teaching and student presentation purposes. This year, 16% of CWRR courses were offered in electronic lab classrooms, with computers for every student. As we continue to hire faculty with experience teaching first-year writing in a technologically equipped classroom, and as the effectiveness of such instruction continues to be demonstrated, necessity and demand for it will necessarily increase in the CWRR Program.

Partnerships
Because CWRR I & II are required of every Millikin student completing a four-year undergraduate degree, the program finds itself in continual contact with departments and affiliations across campus. We work with the PACE Program to provide full-time faculty support for teaching CWRR at an accelerated pace. We provide the James Millikin Scholars (JMS) Honors Program with seasoned, full-time faculty to work with incoming first-year Honors students. Our faculty works closely with the EDGE Program to identify and provide support for incoming at-risk students. By testing and placing these students in Enhanced sections of CWRR I, the equivalent of developmental writing courses at other institutions, we work to bring at-risk students up to speed with their peers' reading and writing abilities and better prepare them for the academic writing in CWRR II, where the EDGE students are integrated with traditional students.

We are also partners with the university's Writing Center, located on the second floor of the Staley Library. One of our devoted full-time contractual faculty members directs the Writing Center, and another full-time, tenure-track faculty member works part-time in the Center. This bolsters the Enhanced Program in that these faculty have extensive experience in encountering students requiring assistance in their work in CWRR and other courses. The Center is staffed by seasoned English majors, usually English Education majors. At the Center, we are intimately involved with meeting students one-on-one to improve their critical reading, writing, research and thinking skills.

The CWRR Program is also connected to English majors through the Teaching Writing Internship Course (EN470), taught by a seasoned, tenured English Department faculty member. All English Education majors are required to take this course to complete their teaching certification. In order to give these students experience teaching reading and writing, each student enrolled in the Fall course is paired with a full-time faculty member teaching CWRR I. The faculty member provides mentoring and guidance in developing and grading assignments, leading class discussions and teaching one-on-one. Generally, these students work to develop professional perspectives on teaching reading and writing, take active roles in leading class activities and serve as role models for first-year writing students.

Because CWRR I & II are interdepartmental courses, and components of the sequential elements that compose a part of the University Studies requirements, the mission and goals or our courses and other required courses are closely connected. In particular, we have a strong connection with the University Seminar (IN140) by way of a cohort with CWRR I (IN 150) during the Fall semester.   Faculty who teach sections of the two courses are paired and share the same group of incoming Fall first-year students. Faculty often work together to create coherence and a sense of community as first-year students join Millikin's academic community. The cohort provides structure for first-year students to adjust to the rigors of university life. CWRR and Seminar faculty aid students in their transition to university studies.

Finally, the CWRR Program has established a strong instructional relationship with the Staley Library faculty and staff. Over the past five years, CWRR directors (myself included) and Library Research Instruction Coordinators (currently Joe Hardenbrook) have worked together closely to develop an instructional relationship unique to the private comprehensive educational experience. Most research universities establish such relationships, but rarely are larger universities and colleges able to provide students with the frequent instructional contact CWRR students have with professionally trained librarians. A full-time faculty member, with a terminal degree in Library Science, visits the CWRR classroom four times over the one year, two course sequence. These visits take place in

classrooms, in electronic laboratories, and in the library. These faculty are assigned to a variety of CWRR sections and work with CWRR faculty to develop tailored instructional sessions. Library faculty introduce students to the library and instruct them on basic search skills in a 50-minute session in CWRR I. Because CWRR II is research heavy, librarians instruct students in advanced search skills and source evaluation processes during three 50-minute class periods. Students engage in online learning tutorials, learn how to access subscription databases, are introduced to the Illinois Library Computer Systems Organization (ILCSO), now the Consortium of Academic and Research Libraries in Illinois (CARLI), are instructed on the validity and use of websites and learn to evaluate the authoritativeness of sources in general. The librarians prepare classroom activities, create exercises for students to practice research skills and evaluate student learning. Our partnership with the library is essential in developing students' abilities to conduct research for academic inquiry, one of our four learning goals. See Joe Hardenbrook's self-study report on Library Instruction for further explanation.

Support Structures: Leadership and CWRR Faculty Development
Thanks to Title III assistance, the CWRR Program has developed a strong tradition of leadership structure and support. For several years, the program has been led by a Director appointed by the Dean of Arts and Sciences and the English Department Chair. The program also supports collaborative leadership through a CWRR Leadership Committee and a CWRR Assessment Team. The CWRR Leadership Committee provides suggestions and recommendations to the Director and CWRR Assessment Team. The CWRR Assessment Team members are intimately involved in the creation of assessment methods for the program. The Director not only leads the Leadership and Assessment Team efforts, but also organizes faculty development opportunities. The Director is responsible for organizing and leading monthly CWRR faculty meetings, where faculty who teach the courses meet to discuss teaching and assessment issues. The Director also organizes and presents CWRR workshops at least once a semester in order to involve the entire CWRR faculty in the decision-making processes for assessment of the program. Additionally, the Director mentors new full- and part-time faculty in the teaching of the two courses, visits faculty classes at least once a year and makes observations and formative evaluations of these classes to share with the faculty member and Department Chair. Through these support structures, faculty teaching in the CWRR Program are guaranteed support and development opportunities and often have the chance to take on leadership roles in order to help improve the program.

Initiatives and Improvements
The Critical Writing, Reading and Research faculty not only have an initial, but a fundamental encounter with first-year students; this encounter is essential in ensuring student success at Millikin University. Faculty who teach the two-semester sequence are always looking for creative, innovative and effective pedagogies and learning environments to guarantee that students become better critical writers, readers, researchers and thinkers. As our faculty engage in experimental pedagogies, we believe that we can enhance student learning in CWRR by 1) enhancing the delivery of our four student learning outcome goals 2) continuing to support faculty development opportunities, as well as the structures that uphold the program and 3) contributing strategies and methods that promote and support writing in a computer classroom. Other improvements and initiatives will come from reflection on the analysis presented in this report. See Part 7 of this report (**Initiatives and Improvements**) for further explanation.

3. The Learning Story

Typical Learning Experience

Every first-year Millikin student takes Critical Writing, Reading and Research I & II. In CWRR I, first-year students fully explore entry into academic inquiry. Students not only examine the connection between critical reading and writing, but experiment with the opportunities such an exploration creates for academic success. In the second semester of the CWRR sequence students continue to grow their intellectual inquiry. The class emphasizes vital skills for academic and professional success. Students investigate and research a topic of their choice. Through the two semesters in CWRR, students learn to (1) read and critique texts actively, deliberately and carefully, (2) write polished, informed essays for personal, public and/or specialized audiences, (3) conduct research to participate in academic inquiry and (4) reflect on the uses of reading and writing in their public and personal lives to better understand themselves, their communities and the world. Since full-time faculty who teach these courses have the opportunity to develop the course content with respect to their own teaching strengths, section offerings vary in methodology and approach. However, emphasis is placed on the importance of reading, writing, research and reflection for personal and professional growth in all learning areas and situations.

Course Descriptions

The following are descriptions of the ways in which the two-course sequence works to help students to make a transition into the discourse of the academy by moving them from writing for personal motivations and audiences to more professional writing for specialized audiences. CWRR I's emphasis on reading, writing and reflection helps students to make this transition. They practice a variety of reading and writing skills over the course of the semester in preparation for the second semester course. The intensive and rigorous nature of CWRR II, the introduction of research as an emphasis and the independent learning that takes place in this course prepares students for more advanced coursework across schools and disciplines. All along the way of both courses, students are given the opportunity to reflect on the reading, writing and researching they are doing in order to become independent learners and thinkers.

Critical Writing, Reading and Research I (IN 150) is designed to develop students as critical writers, readers and researchers. Emphasis is placed on writing and reading as the path to critical thinking. The course is designed to move students from personal, expressive writing based on observation and experience to academic writing based on synthesis, application and analysis. In this way, students have the opportunity to make a timely entry into the academic community and discourses of Millikin University. They also have the chance to discover a variety of audiences for their writing and to explore genres that move them toward developing a more public voice. Over the course of the semester, students are asked to read and critique texts actively, deliberately and carefully, to write polished, informed essays for personal, public and/or specialized audiences and to reflect on the uses of reading and writing in their public and personal lives to better understand themselves, their communities and the world. An introductory library research component is integrated into the course.

Critical Writing, Reading and Research II (IN 151) is designed to position students as successful writers, readers and researchers as they move into advanced coursework and the academic communities and discourses of the university. In this way, the course is generally more rigorous and requires more dedication from the student. In addition to continuing to develop reading and writing skills introduced in the first semester course, students are asked to conduct research to participate in academic inquiry. An extended and intensive library research component is integrated into the course. In addition to learning how to use the library to find information and resources, students are asked to make judgments about

and use these sources to participate in ongoing academic conversations and inquiries. Students may also be asked to summarize and evaluate writing of academic quality, learn how to read and/or write abstracts and annotations, interview professionals in specific disciplines and/or engage in field research. While students are generally asked, over the course of the semester, to perform more reading, writing and research tasks than in CWRR I, they are also encouraged to do so independently and with less guidance from CWRR faculty and with closer engagement with the discipline in which they conduct their research. Each student writes a research essay that demonstrates the ability to evaluate and incorporate resources and contribute to academic discourses and communities. The research essay gives students the opportunity to demonstrate their abilities to formulate well-positioned and well-supported arguments by critically synthesizing multiple perspectives. By the end of CWRR II students fully develop a sense of audience awareness, and can compose a well-organized, properly-documented and carefully edited essay in a confident and personal voice.

Snapshot of the Successful Student Completing CWRR I & II

Greer Williams
Millikin University
First-Year Student
Commercial Art Major

During my freshman year at Millikin, along with other first-year students, I took the class, Critical Writing, Reading and Research (CWRR). At first glance this class, which is divided into two components, CWRR I (first semester) and CWRR II (second semester), seems like any other universities' required first-year writing course. However, it is more than that. Through my experience I have found that this class does more than increase a student's writing ability. It ideally improves the student's whole process of thinking, reading and writing for professional, as well as for personal gain in understanding the world around him or her.

CWRR I is the first half of the course. Through the readings we were assigned we were introduced to the idea of critical thinking. Then, using critical thinking we applied the ideas we read about to write a variety of essays. For me, the written assignments were a new experience. Much of the writing I had done previous to the class had just related to reading for surface information, not for a deeper meaning or understanding of the reason why we write what we write. Because of all the different types of writing assignments (literacy narratives, comparative essays, synthesis/analysis essays, application essays and process narratives) I had to complete, I learned how to incorporate my own voice into my writing. After reading all different types of essays I realized that I, as the reader, felt the most interested in the essays where the author personally engaged me in his or her story. When a reader is more engaged with what one is reading he or she is bound to pay more attention and therefore better understand the ideas the author is attempting to get across.

Where CWRR I exposes students to using their personal voices, CWRR II cultivates those same ideas to enhance the students' original ideas of "the research paper," that is, what we are used to being told to write: a paper that, in essence, is just an accumulation of facts about a specific topic. CWRR II helps students find a balance of outside, reliable sources and their own informed and evaluative thoughts. Some of the class's first assignments

included writing an informed opinion essay on Turnitin.com and a group project presentation. My group explored the legality of Amazon.com collecting and "selling" a user's personal information and buying habits. I felt these assignments complimented the final research essay well. They introduced us to the research aspect of the course and helped with developing informed opinions about the topic. In CWRR II we also had several sessions as a class where one of the Staley Library's librarians instructed us on how to use the library's databases. I know I found (and can only assume that others did, as well) that these sessions were extremely helpful. They taught us to use the online catalogue and databases in effective and evaluative ways, skills which are extremely vital to finding credible information for research.

I was fortunate enough to have both of my CWRR classes in electronic classrooms. I honestly have trouble thinking how the class could be conducted without such a learning environment and still have the same positive impact on student learning. The relationship between writing and information technology is invaluable to the progression of a student's development. In an electronic classroom, the students are able to compose on the computer, and because of that, are able to do several other things. Posting to Blackboard during class is one of the greatest benefits. When students are able to post to Blackboard during class they can receive classmate input almost instantly. Also, when there is an electronic copy of a student's work and a hard copy it is easier to keep track of and have access to a comprehensive collection of student writing. A hard copy could easily be lost, but an electronic copy can be saved in multiple places. Also, in the electronic classroom my professor was able to give power point presentations. This was beneficial to me as I am a very visually oriented person. Rather than just saying or writing instructions on the chalkboard, the power point, I felt, was more stimulating. Since the presentation was able to gain and keep my attention I was able to better focus on and complete my work.

All in all, I found the two sections of CWRR to work together well—the first beginning with personal writing and introducing the students to more academic styles of writing, and the second refining those skills and abilities to help students learn new research skills and apply what they have learned in a more professional way. Also, throughout the year students are able to reflect on what they have learned in order to learn more about themselves. For example, everyone in the class set goals for themselves at the beginning of the semester and then came back to them at the end and re-evaluated his or her situation. This gives the students a chance to see how far they have come, and also realize how what really matters to them individually as readers, writers, researchers and thinkers evolved over the course of the semester. Being aware of the self is one of the most important things that I have gained throughout this course. I believe that when you know why and how you read, write, research and think you are able to become more intellectual and professional about everything you do.

Successful Sample Syllabi (See Appendix M)
Faculty who teach the two-semester sequence are always looking for creative, innovative and effective pedagogies and learning environments to guarantee that students become better critical writers, readers, researchers and thinkers. See Appendix M for examples of successful faculty approaches to teaching the courses.

Unique Opportunities
In addition to learning to write for a variety of audiences, CWRR students are often provided the opportunity to share their writing and research in public presentation spaces. The first-year Honors CWRR II students hold annual Freshman Focus presentation days on which students completing the Honors CWRR sequence may present the research they engaged in over the course of the Spring CWRR II semester. Similarly, some CWRR faculty who teach traditional courses offer students the same opportunity and utilize the final exam period to

engage students in faculty- and peer-reviewed public presentations of their work. Several faculty members use the CWRR I course as a space to promote a literacy of the screen by asking them to publish collections of literacy narratives. Other faculty have asked CWRR students to work collaboratively with students enrolled in the English Department's Computer-Aided Publishing course to design, lay out and publish high-quality magazines on current global and cultural trends and issues.   There are a variety of unique situations in which CWRR students can practice public presentations of their work and further engage one another in critical writing, reading, research and thinking.

4. Assessment Methods
Data Collection Methods for Assessing CWRR Learning Outcome Goals
The CWRR Program has developed several methods for assessing and evaluating student learning in CWRR I & II. In Chapter Three of *The Higher Learning Commission Handbook of Accreditation*, under "Criterion Three: Student Learning and Effective Teaching," **Core Component 3a** recommends that "[t]he organization's goals for student learning are clearly stated for each educational program and make effective assessment possible" (3.1-4). We want to be sure we are communicating our student learning outcome goals to our students, so we collected current faculty syllabi to assess the effectiveness of our communication. Thanks to Millikin's Office of Institutional Research and the program's collaboration with Laura Birch, we conducted quantitative assessment of student learning outcome goals by way of surveying students about their perceptions of how successfully they accomplished the four goals for the two courses.   In order to assess and analyze the library instruction, which takes place over the course of the two semesters, Library Instruction Coordinator Joe Hardenbrook developed entrance and exit quizzes to measure what students retain from these sessions. Finally, and most importantly, we conducted qualitative assessment by collecting and evaluating student artifacts from CWRR II. We used rubrics to assess not only students' reading, writing and research performance, but to assess their understanding of the importance of reading and writing for personal and professional growth at Millikin University.

We began the assessment process by way of professional consultation with Bob Broad, first-year writing professor and administrator, and author of *What We Really Value: Beyond Rubrics in Teaching and Assessing Writing*. Broad was able to offer our assessment team a new vision of how to discover and express the criteria by which faculty evaluate students' writing. In his book, he states that first-year writing "teaches . . . preeminent intellectual skills of the university: critical and creative thinking" (3). He goes on to say that done well, this teaching "prepare[s] our students for success in personal relationships, careers, and democratic citizenship" (3). However, such general statements often do not get at the heart of what actually happens in the writing classroom, nor do they capture the experience students have in such classes. With this in mind, Broad encouraged us to base our assessment on what we really value in student writing and what we really teach. In the Fall of 2003, we collected student sample writing from the end of CWRR I and presented these samples to faculty for review. Then, in small norming sessions held in electronic classrooms, each Self-Study Assessment Team member asked the faculty members to address the student samples and articulate what they valued about the writing in each sample. The team member scribed the conversation, creating lists of criteria valued by faculty. The Self-Study Assessment Team then compiled this data and presented it to the faculty in Fall 2005 at a CWRR full-faculty two-hour workshop. In this workshop, we boiled down pages upon pages of values into our four concise learning outcome goals. Over the course of the Fall semester, at monthly CWRR meetings, faculty agreed upon which artifacts to collect for assessment with regard to our four student learning outcome goals, and created rough drafts of rubrics to be used to evaluate the artifacts. The three artifacts for collection are: reading response, research essay and reflection piece. Descriptions of each artifact were created collaboratively by the Self-Study Team, reviewed by the full faculty

and approved at the last CWRR meeting of the Fall 2005 semester. After identifying points of data collection, the faculty decided to begin collecting artifacts in Spring 2006. The Self-Study Team then worked on drafting rubrics for assessing the artifacts based on the key learning outcome goals. The rubrics were brought to a CWRR full-faculty two-hour workshop early in Spring 2006. One team member presented the rubrics, another mediated the workshop and the third scribed changes to the rubric as agreed upon by all CWRR faculty members. The language of the rubrics was finalized and the collection of student artifacts began in March 2006 and ended in May 2006. The results of the study are included in the Assessment Data and Analysis sections of this report.

While Broad's study on writing assessment cautions against using rubrics to assess student writing, we met and overcame the challenge of using rubrics through full-faculty participation in decision-making processes and with the integration of reflection as a means for assessment. In his study, Broad states that "[v]ery rarely do rubrics emerge from an open and systematic inquiry into a writing program's values" (12). In his visit to Millikin, Broad described scenarios in which rubrics were drafted by individuals, usually by a writing program administrator. Our student learning outcome goals, student artifact identifications and descriptions and the rubrics for assessing the artifacts were developed collaboratively by the CWRR Self-Study Assessment Team and by full-faculty participation in workshops and meetings by those who teach CWRR courses. Such decision-making processes not only overcome the challenges Broad outlines for using rubrics, but, as mentioned before, these meetings and workshops were conducted according to North Central Accreditation's suggestions for establishing appropriate assessment requirements.

Finally, in an attempt not only to assess what we value in student writing but to evaluate what students value in the CWRR two-semester sequence, we developed and integrated reflection into the curriculum of the program. Because one of our student learning outcome goals states that students will gain the ability to reflect on the uses of reading and writing in their public and personal lives to better understand themselves, their communities and the world, CWRR faculty decided to implement reflection activities in either CWRR I or II and to collect a reflective piece of writing from students for assessment. Integrating student reflection into the assessment process is new to the field of first-year writing assessment methods and strategies. In her study on reflection, *Reflection in the Writing Classroom*, Kathleen Blake Yancey spends a chapter addressing reflection and assessment. While she indicates that "*the function of reflection in assessment context isn't entirely clear*" (145), she goes on to examine why it is nevertheless valuable. She argues that the inclusion of student reflection in the assessment process enhances student learning and writing performance: "an engaged learner is likely to perform better, which is the point of education" (146). Through Bob Broad's suggestion that we begin the assessment methodology process by determining what we value, our CWRR faculty determined that student reflection was important, and we created a learning goal to express this value. If reflection is something our CWRR faculty members value in student writing, then Yancey suggests we have to think about why we think it is valuable (145). Through full CWRR faculty workshops and meetings, our program has determined that reflection is valuable for developing students' interpersonal and intrapersonal skills and for cultivating their inquiry and discovery processes. Our faculty also values the input and feedback from students concerning their learning experiences. Through reflection writing, students disclose something about themselves as writers, readers and learners. They also disclose something about their learning needs and the extent to which we are meeting them. Yancey argues that one intent for the use of reflection writing for assessment purposes is "to allow students to share whatever it is that *they think* is relevant, the corollary [to] thinking that we as assessment-designers can't always anticipate what those observations may be" (149). The student reflection artifact is used not only to assess students' interpersonal and

intrapersonal awareness and their inquiry and discovery processes, but also to assess the CWRR Program from the students' perspective. In this way, the program demonstrates that we not only value reflection for learning, but that we also value student input in the assessment process. By including student input in the process, we are able to make changes to the program's curriculum and assessment processes that are appropriate to student learning needs. And by focusing the bulk of our assessment on the qualitative evaluation of student artifacts, we keep students at the center of the program and its decision-making processes.

By establishing a variety of assessment methods, the CWRR Program seeks to gain new insights into the effectiveness of our interactions with first-year students. Examining faculty syllabi provides a way to measure our communication of the goals. The library quizzes provide a way to measure the effectiveness of our instruction of research collaborative with the Staley Library. Collecting student artifacts for evaluation and assessment presents an opportunity to examine the outcomes of all four of our key learning goals in a variety of ways. Each artifact contributes significantly to measuring the success of our delivery of one or more of the four goals. The quantitative survey and the qualitative use of reflection in the assessment process allow us to examine the program from the students' perspectives. By evaluating all four points of data collection, the CWRR Program hopes to gain an understanding of how well we communicate and deliver on our key learning goals.

Points of Data Collection
The CWRR Assessment Team has determined several means for collecting data in order to assess the four student learning outcome goals for the two-course sequence:

1. Faculty Syllabi
2. Library Entrance and Exit Quizzes
3. Student Survey administered through Millikin Office of Institutional Research
4. Student Artifacts (Reading Response, Research Paper, Reflection Piece)

This Spring 2006, we collected and administered all four points of data collection.

Faculty Syllabi
Faculty syllabi were collected in order to determine and measure how clearly and effectively we are communicating our student learning outcome goals to students. We also gathered from these documents specific information regarding the knowledge and skills emphasized in the two-course sequence.

Library Entrance and Exit Quizzes (See Joe Hardenbrook's Self-Study Report on Library Instruction)
The Library Entrance and Exit quizzes were developed and administered by the Staley Library faculty, whose instruction is integrated into CWRR I & II classrooms in order to deliver training on library use and research collection and evaluation. These surveys will help us determine the effectiveness of library instruction and can also indicate the extent to which we deliver on the mission to teach students how to conduct research to participate in academic inquiry.

Student Survey (See Appendix P)
Along with other sequential studies directors, we developed supplemental survey questions for the Your First College Year (YFCY) Survey being administered by Laura Birch, Millikin's Institutional Research Coordinator. The YFCY Survey along with the supplemental questions was distributed to all first-year students Spring 2006 at the end of their first year of study, by CWRR faculty teaching IN 151, the second of the

two CWRR courses. The supplemental questions for the CWRR Program will help us to determine student positions on the nature, impact and importance of the CWRR sequence for their first-year experiences.

Student Artifacts
This Spring 2006, all CWRR II (IN 151) students were asked to submit the following artifacts for evaluation: a reading response, a research essay and a reflection piece. We used a Blackboard course to collect and randomly select artifacts from all CWRR II (IN 151) students. We are using the traffic signal analogy (red, yellow, green) to evaluate and assess. Rubrics have been developed for evaluating each of these student artifacts to determine to what extent we deliver on all four program student learning goals. We have assigned points to all criteria for evaluation to provide an objective report of student success in the CWRR Program.

The 300-word reading response helps assess IN 151 students' various reading skills such as summarizing, responding, critiquing, and synthesizing. The research paper is used to assess IN 151 students' critical writing, research and thinking skills, and was collected and evaluated between May 11 and 16. The student reflection piece helps to assess, from the student's perspective, IN 151 students' abilities to reflect on the uses of reading and writing in their public and personal lives to better understand themselves, their communities and the world. This piece was collected and evaluated between May 11 and 16. The artifacts have been assessed based on the rubrics we have developed for assessing reading, critiquing and writing skills.

Data Collection Links to Student Learning Outcome Goals (See Appendices G, I and K)
Faculty syllabi have been examined to measure how effectively CWRR faculty communicate all four CWRR student learning outcome goals to Millikin's first-year students.

Library entrance and exit quizzes measure the effectiveness of library instruction on students' ability "to conduct research to participate in academic inquiry," CWRR goal 3.

The student survey measures students' perceptions of their abilities to 1) read and critique texts actively, deliberately and carefully 2) write polished, informed essays for personal, public and/or specialized audiences 3) conduct research to participate in academic inquiry and 4) reflect on the uses of reading and writing in their public and personal lives to better understand themselves, their communities and the world. Survey results will measure students' understandings of all four CWRR goals.

The student artifact Reading Response has been used to evaluate CWRR goals 1 & 2: "read and critique texts actively, deliberately and carefully" and "write . . . polished essays for personal, public and/or specialized audiences."

The student artifact Research Essay is used to evaluate CWRR goals 2 & 3: "conduct research to participate in academic inquiry" and "write polished, informed essays for personal, public and/or specialized audiences"

The student artifact Reflection Piece has been used to evaluate CWRR goals 4 & 2: "reflect on the uses of reading and writing in their public and personal lives to better understand themselves, their communities and the world" and "write . . . for personal, public and/or specialized audiences"

Performance Indicators
Each point of data collection will receive a performance indicator using the following rubric:

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.

Blank
Insufficient information available (or governance decision pending).

5. Assessment Data
Faculty Syllabi (See Appendix M)
In the Fall of 2005, CWRR Faculty, in a full-workshop situation, created and agreed upon the student learning outcome goals stated at the beginning of this report. The goals were approved by Council on Curriculum and by the full faculty in the same semester. In December 2005 and January 2006, our faculty members were encouraged through email reminders and discussions at CWRR and English Department meetings to include the newly formed goals in their Spring 2006 CWRR II course syllabi. Of the 27 sections offered in Spring 2006, faculty syllabi were submitted for 26 sections. 17 of the 26 syllabi submitted clearly and articulately state these learning goals in the first one to three pages of the syllabus. 4 of the 26 syllabi submitted used some language from the goals, but did not state them as they were approved by CWRR Faculty, COC and full faculty. 5 of the 26 did not state student learning outcome goals. See Appendix M for examples of successful syllabi for both CWRR I & II.

Prior to establishing these student learning outcome goals, none of the syllabi submitted between Fall 2001 and Fall 2005 contain collective, coherent expectations for learning in CWRR I & II.

Library Entrance and Exit Quizzes (See Joe Hardenbrook's Self-Study Report on Library Instruction)
Joe Hardenbrook's Self-Study Report on Library Instruction will provide the results of library entrance and exit quizzes. This evaluation will account, in part, for the effectiveness of library instruction on students' abilities to "conduct research to participate in academic inquiry," CWRR student learning outcome goal 3 four.

Student Survey (See Appendices P & Q)
The Millikin Institution for Research helped the program to survey first year students completing the CWRR two-course sequence through supplemental questions asked at the end of the Your First College Year (YFCY) Survey (See Appendix P). The CWRR Assessment Team used supplemental questions 39-46 to assess student learning in CWRR; see Appendix Q for the qualitative results of these questions. Questions 39-41 ask students to

evaluate their abilities to read texts actively, deliberately and carefully; these questions correspond to the CWRR Program's student learning outcome goal 1. Question 42 asks students to evaluate their writing abilities; this question corresponds to the CWRR Program's student learning outcome goal 2. Question 43 asks students to evaluate their abilities to conduct research; this question corresponds to the CWRR Program's student learning outcome goal 3. Questions 44-46 ask students to evaluate their abilities to reflect; they correspond to the CWRR Program's student learning outcome goal 4.

YFCY Supplemental Questions 39-46	Evaluates CWRR Student Learning Outcome Goals 1-4
YFCY Supplemental Questions 39-41	Evaluates CWRR Student Learning Outcome Goal 1
YFCY Supplemental Question 42	Evaluates CWRR Student Learning Outcome Goal 2
YFCY Supplemental Question 43	Evaluates CWRR Student Learning Outcome Goal 3
YFCY Supplemental Questions 44-46	Evaluates CWRR Student Learning Outcome Goal 4

15% of the students who were eligible and were provided the opportunity to take the survey did not respond to questions 39-46. 1-3% of students enrolled in CWRR II Spring 2006 did not take the survey.

Of those who did take the survey, the majority agreed that they successfully completed the goals of the course. 71.7% of students either agreed or strongly agreed that they learned how to read and critique texts actively, deliberately and carefully. 73% agreed or strongly agreed that they learned how to write polished, informed essays for varied audiences. 72% agreed or strongly agreed that they learned how to conduct research to participate in academic inquiry. 60% agreed or strongly agreed that they learned how to reflect on the uses of reading and writing in their public and personal lives to better understand themselves, their communities and the world.

Student Artifacts (See Appendices H, J and L)
The following student artifacts were collected from CWRR II courses this Spring 2006. 556 students were enrolled in 28 sections of CWRR II during this semester. The CWRR Self-Study Assessment Team members (Peiling Zhao, Anne Matthews and Carmella Braniger) sampled 10% of students enrolled and examined 55 samples for each artifact.

Reading Response (See Appendix H)
Each Reading Response had the potential for scoring 12 points in three criteria areas: reading skills (5 points), critiquing skills (5 points) and writing skills (2 points). The overall average score for the 55 artifacts examined was 8.72. The average score for each criteria area was 3.781 for reading skills, 3.581 for critiquing skills and 1.36 for writing skills. See Appendix H for a visual representation of this data.

Research Essay (See Appendix J)
Each Research Essay had the potential for scoring 15 points in four criteria areas: research (5), informed (5), audience (3) and polish (2). The overall average score for the 55 artifacts examined was 10.22. The average score for each criteria area was 3.36 for research, 3.581 for informed, 2.127 for audience and 1.1136 for polish. See Appendix J for a visual representation of this data.

Reflection Piece (See Appendix L)
Each Reflection Piece has the potential for scoring 15 points in three criteria areas: interpersonal understanding (5), intrapersonal understanding (5) and inquiry (5). The overall average score for the 55 artifacts examined was 10.59. The average score for each criteria area was 3.69 for interpersonal understanding, 2.99 for intrapersonal understanding and 3.89 for inquiry. See Appendix L for a visual representation of this data.

6. Analysis of Assessment Results

Faculty Syllabi (See Appendices N and O)
The CWRR Program's Self-Study Team assigns a Moderate Green indicator for this point of data collection. A comparative examination of CWRR syllabi submitted prior to the establishment of common program student learning outcome goals and of syllabi submitted in Spring 2006, after shared goals were created, demonstrates not only that we have significantly improved in this assessment area, but reveals an acceptable performance level. Prior to Spring 2006, faculty syllabi do not indicate a cohesive sense of the knowledge and skills emphasized by the two-course sequence. On Spring 2006 CWRR II syllabi, our CWRR faculty made a strong attempt to deliberately, visibly and articulately communicate to students our shared learning goals for CWRR I & II. 65% of the syllabi specifically state the student learning outcome goals, 15% make an attempt and only 20% do not state these goals. With 80% of faculty in compliance, we are clearly headed in the right direction. We will continue to support faculty initiatives to communicate the CWRR Program's student learning outcome goals to students through syllabi.

Library Entrance and Exit Quizzes (See Joe Hardenbrook's Self-Study Report on Library Instruction)
In Joe Hardenbrook's Self-Study Report on Library Instruction, he assigns a Green indicator for this point of data collection. The report provides performance indicators for library entrance and exit quizzes. His evaluation accounts, in part, for the effectiveness of library instruction on students' abilities to "conduct research to participate in academic inquiry," CWRR student learning outcome goal number four. In the report, this CWRR goal receives a Green indicator. Our partnership with the library is clearly headed in the right direction and shows few areas that need immediate attention or improvement.

Student Survey (See Appendix Q)
The CWRR Program's Self-Study Team assigns a Green indicator for this point of data collection. Of those students who took the YFCY Survey, the majority agreed that they successfully completed the goals of the two courses. 71.7% of students either agreed or strongly agreed that they learned how to read and critique texts *actively, deliberately and carefully*, 73% agreed or strongly agreed that they learned how to write polished, informed essays for varied audiences, 72% agreed or strongly agreed that they learned how to conduct research to participate in academic inquiry, and 60% agreed or strongly agreed that they learned how to reflect on the uses of reading and writing in their public and personal lives t*o better understand themselves, their communities and the world*.

Goal 1—Students will be able to read and critique texts actively, deliberately and carefully. Goal 1 is assessed by survey questions 39-41. 72% of students either agreed or strongly agreed that they learned how to read and critique texts *actively*. 70% of students either agreed or strongly agreed that they learned how to read and critique texts *deliberately*. 73% of students either agreed or strongly agreed that they learned how to read and critique texts *carefully*. Because 71.7% of students either agreed or strongly agreed that they learned how to read and critique texts *actively, deliberately and carefully*, the CWRR Program's Assessment Team

concludes that Goal 1 should receive a Moderate Green indicator. According to the performance indicators, a Green indicator suggests clear movement in the right direction. From the point of view of our students, the CWRR Program should continue to support faculty initiatives to teach active reading skills and an immediate change in course of action is not needed.

Goal 2—Students will be able to write polished, informed essays for personal, public and/or specialized audiences. Goal 2 is assessed by survey question 42. Because 73% agreed or strongly agreed that they learned how to write polished, informed essays for varied audiences, the CWRR Program's Self-Study Assessment Team concludes that Goal 2 should receive a Moderate Green indicator. According to the performance indicators, a Green indicator suggests that an immediate change in course of action is not needed. From the point of view of our students, the CWRR Program is headed in the right direction and should continue to support faculty as they work to teach students how to successfully use writing skills.

Goal 3—Students will be able to conduct research to participate in academic inquiry. Goal 3 is assessed by survey question 43. Because 72% agreed or strongly agreed that they learned how to conduct research to participate in academic inquiry, the CWRR Program's Self-Study Assessment Team concludes that Goal 2 should receive a Moderate Green indicator. According to the performance indicators, a Green indicator suggests that, from our students' perspectives, the program is headed in the right direction in teaching research, and that immediate change is not necessary. The CWRR Program will continue to support both the program's faculty and the library faculty, who help with research instruction, in all efforts to deliver on this student learning outcome goal.

Goal 4—Students will be able to reflect on the uses of reading and writing in their public and personal lives to better understand themselves, their communities and the world. Goal 4 is assessed by survey questions 44-46. 63% of students either agreed or strongly agreed that they learned how to reflect on the uses of reading and writing *to better understand the self*. 56% of students either agreed or strongly agreed that they learned how to reflect on the uses of reading and writing *to better understand communities*. 61% of students either agreed or strongly agreed that they learned how to reflect on the uses of reading and writing *to better understand the world*. Because 60% agreed or strongly agreed that they learned how to reflect on the uses of reading and writing in their public and personal lives *to better understand themselves, their communities and the world*, the CWRR Program's Self-Study Assessment Team concludes that Goal 2 should receive an Advanced Yellow indicator. According to the performance indicators, an Advanced Yellow indicates an acceptable level of students' awareness of the importance of reflection. The questions used to evaluate this goal received the lowest scores. This indicates two areas for development: pedagogy and practice. If the language of reflection is better integrated into the CWRR coursework and classroom, then students could more clearly understand what they are asked to evaluate in the survey. And, more importantly, since CWRR courses may be one of the first places students encounter the meta-cognitive process of reflection, students may simply need more practice reflecting throughout the two-course experience before they can adequately evaluate their learning in this area.

Student Artifacts (See Appendices H, J & L).
The CWRR Program's Self-Study Team assigns an Advanced Yellow indicator for this point of data collection. Faculty evaluation of student artifacts indicates from Low Yellow to

Borderline Green student articulation and performance of all four student learning outcome goals.

Goal 1—Students will be able to read and critique texts actively, deliberately and carefully. Goal 1 is assessed by the "Reading" and "Critiquing" criteria from the Reading Response student artifact rubric, the "Informed" criterion from Research Essay student artifact rubric, and the "Inquiry" criterion from the Reflection Piece student artifact criteria. All four criteria areas show students performing at or above the Yellow performance indicator, as defined in the Assessment Methods section of this report. According to our assessment of these three artifacts, the CWRR Program's Self-Study Assessment Team concludes that Goal 1 should receive an Advanced Yellow performance indicator. According to the performance indicators, an Advanced Yellow indicates an acceptable level in student's reading, critiquing, synthesizing and inquiry processes.

Goal 2—Students will be able to write polished, informed essays for personal, public and/or specialized audiences. Goal 2 is assessed by the "Critiquing" and "Writing" criteria from the Reading Response student artifact rubric, the "Informed," "Audience" and "Polished" criteria from the Research Essay student artifact rubric, and the "Intrapersonal" and "Interpersonal" criteria from the Reflection Piece student artifact rubric. According to our assessment of these three artifacts, the CWRR Program's Self-Study Assessment Team concludes that in Goal 2,writing should receive an Advanced Yellow performance indicator, audience a Low-to-Medium Yellow performance indicator, and polish a Low Yellow performance indicator. According to the performance indicators, an Advanced Yellow in writing indicates an acceptable level in students' abilities to write well-positioned judgments, to be engaged in active conversations with what they read and to formulate well-positioned arguments or opinions. A Low-to-Medium performance indicator for audience suggests the need to address student awareness of personal, public and specialized audiences. A Low Yellow performance indicator for polished writing suggests the need for improvement in students' abilities to compose a well-organized, properly documented and edited/proofread document.

Goal 3—Students will be able to conduct research to participate in academic inquiry. Goal 3 is assessed by the "Research" and "Informed" criteria from the Research Essay student artifact rubric and the "Inquiry" criterion from the Reflection Piece student artifact rubric. According to our assessment of these two artifacts, the CWRR Program's Self-Study Assessment Team concludes that Goal 3 should receive an Advanced Yellow. We assign this indicator because we see an acceptable level of students' abilities to use research to form their own opinions and an even more acceptable level of students' awareness of their inquiry processes.

Goal 4—Students will be able to reflect on the uses of reading and writing in their public and personal lives to better understand themselves, their communities and the world. Goal 4 is assessed by the "Interpersonal," "Intrapersonal" and "Inquiry" criteria from the Reflection Piece student artifact rubric. According to our assessment of this artifact, the CWRR Program's Self-Study Assessment Team concludes that Goal 4 should receive a borderline Green performance indicator. We assign this indicator because we see a highly acceptable level in all criteria areas except Intrapersonal Understanding. This suggests that we are moving in the right direction, but need to develop recommendations for increasing students' intrapersonal awareness.

7. Initiatives and Improvement Plans
The Critical Writing, Reading and Research faculty not only have an initial, but a fundamental encounter with first-year students; this encounter is essential in ensuring student success at Millikin University. Full-time English Department faculty are committed to teaching the two-semester sequence. In their pursuits to enhance student learning, they are always looking for creative, innovative and effective pedagogies and learning environments to guarantee that students become better critical writers, readers, researchers and thinkers.   Relationships with faculty outside the English Department, such as partnerships with the Staley Library and University Seminar faculty, further enrich student learning and faculty development. By keeping our class sizes within the recommendations of ADE and MLA, and by complying with teaching load standards, the CWRR Program offers faculty and students the chance to interact and engage with one another in thoughtful and critical ways.

As our faculty continually engage in experimental pedagogies, we believe that we can improve student learning in CWRR by 1) enhancing the delivery of our four student learning outcome goals 2) continuing to support faculty development opportunities, as well as the structures that uphold the program and 3) contributing strategies and methods that promote and support writing in a computer classroom. Other improvements and initiatives will come from reflection on the analysis presented in this report.

Clearly Communicate Student Learning Outcome Goals (See Appendices N & O)
Because over 50% of the syllabi specifically state the student learning outcome goals, 20% make an attempt and only 15% do not state these goals, we are noticeably headed in the right direction with the program's initiative to clearly articulate learning expectations to our students. When measuring the success of CWRR faculty in clearly communicating student learning outcome goals on their syllabi, our Team assigns a Green performance indicator (See Appendices N & O).   Continuing support and reminders will be provided to ensure we maintain a green performance indicator in this assessment area.

Enhance the Delivery of Student Learning Outcome Goals
An overall assessment of the CWRR Program's four student learning outcome goals reveals that our students are not far from effectively reaching these goals. The YFCY survey results indicate that students are successfully completing the program's student learning outcome goals and that the CWRR Program is meeting their needs as our faculty continually improve teaching strategies and pedagogies. According the CWRR Assessment Team's analysis of the student survey results, goals 1-3 receive Moderate Green indicators and goal 4 receives an Advanced Yellow indicator (see Appendix Q). From the students' perspective, the program is productively delivering on all four student learning outcome goals. Additionally, the Staley Library's Green indicator assessment of student performance in conducting research for academic inquiry suggests that, with the help of the Staley Library faculty, we are headed in the right direction with regard to student learning outcome goal 3 (See Joe Hardenbrook's Self-Study Report on Library Instruction).

The student artifacts examined and evaluated gives the program clear indications for initiatives and improvements. The average scores for each artifact collected and examined demonstrate Yellow to Advanced Yellow performance indicators (See Appendices H, J & L). A report on student learning outcome goals and performance indicators will be delivered to full CWRR faculty at the first CWRR meeting of the Fall 2006 semester. The two-hour CWRR Fall 2006 workshop will be dedicated to making plans and initiatives for enhancing the delivery of student learning outcome goals based on our examination of student artifacts.

Goal 1—Students will be able to read and critique texts actively, deliberately and carefully. According to our assessment of these three artifacts, the CWRR Program's Self-Study Assessment Team concludes that Goal 1 should receive an Advanced Yellow performance indicator. According to the performance indicators, an Advanced Yellow indicates an acceptable level in student reading, critiquing, synthesizing, and inquiry processes. We are headed in the right direction in helping students read and critique texts. As we move toward achieving a highly acceptable level of teaching and learning in this area, faculty will work together to determine appropriate methods and pedagogies for enhancing students' abilities to read and critique texts actively, deliberately and carefully.

Goal 2—Students will be able to write polished, informed essays for personal, public and/or specialized audiences. According to the performance indicators, an Advanced Yellow in writing indicates an acceptable level in students' abilities to write well-positioned judgments, to be engaged in active conversations with what they read and to formulate well-positioned arguments or opinions. A Low-to-Medium Yellow performance indicator for audience suggests the need to address student awareness of personal, public and specialized audiences. A Low Yellow performance indicator for polished writing suggests the need for improvement in students' abilities to compose a well-organized, properly documented and edited/proofread document. To make improvements in audience awareness, and in students' abilities to write well-organized, edited and proofread documents, faculty will work together to share resources, methods and pedagogies for making appropriate adjustments to increase rates of improvements in these areas.

Goal 3—Students will be able to conduct research to participate in academic inquiry. According to our assessment of these two artifacts, the CWRR Program's Self-Study Assessment Team concludes that Goal 3 should receive an Advanced Yellow. We assign this indicator because we see an acceptable level of students' abilities to use research to form their own opinions and an even more acceptable level of students' awareness of their inquiry processes. As we celebrate student curiosity and inquiry in the research process, CWRR faculty will continue to work together and with Staley Library faculty toward excellence as faculty guide students in conducting research and fairly using a variety of reliable sources to participate in ongoing academic conversations and inquires.

Goal 4—Students will be able to reflect on the uses of reading and writing in their public and personal lives to better understand themselves, their communities and the world. According to our assessment of this artifact, the CWRR Program's Self-Study Assessment Team concludes that Goal 4 should receive a borderline Green performance indicator. We assign this indicator because we see a highly acceptable level in all criteria areas except Intrapersonal Understanding. This suggests that we are moving in the right direction, but need to develop recommendations for increasing students' intrapersonal awareness. As we celebrate our greatest strength, which is students' highly acceptable performance in their abilities to reflect, we will look for ways to integrate the language of reflection into the classroom, to provide guided reflective activities and to help students develop a more sensitive awareness of themselves as audience.

As we work on initiatives and improvements in the delivery of the CWRR Program's learning outcome goals, we will celebrate our strengths and address areas for improvement. Because our students our close to performing at highly acceptable levels of learning, the

program is headed in the right direction. With minimal changes in the delivery methods and pedagogies used to teach the course, and simple awareness of performance indicators for each student learning outcome goal, faculty can easily move students toward excellent performance in the areas of reading, critiquing, synthesizing, making informed judgments and opinions, research, inquiry and reflection. Continual efforts by CWRR faculty to work collaboratively to improve instruction in audience awareness, essay organization, editing and proofreading will help us to improve student success in the program. Our two-hour CWRR Fall 2006 workshop and our CWRR monthly faculty meetings will be dedicated to initiatives and improvement plans for student learning in CWRR.

Continue Faculty Development and Program Support Structures

Program Support Structures

Currently, Title III funds are being used to help ensure support structures for the program. The CWRR Assessment Team (Carmella Braniger, Anne Matthews and Peiling Zhao) and the CWRR Director (Carmella Braniger) are compensated for the time and energy they bring to the program as they both systematize and complete assessment methods and organize faculty support and curriculum improvements. All CWRR Assessment Team members have been intimately involved in the creation of the current assessment methods for the program. As Director, I not only lead the Assessment Team efforts, but also organize monthly CWRR faculty meetings, where faculty who teach the courses meet to discuss teaching and assessment issues. This year, I led two CWRR two-hour workshops in order to involve the entire CWRR faculty in the decision-making processes for assessment of the program. These meetings and workshops were conducted according to North Central Accreditation's suggestions for establishing appropriate assessment requirements. There has been full-faculty involvement in the development of the CWRR Program's assessment processes. Our goals for the future include reporting assessment results to the full CWRR faculty in Fall 2006. In doing so, we hope to encourage another NCA goal: "ongoing faculty use of the information acquired from the assessment" (Letter from NCA Officer Randy Brooks, September 08, 2005). CWRR Faculty will review the assessment report from 2005-2006 and plan initiatives based on this report. We also hope to work more closely with the University Seminar Program to integrate "writing, oral communication and critical thinking skills as cumulative" as is also recommended by NCA (Letter from NCA Officer Randy Brooks, September 08, 2005). Such continued coordination will enhance University Studies sequential courses required of all Millikin students.

When Title III funds are no longer available to support the structure of the program, we hope the university will find a way to continue supporting the program. According to professional organizations ADE and MLA, one way to compensate directors and assessment team members is to give "a reduced teaching load if they have been assigned major administrative duties" (*ADE Bulletin*, No. 132, 74). To ensure an equitable work environment for faculty members "who are required to contribute substantially to departmental and college governance," ADE and MLA recommend that the full teaching load of such faculty members be decreased.

Student Research Assistant Funding

The generous decision of the Title III committee to fund a student research assistant for data collection, organization and preparation has aided tremendously in completing the assessment process for this year and preparing for future assessments. This decision also offered a first-year Millikin student the opportunity to extend and expand her learning of and engagement with reading, writing, research and reflection. We hope to continue this important faculty/student

engagement. Next year, we plan to ask the Title III committee again to offer a student the opportunity to engage in institutional research by funding a full-time Student Research Assistant for the CWRR Program.

June CWRR Faculty Development Workshop: Teaching Guide Handbook
As CWRR Director, I initiated, organized and submitted a proposal for funding a two-day CWRR workshop to be held June 2006 in order to involve CWRR faculty in the creation of a handbook for teaching both courses. This initiative was accepted and funded by the Development Funds Advising Team (DFTA). The workshop will take place June 1 & 2. CWRR faculty will meet to discuss and organize the creation of a handbook on the instruction of CWRR I & II at Millikin. Our deliverable is a CWRR Teaching Guide Handbook for new and part-time faculty. The handbook will be ready by August 1, 2006.

<u>Promote and Support Writing in a Computer Classroom</u>
Technology
One of our initiatives for the upcoming year is to increase the number of sections of CWRR offered in electronic labs and classrooms. As our need for electronic classroom space and lab settings for writing instruction increases, we need to consider finding a centralized, dedicated electronic classroom environment for CWRR instruction. Not only have students coming to Millikin become accustomed to the electronic learning environment, new full-time and part-time faculty have been well-trained at other institutions for teaching first-year writing in the electronic classroom.

In order to move toward "a literacy of the screen" (CCCC), the CWRR Program needs to continue to initiate and support access to information technologies for faculty members and students. There is a need for our program to address technological literacy as a curriculum initiative, as well. A portion of this need is fulfilled through the Staley Library's cooperation with the CWRR Program in library instruction components. But CWRR's next main step toward addressing this initiative will be to establish a set of clear practices for teaching CWRR in the electronic classroom. A good portion of our June CWRR Faculty Development Workshop will address issues of technology use in the CWRR classroom for incoming faculty. A set of best practices for teaching in the electronic classroom will appear in the CWRR Teaching Guide Handbook that our faculty will create this Summer. Such an initiative addresses CCCC's position on the importance of teaching writing in digital environments.

In addition to establishing best teaching practices in the CWWR electronic classroom, we should consider revising our Student Learning Outcome Goals to reflect technological literacy. Because writing instruction is "delivered contextually," CCCC recommends the following: "institutional mission statements should . . . inform decisions about teaching writing digitally in the same way that they should inform any curricular and pedagogical decisions." A focus on improving the program this year will be to address technological literacy in the program's curriculum, pedagogy and assessment. Moreover, CWRR faculty with experience in teaching writing in the electronic classroom will take on the initiative to start the process toward a proposed dedicated electronic learning environment for the teaching of CWRR courses. Such dedication demonstrates institutional support of equitable access to information technology for students and faculty.

Other Improvements and Initiatives
Other improvements and initiatives will come from reflection on the analysis presented in this report and will be delivered at the first CWRR meeting of the next academic year 2006-2007. Future initiatives and improvements should always include ongoing assessment processes and full CWRR faculty participation in decision-making processes.