<div align="center">
Millikin University
Report on Student Learning in Critical Writing, Reading & Research I & II
IN 150 & IN 151 MPSL First-Year Writing Requirement
Academic Year 2012-2013
by Dr. Carmella Braniger, IN150/151 Coordinator
July 1, 2013
</div>

Executive Summary

Critical Writing, Reading, and Research I & II are sequential requirements in the Millikin Program of Student Learning. The two-courses are part of our University Studies Program's interdepartmental sequential curriculum required of all students (Traditional, Enhanced, Honors, and Pace). CWRR's four student learning outcome goals—critical reading, writing, research, and reflective thinking skills—are vital to a successful transition to college and to the long-term academic, professional, and personal success of a diverse student body. The requirement fulfills specific university-wide student learning goals—critical reading, writing, inquiry, and expression of self.

To assess how the CWRR program helps students achieve the requirement's learning outcome goals, we use direct authentic assessment of student-produced artifacts. Our method directly assesses all learning outcome goals through evaluating a percentage sampling of three student artifacts—a reading response, a research essay and a reflection piece— collected from all sections of CWRR II. Each goal connects and is assessed by one or more of three different student artifacts collected. All goals connect specifically to the MPSL goals and the vision of the university, as well as the university's emphasis on performance-learning. To that end, a performance-learning new opportunity, the MPW (Millkin's Premiere Writers) Contest, was proposed and supported this year by students, faculty, and administration. This student-directed contest and subsequent anthology publication (produced by Bronze Man Books and set to be released Spring 2014) highlights the very best writing of Millikin's first-year students. This incentive of such recognition has the potential for improving the overall performance of students in the CWRR program.

Our assessment of the CWRR program in 2012-2013 reveals that our students are can use more help successfully reaching the goals of the program, especially the research goal. Assessment of the three student artifacts clearly indicates that students are performing at adequate and excellent levels in achieving all four learning outcome goals: **Yellow for Goals 1, 2, and 3, and Green for Goal 4**. Analysis of student artifacts also indicates that students are performing at adequate and excellent levels in all of the three artifacts: **Yellow** for the research essay artifact, **Yellow** for the reading response artifact, and **Green** for the reflection piece.

A brief assessment of our norming was conducted for this year's report. The assessment revealed that faculty assessors have a similar understanding of the criteria and performance expectations for the reading response and research essay artifacts. There is more deviance in the scoring of the reflection artifact, demonstrating less of an understanding of the criteria and expectations for this artifact. We will continue to discuss the reflection artifact and share our assignments with one another during CWRR workshops and roundtables, in order to better facilitate a more consensual understanding of our expectations as assessors of student work.

Six suggestions and four new recommendations should be considered further improving the performance of the CWRR program. Faculty teaching in the CWRR Program should: continue to monitor trends in class size, staff overload, and the use of technology; continue to refine assessment process; continue to review and enhance the delivery of Goals 2, the research goal; continue to explore venues such as the MPW contest for sharing, among CWRR faculty and students, writing assignments, student writings, and other CWRR-related discourse; continue to meet regularly to discuss teaching strategies and best practices for teaching the research essay, in particular, but all assignments, as well; continue review of new faculty syllabi by Coordinator of the First Year Writing Program prior to teaching.

Four Recommendations
1) Utilize the Writing Center. Require students to attend to receive help onthe research essay.
2) Reduce the number of adjuncts teaching in the program.
3) CWRR Committee should revise the research rubric and present to faculty for approval by Spring 2013.
4) Utilize the department mentor program to help improve the teaching of writing, reading, research, and reflection.

This assessment report will be delivered electronically to all CWRR faculty by the end of August 2013 and discussed at the first CWRR meeting of the year in Fall 2013. Such delivery and discussion will help CWRR faculty make appropriate adjustments to their CWRR courses in Fall 2013 and Spring 2014. The subsequent monthly CWRR meetings in 2011-2012 should be devoted mainly to implementing the recommendations made in this report.

1. CWRR Program Learning Outcome Goals

Critical Writing, Reading, and Research I & II are sequential requirements in the Millikin Program of Student Learning. The learning outcome goals for both Critical Writing, Reading and Research I & II are for students to:

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; and
4. reflect on engagements with critical reading, writing and research to acquire, examine and present self-awareness about those engagements.

1.1 Learning Story

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 their intellectual inquiry by investigating and researching a topic of their choice. Both classes emphasize vital skills for academic and professional success and place importance on reading, writing, research, and reflection for a personal life of meaning and value for all learning areas and occasions.

1.2 Curriculum Map

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

1.3 Connections to MPSL & University-Wide Learning Outcome Goals

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 contributes primarily to professional success preparation and significantly to the development of a personal life of meaning and value.

CWRR Goals 1, 2 &3 helps prepare students for professional success by introducing students to qualitative inquiry methods and general technological literacy; asking students to reflect on the uses of reading and writing (CWRR I & II Goal 4) prepares students for a life of personal meaning and value. While there are opportunities for CWRR I & II to contribute to the development of 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 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.

In addition to its considerable contributions to the delivery of Millikin's three prepares and the MPSL student learning outcome goals, the CWRR program also works to introduce students to Millikin's theory/practice model by integrating writing and researching theories and rhetorics into the reading, writing, research, and reflective skills they frequently practice in the program. And this year (2012-2013), we piloted a performance-learning opportunity for CWRR students: The MPW Contest, which is described below, as well as participation by many sections of CWRR in Celebrations of Scholarship.

2. Snapshot: Overview of CWRR Program in 2011-2012

This report will provide a brief overview of types and numbers of courses offered per semester, variety of students served, facilities, faculty & staff, class sizes & faculty loads, partnerships external to the program, and programmatic support structures and program review methods for the 2011-2012 academic year.

Snapshot of IN 150/151—Fall 2012-Spring 2013

FALL 2011

Professor Name	Type & #	F/P	# Students Traditional	# Students Honors	# Students Enhanced	# Students PACE	Facilities
Fall 2012, IN151							
Matthews, Anne	(P-1)	F				18	SCO 005**
Minicucci, Matthews	(T-1)	P	36				SH 328*
Total # IN151 Students Served		**1 F/ 1 P**	**36**			**18**	
Total # IN151 Students Served Fall 2011							**54**
Fall 2012, IN150							
Banerjee, Purna	(T-2)	F	40				SH 409*
Braniger, Carmella	(H-1)	F		20			LIB 08* &LIB MUELLER**
Julie Bates	(T-1)	P	20				SH 302*
Crowe, Judi	(T-1, H-1, E-1)	F	21	20	15		Lib. 29*
Frech, Stephen	(T-1)	F	20				SCO 109*
George, Michael	London	London	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Gilpin, Vicky	(T-1)	P	19				SH 420*
Henson, Katie	(T-3)	F	62				SCO 315,* SCO 309*
Jewett, Michelle	(T-1)	F	20				SH 409*
Lambert, Scott	(T-2)	F	20				SH 420*
Magagna, Tony	Fulbright	Fulbright	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Matthews, Andy	(T-2)	P	39				SH 409*
Matthews, Anne	(E-2, P-1)	F			32	9	SH308
O'Conner, Michael	(H-2)	F		44			SCO 005**
Outland, Ruth	(T-3)	F	59				SH 303*, 320*, 328*
Talley, Erin	(T-2)	P	39				SCO 213*
Thimell, Karen	(T-2)	P	32				SH 302,* 320*
Total # IN150 Students Served		**10 F /5 P**	**391**	**84**	**47**	**9**	**537**
Total # IN150 Students Served Fall 2011							**537**
Grand Total # Students Served FA11			**TRAD**	**HONORS**	**ENHANCED**	**PACE**	**TOTAL**
			427	**84**	**47**	**27**	**585**

*Indicates Room with Tech Station   **Indicates Computer Lab

SPRING 2012

Professor Name	Type & #	F/P	# Students Traditional	# Students Honors	# Students Enhanced	# Students PACE	Facilities
Spring 2012, IN150							
Matthews, Anne	(T-1)	F	13		NA		SH 316*
Henson, Katie	(T-1)	P	9		NA		SH 302*
Stimeling, Melanie	(P-1)	P			NA	4	SCO 010**
Total		**2F/1 P**	**22**		**NA**	**4**	
Total # IN150 Students Served Spring 2012							**26**
Spring 2011, IN 151							
Banerjee, Purna	(T-2)	F	32		NA		SH 319*, SH 322*
Braniger, Carmella	(H-2)	F		34	NA		LIB 08*, Mueller**
Bates, Julie	(T-1)	P	20		NA		SH 316*
Crowe, Judi	(T-2, H-1)	F	32	12	NA		Lib 29*, K128*
Gilpin, Vicky	(T-1)	P	17		NA		SH 316*
Henson, Katie	(T-2)	F	40		NA		SH 412*
Frech, Stephen	(T-1)	F	20		NA		SH 310*
George, Michael	(T-2)	F	39		NA		SH 420*
Jewett, Michelle	(T-2)	F	32		NA		SCO 418*
Magagna, Tony	Fulbright	Fulbright	0	0	NA	0	SCO 313*
Matthews, Anne	(T-1)	F	21		NA		SH 302*
Matthews, Andy	(T-2)	P	40		NA		Lib 08*
Wright, David	(T-1)	P	15		NA		SH 312*
Stimeling, Melanie	(P-1)	P				14	Mueller**
Outland, Ruth	(T-3)		58				SH 316*, 319*, 420*
O'Conner, Michael	(H-2)	F		37	NA		Lib 29*, Mueller**
Lambert, Scott	(T-1)	F	21		NA		SH 319*
Total		**11 F/ 5P**	**387**	**83**	**NA**	**14**	
Total # IN151 Students Served Spring 2012							**484**
Grand Total # Students Served SP12			**TRAD**	**HONORS**	**ENHANCED**	**PACE**	**TOTAL**
			409	83	NA	18	510
GRAND TOTAL of STUDENTS SERVED ANNUALLY							
Grand Total # Students Served Fall 2011							**585**
Grand Total # Students Served Spring 2012							**510**
Grand Total # Students Served 2011-2012							**1095**

*Indicates Room with Tech Station   **Indicates Computer Lab

2.1 Trends in Staff

The following chart gives an overview in trends of the types and numbers of faculty teaching CWRR courses per semester. There is an overall trend for an increasing use of adjuncts in the CWRR classroom. In Fall 2012, 5-6 adjuncts taught in the program, as opposed to 2 adjuncts in Fall 2005. Full-time contributions are more consistent and preferred. We need to decrease our use of the number of adjuncts teaching these important courses.

	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	SP 06	FA 05
Full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty	8	8	9	10	DM	11	11	9	9	8	8	8	9	10	10
Full-time contractual faculty	3	3	1	1	DM	1	1	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3
Part-time adjunct Faculty	5	6	5	6	DM	5	4	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2
Total	16	17	15	17		17	16	13	14	13	13	13	14	15	15

2.2 *Trends in Types and Numbers of Courses Taught*

Types and Numbers of Courses Taught	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
150 Enhanced	3	3	DM	2	2	2	2	2
150 Traditional	23	22	DM	21	20	21	22	27
150 Honors	4	3	DM	4	4	4	4	2
150 PACE	2	2	DM	2	1	0	1	2
CWRR I Total	**32**	**30**	**DM**	**29**	**27**	**27**	**29**	**33**
151 Traditional	24	22	DM	25	21	22	24	21
151 Honors	4	3	DM	6	6	4	4	5
151 PACE	2	2	DM	2	2	4	1	3
CWRR II Total	**30**	**27**	**DM**	**33**	**29**	**30**	**29**	**29**
150/151 Total	**62**	**57**	**DM**	**62**	**56**	**57**	**58**	**62**

The above trend chart reveals that the total number of CWRR courses offered in 2012-2013 was 5 sections more than last year's and equal to 2009-2010. Offerings of IN150 went up two sections in Fall 2012, following a general increase in enrollment university-wide. The 2012-2013 entering class was much larger than previous years (around 525). We continued to offer one additional section of Enhanced to help address the growing developmental needs of our incoming first-year students. Offerings of IN151 went up by 3 sections, as well. The Honors program enrollment was up in 2012-2013, resulting in one additional section each of Honors IN150 and IN151 offerings in Fall and Spring semesters. PACE offerings remained consistent.

The lack of difference seen in the number of IN151 sections offered in the Spring semester suggests retention of first year students is improving, as the total number of sections offered between Fall and Spring only decreased by 2 sections, rather than the normal 3. This year, new caps were put in place for Honors and Enhanced, at 15 each. Such increase explains, in part, the increase in # of sections. While Traditional sections will remain at 20, we will continue to work to set those limits at 17, if administration will support these best practice caps.

A breakdown of different types of courses shows the following trends: we offered 2 more CWRR, 5 more CWRR II, 2 additional Honors, the same and I number of PACE. Overall, the distribution of different types of CWRR courses followed the trend in the past four years, with fluctuation in the Honors program, Edge, and persistence between semesters and with accommodations made for the larger incoming freshmen class.

2.3 Syllabi Review
All syllabi were reviewed for alignment with learning outcome goals. With the exception 25% of syllabi needing to identify artifacts for final assessment collections, all syllabi clearly articulate the learning outcome goals and align with standards of the program.

2.4 Class Size and Staff Workload
According to the guidelines, policies, and recommendations of the professional groups in the field of composition and rhetoric, 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).

Trends in Class Size:

	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Average Class Size	17.7	19.5	Data Missing	19	18.58	18.07	18.6	19.51

The average class size for any one section during 2012-2013 was 17.7, compared to 19.5 in 2011-2012, 19 in 2009-2010, 18.58 in 2008-2009, 18.07 in 2007-2008, 18.6 in 2006-2007, and 19.51 in 2005-2006. This is the smallest average class size and the largest freshman class we've had in years. We were able to effectively increase our number of sections and decrease the average class size, and without increasing costs. This is excellent administrative management of the program.

The average class size for Fall 2012 was 18.3 (compared to 19.8 in Fall 2011) and for Spring 2013 was 17 (compared to 19.2 in Spring 2012). In 2012-2013, the average class size for Enhanced CWRR was 15.6; for Honors was 18.5; 11.25 for PACE; and 17 for Traditional.

The cap size maintains the integrity of best practices, particularly regarding developmental/ remedial courses and is efficient and cost-effective for the university. In fact, with support of administrators (Academic Deans and VPAA), we were able to effectively lower the average cap by 2 students per section, without increasing FTE. This goes a long way toward the goal of capping all IN150/151 courses at between 15-17 students.

Trends in Staff Workload:
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). The average number of CWRR courses taught by each full and part-time faculty in 2009-2010 was 1.88, which is a bit lower than the trend in the past four years (2.15 in 2009-2010, 2.15 in 2008-2009, 2.19 in 2007-2008, 2.15 in 2006-2007, and 2.06 in 2005-2006).

Two full-time faculty were on leave in Fall 2012 (Mike George and Tony Magagna) and one in the Spring 2013 (Tony Magagna). Their leaves account, in part, for the number of faculty taking overloads for IN150/151, and in part for the number of adjuncts needed to help cover their CWRR obligations.

In 2012-2013, 2 full-time tenure-track faculty taught 3 CWRR sections in both Fall 2012 and Spring 2013; 1 full-time contractual faculty member taught 3 CWRR sections both semesters in a row; 3 full-time tenure-track faculty taught only one section of CWRR each semester. PACE demands, too, increase faculty load in CWRR, putting one faculty member on overload in Fall 2012 with four sections of CWRR in one semester. Four sections fall outside best practices and endangers the teaching and learning processes for both faculty and students.

2.5 Trends in Facilities
In 2012-2013, CWRR courses were taught in the following locations: Shilling Hall, Staley Library, and ADM-Scovill Hall. Following the trend in past years, the majority of the sections were taught in Shilling Hall and ADM-Scovill, with mostly Honors classes meeting in Staley Library. Most faculty are requiring facilities equipped with technology for teaching the two courses, choosing to teach in either a classroom with technology available to the instructor or a traditional/computer lab split configuration. We believe that teaching writing using technology is imperative to student success in the 21st century.

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: ". . . of print and . . . of the screen." The position statement argues that each "medium is used to *enhance learning* in the other" (italics added).

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. Luckily, during 2012-2013, under the leadership of President Jeffcoat, we saw new computer stations installed in well over a half dozen classroom in Shilling Hall alone, making it much easier to meet the technology demands of our faculty teaching in the program. 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 continue to increase in the CWRR Program. While we have seen significant changes in availability of technology in teaching classrooms, improvements can still be made. The program should endure to advocate for continued provision of such facilities.

2.6 Support Structures: Leadership, CWRR Faculty Development, & Performance Learning

Leadership and Faculty Development: The CWRR Program has developed a strong tradition of leadership structure and support. The Coordinator of the First Year Writing Program leads the program, sits with the other University Studies Coordinators, works with the Director of First Year Experience, the Director of the Office of Student Programs, and the Library Instruction Coordinator to help build and coordinate a high quality program.

The Coordinator of the First Year Writing program offers leadership and support to the program through taking responsibilities for 1) helping schedule effective offerings of the CWRR each fall and spring semester, including the gathering of course descriptions and syllabi for all sections; 2) mentoring new faculty and coordinating among all faculty, observing and evaluating their classroom teaching; 3) holding workshops and meetings to facilitate faculty development opportunities for all CWRR faculty; 4) overseeing the annual CWRR assessment process; 5) leading the CWRR assessment team in assessing data and writing the annual assessment report; 6) collaborating with related university programs such as the First Year Experience Team (Freshman Seminar, Student Programs, etc.), Writing Center, and especially with the librarians for integration of library instruction. Through these support structures, faculty member 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.

New Initiative in Performance-Learning—"MPW Contest": In an effort to engage first-year writing students in performance learning opportunities, undergraduate fellow Brittany Mytnik & Critical Writing, Reading, and Research Coordinator, Dr. Carmella Braniger, worked together to organize and launch the inaugural Millikin's Premier Writers Contest.

To participate in the contest, students submitted abstracts of their work for participation in Celebrations of Scholarship, Spring 2013, and for subsequent publication in a collection of first-year students' essays. Twelve students were chosen to present at COS. Of those twelve, five of the very best essays were selected for publication in a new anthology for first-year writers by the

MPW editorial team consisting of Brittany Mytnik, Jordan Pennington, Morgan Ewald, Amy Fehr, Kara Anderson, and Nicole Johnson.

The purpose of the contest is to reward and celebrate student achievement by publishing exceptional work, to motivate students to generate quality essays, and to provide students with a sense of audience for their academic writing. MPW gives first-year students the opportunity to make a name for themselves in the academic community from the start of their college careers. At Millikin, we believe in performance learning, and there's no better way to "perform" writing than to put it on display through Celebrations of Scholarship and in the final anthology publication.

3. <u>Assessment Process</u>

3.1 Assessment Methods
Because of our emphasis on learning-by doing or performance-learning, it is only fitting that our primary assessment method is direct authentic assessment of Student Artifacts (Reading Response, Research Paper, and Reflection Piece), which provide substantial qualitative data about student performance in each goal area.

In 2012-2013, we collected artifacts from Pace, Honors, Enhanced, and Traditional sections in both Spring and Fall semesters. Reflection artifacts were collected in IN150; this collection process marks a new change in our assessment processes. Research essays and reading responses were collected in IN151. A total of 415 reflection artifacts, 302 reading responses, and 335 research essays were collected directly from students through Moodle courses designed for student submissions. Our primary method directly assesses all learning outcome goals through evaluating a 10% sampling of three student artifacts—this year, 30 reading responses, 33 research essays and 42 reflection pieces. Cindie Zelhart, University Studies Coordinator, collates and distributes 10% of collected artifacts to the CWRR Assessment Team members for evaluation. We use rubrics (see appendices) to assess the four learning outcome goals that are imbedded in the three types of student artifacts collected.

Full-time CWRR faculty members assess student artifacts annually. Each year, three CWRR faculty members serve on the CWRR Assessment Team: Coordinator of the CWRR Program, one permanent assessment team member, and one rotating CWRR faculty member. For the annual assessment, the three assessment team members meet for a pre-assessment norming meeting, where they discuss the rubrics, score the sample artifacts using the rubrics, and then compare their scores with each other. They then discuss the similarities and discrepancies among the three scores and use this discussion as a way to generate consensus about using the rubrics.

Assessment team members individually score the artifacts assigned to them by University Studies Coordinator, Cindie Zelhart, and meet again for a post-assessment meeting, during which they share their scores, observations, and reflections and make recommendations on improving, assessing, and delivering the program. The Director collects the assessment results and recommendations, makes tabulations and charts, makes assessments, and writes the annual report. The Assessment Team also meets between the annual assessments to discuss ways to implement the recommendations and respond to the needs and concerns of the CWRR faculty.

3.2 Assessment Data: Student Artifacts

All CWRR II students are asked at the end of CWRR I & II to submit the following artifacts for evaluation: a reading response, a research essay and a reflection piece. We use the Moodle to collect and randomly select artifacts from all CWRR students. We are using "traffic signal" performance indicators (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. The reading response helps assess IN 151 students' reading skills such as summarizing, responding, critiquing, and synthesizing. The research paper is used to assess students' critical writing, research and thinking skills. The student reflection piece helps to assess, from the student's perspective, their abilities to reflect on the uses of reading, writing, and research skills in their public and personal lives to better understand themselves, their communities, and the world.

3.3. Data Collection Links to Student Learning Outcome Goals
All data are collected to assess the four learning outcome goals:

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

- The student artifact Reading Response is 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 3 & 2: "conduct research to participate in academic inquiry" and "write polished, informed essays for personal, public and/or specialized audiences"
- The student artifact Reflection Piece is 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."

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

3.4 Assessment Rubrics: Performance Indicators
All student artifacts are assessed with rubrics (see Appendix for Reading Response Assessment Rubric, Research Essay Assessment Rubric, and Reflection Piece Assessment Rubric). Each point of data collection receives a performance indicator using the following scale:

CWRR Artifact Performance Indicators (Scale Based on Percents):

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.

Blank: Insufficient information available (or governance decision pending).

4. Assessment Analysis
This report will present the data collected and evaluate the effectiveness of our courses in helping students meet the CWRR learning goals based on their performances.

4.1 Reading Response Performance 2012-2013 (Yellow)

Reading Response Artifact received a Yellow performance indicator (72%).

Average	Reading	Critiquing	Writing	Overall
2012-2013	3.8 (76%)	3.4 (68%)	2.1 (70%)	9.3 (72%)
2011-2012	3.6 (72%)	3.1 (62%)	2.5 (83%)	9.2 (71%)
2010-2011	Data Missing	Data Missing	Data Missing	Data Missing
2009-2010	3.86 (77%)	3.43 (68.6%)	2.52(84%)	9.82 (75.5%)
2008-2009	3.467 (69.33%)	2.566 (85.55%)	2.566 (85.55%)	9.983 (76.79%)

Reading Response Performance in the Past Seven Years

Year	Nominal (Red—Stop)	Adequate (Yellow--Caution)	Excellent (Green—Go)
2006-2007		68.95%	
2007-2008			80.61%
2008-2009			76.79%
2009-2010			75.5%
2010-2011	Data Missing	Data Missing	Data Missing
2011-2012		71%	
2012-2013		72%	

4.2 Research Essay 2011-2012 (Yellow)

Research Essay artifact received a Yellow performance indicator (65%).

	Research	Informed	Audience	Polished	Total
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%)
2008-2009	4.103 (82.06%)	3.8234 (76.47%)	2.632 (88%)	1.5 (74%)	12.06(80.39%)

Research Essay Performance in the Past Seven Years

Year	Nominal (Red—Stop)	Adequate (Yellow--Caution)	Excellent (Green—Go)
2006-2007		68.69%	
2007-2008			74.38%
2008-2009			80.34%
2009-2010			77.13%
2010-2011	Data Missing	Data Missing	Data Missing
2011-2012		74%	
2012-2013		65%	

4.3 Reflection Artifact 2012-2013 Green

Reflection Artifact Received a Green performance indicator (80%).

Year	Identification and articulation of self-awareness 1-5 pts	Critical Examination and Evaluation of Self-Awareness 1-5 pts	Presentation of Self awareness to public audience 1-5 pts	Total score 15 pts
2012-2013	4.3 (86%)	3.9 (78%)	3.9 (78%)	12 (80%)
2011-2012	4.1 (82%)	3.8 (76%)	4.1 (82%)	12.02 (80%)
2010-2011	Data Missing	Data Missing	Data Missing	Data Missing
2009-2010	2.65 (53%)	2.88 (57.6%)	2.68 (53.6%)	8.74 (58.2%)
2008-2009	2.91 (58.28%)	2.293 (45.86%)	3.00 (60%)	8.207 (54.71%)

Reflection Performance in the Past Seven Years

Year	Nominal (Red—Stop)	Adequate (Yellow--Caution)	Excellent (Green—Go)
2006-2007		54.73%	
2007-2008		61.11%	
2008-2009		54.71%	
2009-2010		58.2%	
2010-2011	Data Missing	Data Missing	Data Missing
2011-2012			80%
2012-2013			80%

The average of the overall score for each of the three types of artifacts in 2012-2013 was 72%, a strong yellow level, which still exceeds the average of all previous years of data collection except last year (2011-2012). Such comparison shows that the overall performance of the CWRR Program is consistent with the trend in the past four years, and it is strengthening particularly in the area of reflection. Overall, the CWRR program shows success in two artifacts: reading response and reflection essay. More than ever, attention is needed for instruction on the research essay, which received one of the lowest scores for this artifact in the history of our assessment.

CWRR Overall Artifact Performance (Average of Three Artifacts):

Year	Nominal (Red—Stop)	Adequate (Yellow--Caution)	Excellent (Green—Go)
2006-2007		63.88%	
2007-2008		71.70%	
2008-2009		70.35%	
2009-2010		70.28%	
2010-2011	Data Missing	Data Missing	Data Missing
2011-2012			75%
2012-2013		**72%**	

4.2 Comprehensive Analysis of Four Learning Outcome Goals

Analysis of the average score of individual components contributing to corresponding goals offers a comprehensive assessment of how our students perform on each goal.

Artifact	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3	Goal 4
Reading response: comprehending and critiquing	Green (76%)	Yellow (68%)		
Reading Response: writing		Yellow (70%)		
Research Essay: informed, audience, polished	Yellow (67%)	Yellow (70%) & Red (50%)		
Research essay: research, informed	Yellow (67%)		Yellow (68%)	
Reflection: Identification and articulation of self awareness				Green(86%)
Reflection: Critical Examination and evaluation of self awareness				Green (78%)
Reflection: Presentation of self awareness		Green (78%)		

Overall Performance of Each Learning Goal

	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3	Goal 4
Average Score	70%	67%	68%	82%
Performance indicator	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Green

Goal 1—Read critically to comprehend, analyze and evaluate (Advanced Yellow 70%)

Goal 1 is assessed by a combination of criteria: the "Reading" and "Critiquing" criteria from the Reading Response and the "Informed" criterion from Research Essay. In 2012-2013, Goal 1 received an Advanced Yellow indicator, indicating that Goal 1 is heading in the right direction but needs some attention from the program to adjust strategies and approaches in order to reach higher level of performance.

Goal 2—Write polished, informed essays for personal, public and/or specialized audiences. (Yellow 67%)

Goal 2 is assessed by a combination of the following seven criteria: the "Critiquing" and "Writing" criteria from the Reading Response, the "Audience" and "Polished" criteria from the Research Essay. According to our assessment of these criteria, the CWRR Program's Self-Study Assessment Team concludes that Goal 2 should receive a Yellow indicator (67%).

Goal 3—Conduct research to participate in academic inquiry. (Yellow 68%)

Goal 3 is assessed by the "Research" criteria from the Research Essay student artifact rubric. The CWRR Program's Self-Study Assessment Team concludes that Goal 3 should receive a Yellow indicator. The committee recommends that the program continue to target the areas of research and informed use of sources when teaching the research essay in CWRR2.

Goal 4— Reflect formally on engagements with critical reading, writing and research to acquire, examine and present self-awareness about those engagements (Green 82%)

Goal 4 is assessed by the first two 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 Green (82%) performance indicator. Efforts to improve reflective learning in CWRR has been successful. No change is needed at this time. Faculty should continue what they are doing with regard to teaching reflection.

5. Assessing the Assessors

The following data shows the results of our norming session, held on Thursday, May 23 at 10am in SH415. Present were colleagues Dr. Anne Matthews, Judi Crowe, Dr. Jeff Kirchiff, and Dr. Carmella Braniger. As a new full time faculty member (Fall 2013) and expert in Composition and Rhetoric, Dr. Kirchiff was there to observe the conversation among seasoned faculty assessors Dr. Matthews, Dr. Braniger, and Prof. Crowe.

During the norming session, each participant read and scored the same artifact for each area of collection: reading response, reflection, research essay. We then compared scores and discussed our rationales for each score. The conversation included suggestions for a small revision to the reflection rubric ("and/or"), which appears in the rubric attached to this report. We also discussed revising the research essay significantly to better assess exactly where students are struggling in the process. Adding a new category (organization) and combing two others (research and informed) might better enable us to better understand how to teach the research essay. This should be a top priority for the CWRR Committee.

The following charts report the average scores given by each assessor on all criteria areas of the rubrics. Also reported is the average score for each artifact, as well. These are not connected out to the goals, specifically, but instead indicate broader trends in our assessment methods.

5.1 Reading Response Performance 2012-2013 (Yellow)

Reading Response Artifact									
		Assessor #1							
	Reading (5)	Critiquing (5)	Writing (3)		Artifact Total				
Average	3.1	3.2	2.3		8.6 YELLOW				
	62%	64%	77%		66%				
	YELLOW	YELLOW	GREEN						
		Assessor #2						Reading Response Artifact	
Average	3.5	3.5	1.9		8.9 YELLOW			EXCELLENT	10.5 TO 13
	70%	70%	64%		69%			ADEQUATE	7 TO 10.5
	YELLOW	YELLOW	YELLOW					Nomial	1 TO 6.5
		Assessor #3							
Average	4.5	3.09	1.92		9.46 YELLOW				
	89%	62%	64%		73%				
	GREEN	YELLOW	YELLOW						

5.2 Research Essay 2011-2012 (Yellow)

Research Essay

	Assessor #1					Artifact Total			
	Research (5)	Informed (5)	Audience (3)	Polished (2)				Research Essay	
Average	3.3	2.81	2.1	1.09	9.36	YELLOW		EXCELLENT	12 TO 15
	66%	56%	70%	55%		62%		ADEQUATE	8 TO 11
	YELLOW	NOMINAL	YELLOW	NOMINAL				NOMINAL	1 TO 7
	Assessor #2								
Average	3.3	3.42	2.1	0.92	9.75	YELLOW			
	66%	68%	70%	46%		65%			
	YELLOW	YELLOW	YELLOW	NOMINAL					
	Assessor #3								
Average	3.45	3.6	2.1	1.08	10.3	YELLOW			
	69%	72%	70%	55%		69%			
	YELLOW	YELLOW	YELLOW	NOMINAL					

5.3 Research Essay 2011-2012 (Yellow)

Reflection Essay

	Assessor #1					Artifact Total			
	Identification	Critical exam	Presenation of self awarer					Reflection Essay	
Average	3.75	3.5	3.6	10.9		YELLOW			
	75%	70%	72%			73%			
	GREEN	YELLOW	YELLOW					Reflection Essay	
	Assessor #2							Excellent	12 to 15
Average	4	3.9	3.9	11.9		GREEN		Adequate	8 to 11
	80%	78%	78%			79%		Nominal	1 to 7
	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN						
	Assessor #3								
Average	4.3	3.7	3.5	12.3		GREEN			
	86%	74%	70%			82%			
	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN						

The most significant conclusions to draw here are the striking similarities in scores among assessors for the research essay and reading response. With such little variation, it is safe to say we have a clear understanding of the artifact expectations and our evaluation tools. While we may still want to expand our rubric for the research essay to gather more data, clearly, there is stability in terms of student outcome expectations for this artifact. The differences to note in the scores among assessors are in relation to the reflection artifact. While assessor #3 tends to trend higher on all the artifacts, the difference between assessor #1 & #3 on the reflection artifact is 10%. Note, too, that while all three assessors' percentage scores resulted in the same performance indicator for the research essay and reading response, assessor #1's scores consistently resulted in yellow indicators, while assessors #2 & #3 rated the reflection artifact green.

5.4 Assessing the Assessors: At a Glance

Reading Response Artifact

	Assessor #1				Artifact Total		Reading Response Artifact	
	Reading (5)	Critiquing (5)	Writing (3)					
Average	3.1	3.2	2.3		8.6 YELLOW			
	62%	64%	77%		66%			
	YELLOW	YELLOW	GREEN					
	Assessor #2						**Reading Response Artifact**	
Average	3.5	3.5	1.9		8.9 YELLOW		EXCELLENT	10.5 TO 13
	70%	70%	64%		69%		ADEQUATE	7 TO 10.5
	YELLOW	YELLOW	YELLOW				Nomial	1 TO 6.5
	Assessor #3							
Average	4.5	3.09	1.92		9.46 YELLOW			
	89%	62%	64%		73%			
	GREEN	YELLOW	YELLOW					

Reflection Essay

	Assessor #1			Artifact Total		Reflection Essay	
	Identification	Critical exam	Presenation of self awarer				
Average	3.75	3.5	3.6	10.9 YELLOW			
	75%	70%	72%	73%			
	GREEN	YELLOW	YELLOW				
	Assessor #2					**Reflection Essay**	
Average	4	3.9	3.9	11.9 GREEN		Excellent	12 to 15
	80%	78%	78%	79%		Adequate	8 to 11
	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN			Nominal	1 to 7
	Assessor #3						
Average	4.3	3.7	3.5	12.3 GREEN			
	86%	74%	70%	82%			
	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN				

Research Essay

	Assessor #1				Artifact Total		Research Essay	
	Research (5)	Informed (5)	Audience (3)	Polished (2)				
Average	3.3	2.81	2.1	1.09	9.36 YELLOW		**Research Essay**	
	66%	56%	70%	55%	62%		EXCELLENT	12 TO 15
	YELLOW	NOMINAL	YELLOW	NOMINAL			ADEQUATE	8 TO 11
	Assessor #2						NOMINAL	1 TO 7
Average	3.3	3.42	2.1	0.92	9.75 YELLOW			
	66%	68%	70%	46%	65%			
	YELLOW	YELLOW	YELLOW	NOMINAL				
	Assessor #3							
Average	3.45	3.6	2.1	1.08	10.3 YELLOW			
	69%	72%	70%	55%	69%			
	YELLOW	YELLOW	YELLOW	NOMINAL				

6. Recommendations and Improvement Plans

Based on synthesized information presented in this report, the CWRR Program Assessment Team makes recommendations and improvement plans that further enhance the quality of the program. Our detailed assessments of each artifact and each learning outcome goal suggest that the student artifact assessments have been useful and effective in evaluating the delivery of our CWRR program. While believing that we need to continue with our established methods, the Assessment Teams recommends the following plans for further improving our CWRR program.

Six suggestions and four new recommendations should be considered further improving the performance of the CWRR program. Faculty teaching in the CWRR Program should:

Six Suggestions
1) continue to monitor trends in class size, staff overload, and the use of technology;
2) continue to refine assessment process;
3) continue to review and enhance the delivery of Goals 2, the research goal;
4) continue to explore venues such as the MPW contest for sharing, among CWRR faculty and students, writing assignments, student writings, and other CWRR-related discourse;
5) continue to meet regularly to discuss teaching strategies and best practices for teaching the research essay, in particular, but all assignments, as well;
6) continue review of new faculty syllabi by Coordinator of the First Year Writing Program prior to teaching.

Four Recommendations
1) Utilize the Writing Center. Require students to attend to receive help on all three artifacts, especially the research essay.
2) Reduce the number of adjuncts teaching in the program.
3) CWRR Committee should revise the research rubric and present to faculty for approval by Spring 2013.
4) Utilize the department mentor program to help improve the teaching of writing, reading, research, and reflection.

This assessment report will be delivered electronically to all CWRR faculty in Fall 2013 and discussed at the First CWRR meeting. Such delivery and discussion will help CWRR faculty make appropriate adjustments to their CWRR courses in Fall 2013 and Spring 2014. The subsequent monthly CWRR meetings in 2013-2014 will be devoted to fostering best teaching practices across sections and to implementing the recommendations made in this report.

Appendices A & B

A. CWRR Student Artifact Descriptions 2012-2013

Reading Response Artifact Description (Revised in 2009)

The reading response artifact targets primarily learning outcome goal 1 (read critically to comprehend, analyze, and evaluate the texts).
- The reading response artifact may take various forms—reading response essay, annotation, or journal entry;
- The reading response should emphasize reading skills such as summarizing, analyzing, and critiquing/evaluating
- The reading response should include a summary, analysis, and critique of a common reading;
- The length should be 2-3 pages or 600-900 words;
- The reading response must be collected from students after detailed instruction and guided practices on the expected reading skills

Research Essay Description (Revised in 2009)

This research essay artifact targets primarily Goal 2 and Goal 3.
- Individual instructors have the liberty to decide the topics suitable for the research essay;

- **T**he proper length should be 10-15 pages (between 3,000 and 4,500 words);

- Individual instructors have the liberty to decide documentation style used for the research essay (MLA, APA, or Chicago Style). Please ask students to number the pages, double-space the document and include a title page;

- The research essay should be assigned and collected as the last major non-collaborative research project of IN151;

- Individual instructors should give detailed guidance and instruction to the students and to allow students sufficient time and chances to revise their paper with feedback from peers and/or instructors.

Reflection Artifact Description (Revised in 2009)

The reflection artifact targets primarily Goal 4.
- The reflection essay should be collected after guided discussions and practices on reflections on students' engagements with reading, writing, and research;
- The reflection essay should be 3-5 double-spaced pages or 1,200-15,00 words.

 Reflection Assessment Rubric
Goal 4: Reflect on critical reading, writing and research experiences to acquire, examine and present new knowledge about the self in relation to the public.

B. CWRR Student Artifact Assessment Rubrics 2011-2012

Reading Response Artifact Assessment Rubric
(revised in 2007)
Millikin University
Critical Writing, Reading and Research Program
Student Learning Evaluation

Evaluation of CWRR Goal 1 & 2: "read and critique texts actively, deliberately, and carefully" and "write . . . polished essays for personal, public, and/or specialized audiences"
Item Evaluated: **Reading Response**
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 contains a passive paraphrasing of the major aspects of the reading. 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 either careful, well-supported, and well-positioned judgments about the reading and/or active conversation with the reading. [5 points]	An adequate reading response contains only some careful, supported and positioned judgments and/or passive engagement with the reading. [3 points]	A nominal response contains no judgments 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

Millikin University CWRR Program Dr. Carmella Braniger   07/2012

Research Essay Artifact Assessment Rubric
2006-2007
Millikin University
Critical Writing, Reading and Research Program
Student Learning Evaluation

Evaluation of CWRR Goal 2 & 3: **"conduct research to participate in academic inquiry"; "write polished, informed essays for personal, public, and/or specialized audiences"**
Item Evaluated: **Research Essay**
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 find and fairly use a variety of reliable sources in order to assimilate, synthesize, make judgments about/use these sources to participate in ongoing academic conversations and inquiries. [5 points]	An adequate research essay demonstrates inconsistent attempts to find and use a variety of reliable sources & to evaluate and synthesize these sources. Student may make an attempt to enter academic conversations. [3 points]	A nominal research essay demonstrates little or no attempt to use and evaluate multiple sources. [1 point]	
Informed	An excellent research essay demonstrates the student's abilities to formulate a well-positioned and well-supported argument or opinion by critically synthesizing multiple perspectives. [5 points]	An adequate research essay demonstrates the student's inconsistent attempt to formulate an argument or opinion by critically synthesizing multiple perspectives. [3 points]	Nominal essay demonstrates no attempt to recognize other perspectives, relies heavily on sources; no clear opinion. [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 specialize 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 well-organized, properly-documented, and carefully edited piece in a confident and personal voice. [2 points]	An adequate research essay demonstrates the student's inconsistent attempt to write in a confident, personal voice. The student may make errors in documentation and/or grammar. [1 point]	A nominal research essay demonstrates little or no attempt to edit and to document. Lacks a personal voice. [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

Millikin University CWRR Program Dr. Carmella Braniger   07/2012

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

	EXCELLENT (GREEN-- GO)	ADEQUATE (YELLOW—CAUTION)	NOMINAL (RED—STOP)	POINTS
Identification and articulation of Self-awareness	An excellent reflection demonstrates student's ability to clearly identify and articulate new knowledge about the self and/or reading, writing, and research processes	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 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