Millikin University
Report on Student Learning in Critical Writing, Reading & Research I & II
IN 150 & IN 151 MPSL First-Year Writing Requirement
Academic Year 2013-2014
by Dr. Carmella Braniger, IN150/151 Coordinator
July 1, 2014

Executive Summary

Critical Writing, Reading, and Research I & II are sequential requirements in the Millikin Program of Student Learning (MPSL). 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 new performance-learning 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 released on an annual basis in the Spring semester) highlights the very best writing of Millikin's first-year students. The incentive of such recognition has the potential for improving the overall performance of students in the CWRR program. The success of this endeavor points to future conversations with CWRR faculty about what performance learning looks like in the first-year writing classroom.

Our assessment of the CWRR program in 2013-2014 reveals that our students are can use more help successfully reaching all goals of the program. 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, 3, and 4; Green for Goal 2**. 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, **Green** for the reading response artifact, and **Yellow** for the reflection piece. While all artifacts were fairly similar in performance across the set of goals, it was clear from scores and comments that students' reading and reflection summary skills were stronger than their reading and reflection analysis. Research essays are informed but not properly documented throughout. In particular, lack of direct citation was observed on most research artifacts receiving yellow and red performance indicators. Six suggestions and three new recommendations should be considered for further improving the performance of the CWRR program.

Six Suggestions:
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 processes; continue to review and enhance the delivery of all four goals; 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, reading response and reflection piece; continue review of new faculty syllabi by Coordinator of the First Year Writing Program prior to teaching.

Four Recommendations
1) Work to define what performance-learning means for the CWRR program faculty and students.
2) Improve pedagogical instruction on all four student-learning outcomes. Focus on the difference between summary and analysis in both reading responses and reflections. Focus on integration of research, direct citation, and proper documentation for the research essay.
3) Utilize the department mentor program to help improve the teaching of writing, reading, research, and reflection.
4) Reduce the number of adjuncts teaching in the program. Support and mentor the adjuncts we do retain.

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 2014. Such delivery and discussion will help CWRR faculty make appropriate adjustments to their CWRR courses in Fall 2014 and Spring 2015. The subsequent monthly CWRR meetings in 2013-2014 should be devoted mainly to implementing the recommendations made in this report.

1. CWRR Program Learning Outcome Goals

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 prepares:

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. For the past two year, we've worked to pilot 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 2013-2014

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 2013-2014 academic year.

Snapshot of IN 150/151—Fall 2013-Spring 2014

FALL 2013

Professor Name	Class: Type&#	Full/PT	# Students Traditional	# Students Honors	# Students Enhanced	# Students PACE	Facilities
Fall 2013, IN151							
Matthews, Anne	(P-1)	F				12	SCO 006**
Henson, Katie	(T-2)	F	35				SH 317*
Total # IN151 Students Served		**2 F**	**35**			**12**	
Total # IN151 Students Served Fall 2013							**47**
Fall 2013, IN150							
Case, Juli	(T-1)	P	21				SH 420
Braniger, Carmella	(H-1)	F		17			LIB 08* & LIB MUELLER**
Hine, Angela	(T-1)	P	12				SCO 212*
Crowe, Judi	(T-2, H-1)	F	41	20			Lib. 29*, SH312*
Frech, Stephen	(T-1)	F	21				SH 323*
George, Michael	(T-1, P-1)	F	20			7	SCO 06*, SH322*
Gilpin, Vicky	(T-1)	P	20				SH312*
Henson, Katie	(T-1)	F	20				SCO 319*
Lambert, Scott	(T-3)	F	62				SH 323*, SH315*
Magagna, Tony	(T-3)	F	55				SH 303*, SH319*, SH 322*
Matthews, Andy	(T-2)	P	40				SH 311, SH420
Matthews, Anne	(E-2)	F			29		SH308
O'Conner, Michael	(H-2)	F		42			MUELLER**, SCO 005**
Kirchoff, Jeff	(T-2)	F	41				SH 303*,
Total # IN150 Students Served		**10 F /4 P**	**353**	**79**	**29**	**7**	
Total # IN150 Students Served Fall 2013							**468**
Grand Total # Students Served FA13		**TRAD**	**HONORS**	**ENHANCED**	**PACE**	**TOTAL**	
		388	**79**	**29**	**19**	**515**	

*Indicates Room with Tech Station   **Indicates Computer Lab

SPRING 2014

Professor Name	Class: Type & #	Full/PT	# Students Traditional	# Students Honors	# Students Enhanced	# Students PACE	Facilities
Spring 2014, IN150							
Matthews, Anne	(P-1)	F			NA	4	SCO 010**
Case, Juli	(T-2)	P	23		NA		SH 409*
Total		**1 F/1 P**	**23**		**NA**	**4**	
Total # IN150 Students Served Spring 2014							**27**
Spring 2014, IN 151							
Braniger, Carmella	(H-1, T-1)	F	19	22	NA		LIB 08*, Mueller**
Cox, Aubrie	(T-2)	P	39		NA		SH 310*
Crowe, Judi	(T-1, H-1)	F	19	18	NA		Lib 29*
Gilpin, Vicky	(T-1)	P	20		NA		SH 420*
Henson, Katie	(T-2)	F	40		NA		SH 303*
Frech, Stephen	(T-1)	F	20		NA		SH 327*
Magagna, Tony			40				SCO 319*, SH412*
Matthews, Anne	(T-2, P-1)	F	42		NA	10	SH 308*, SCO 010*
Matthews, Andy	(T-1)	P	19		NA		Lib 08*
Hine, Angela	(T-2)	P	21		NA		SH 322*
Kirchoff, Jeff	(T-2)	F	40				SCO 5**, 211*, 315*
O'Conner, Michael	(H-2)	F		36	NA		Mueller**
Lambert, Scott	(T-1)	F	24		NA		SH 318*
Total		**8 F/ 4P**	**343**	**76**	**NA**	**10**	
Total # IN151 Students Served Spring 2014							**429**
Grand Total # Students Served SP14		**TRAD**	**HONORS**	**ENHANCED**	**PACE**		**TOTAL**
		366	76	NA	14		456
GRAND TOTAL of STUDENTS SERVED ANNUALLY							
Grand Total # Students Served Fall 2013							**515**
Grand Total # Students Served Spring 2014							**456**
Grand Total # Students Served 2013-2014							**971**

*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. While there has been an overall trend for an increasing use of adjuncts in the CWRR classroom, this academic year shows that we decreased the number of adjunct faculty teaching in Fall 2013 by two. In Fall 2013, 4 adjuncts taught in the program, as opposed to 6 adjuncts in Fall 2012. In Spring, the number of adjuncts teaching remained consistent, with 5 adjuncts each semester. Full-time contributions are more consistent and preferred. These fluctuations are due, in part, to full-time faculty returning who were on leave, Fulbright, or study abroad. In general, we need to continue to decrease our use of the number of adjuncts teaching these important courses.

	SP 14	FA 13	SP 13	FA 12	SP 12	FA 11	2011-2012	SP 10	FA 09	SP 09	FA 08	SP 08	FA 07	SP 07	FA 06	SP 06	FA 05
Full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty	7	8	8	8	9	10	DM	11	11	9	9	8	8	8	9	10	10
Full-time contractual faculty	3	3	3	3	1	1	DM	1	1	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3
Part-time adjunct Faculty	5	4	5	6	5	6	DM	5	4	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2
Total	15	15	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	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
150 Enhanced	2	3	3	DM	2	2	2	2	2
150 Traditional	20	23	22	DM	21	20	21	22	27
150 Honors	4	4	3	DM	4	4	4	4	2
150 PACE	1	2	2	DM	2	1	0	1	2
CWRR I Total	**27**	**32**	**30**	**DM**	**29**	**27**	**27**	**29**	**33**
151 Traditional	20	24	22	DM	25	21	22	24	21
151 Honors	4	4	3	DM	6	6	4	4	5
151 PACE	2	2	2	DM	2	2	4	1	3
CWRR II Total	**26**	**30**	**27**	**DM**	**33**	**29**	**30**	**29**	**29**
150/151 Total	**53**	**62**	**57**	**DM**	**62**	**56**	**57**	**58**	**62**

The above trend chart reveals that the total number of CWRR courses offered in 2013-2014 was 9 sections less than last year's and the lowest number of sections offered since 2007-2008. Offerings of IN150 went down 5 sections in Fall 2013, following a general decrease in enrollment university-wide. The 2013-2014 entering class was much smaller than previous years (around 450). We offered one less section of Enhanced, three less traditional and the same number of Honors and PACE. Offerings of IN151 went down by 4 sections, as well. The Honors program enrollment was up again in 2013-2014, resulting in one additional section each of Honors IN150 and IN151 offerings in Fall and Spring semesters. PACE offerings remain 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. Due to financial conscientiousness among administration and faculty, we have decided to keep the cap for Traditional sections at 20 for the next several years. However, we will maintain a cap of 17 for Honors sections and 15 for Enhanced.

A breakdown of different types of courses shows the following trends: we offered 4 less CWRRI sections, 4 less CWRR II sections, the same number of Honors, and the same and of number of PACE. Overall, the distribution of different types of CWRR courses followed the trend in the past four years, with persistence between semesters and overall fluctuation in the traditional and enhanced with accommodations made for the smaller incoming freshmen class.

2.3 Syllabi Review
All syllabi were reviewed for alignment with learning outcome goals. 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:

	2013-2014	2012-2013	2011-2012	2010-2011	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Average Class Size	18.3	17.7	19.5	Data Missing	19	18.58	18.07	18.6	19.51

The average class size for any one section during 2013-2014 was 18, compared to 17.7 in 2012-2013, 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. The average class size is consistent over time and in alignment with best practices in the discipline. This is excellent administrative management of the program.

The average class size for Fall 2013 was 18.4 (compared to 18.3 in Fall 2012) and for Spring 2013 was 17 (compared to 17 in Spring 2013). In 2013-2014, the average class size for Enhanced CWRR was 14.5; for Honors was 19.4; 8.25 (compared to last year's 11.25) for PACE; and 18.9 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 1-2 students per section, without increasing FTE. This goes a long way toward the goal of capping all IN150/151 courses at between 15-20 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 1.76, which is a bit lower than the trend in the past five years (1.88 in 2012-2013, 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).

One full-time faculty did not teach CWRR in Spring 2014 (Mike). 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 2013-2014, 3 full-time tenure-track faculty taught 3 CWRR sections in both Fall 2013 and Spring 2014; 1 full-time tenure track and 1 contractual faculty member taught 3 CWRR sections in Fall 2013; 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 both Fall 2013 and Spring 2014. However, no one faculty member taught over 3 sections in one semester, keeping the program in alignment with best practices.

2.5 Trends in Facilities
In 2013-2014, 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.

In 2014-2015, the CWRR program will be under new leadership. Dr. Jeffery Kirchoff was hired last year, with the intention of his transition into leadership of CWRR. His excellence in teaching and dedication to the department demonstrate his ability to lead the program into the future. One of the initiatives he hopes to accomplish during his coordinatorship will be to obtain program recognition by the CCCC certificate in excellence opportunity. We welcome Dr. Kirchoff's expertise in composition and rhetoric and look forward to the new energies he will bring to the CWRR 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. 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. Next year, we hope to integrate use of these anthologies into the CWRR classrooms. In fact, many faculty have already expressed interest in using the anthology of first-year research essays to help teach the research project in IN151 CWRRII. CWRR students and faculty in the future will directly benefit from this performance learning opportunity.

Recognition for New Initiative in Performance-Learning—"MPW Contest": Along with undergraduate research fellow Brittany Mytnik, I attended the annual Allerton Articulation Conference 2014, in Monticello, IL, April 16, where we discussed the efforts of Millikin University's undergraduate writing program to cultivate undergraduate student writing endeavors and provide performance-learning opportunities for Millikin first-year writers, including publication in the annual first-year writing anthology, *Millikin's Premier Writers*. We were well-received by our colleagues, who were excited for the opportunity to hear about our university's recognition of first-year writing students' successes. They were pleased to see a publication focusing on the professionalization of first-year writers, who often find a lack of audience or purpose in their composition classrooms. Much of the excellence achieved by the accomplishment of MPW rests with the impact such a publication can have not only for the students who are published in it, but also for the third-party constituents involved in the performance learning opportunity: all CWRR students who read the publication as an example of performance expectations for first-year writing. Our goal is to continue conversations with CWRR faculty about the use of MPW in the first-year writing classroom. The more real-world constituents we have involved in this performance learning endeavor, the greater the stakes for the department and program to argue for the value of two semesters of writing in the first year. These arguments will be crucial to build as we face continued cuts to curriculum across the university.

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 2013-2014, we collected artifacts from Pace, Honors, Enhanced, and Traditional sections in both Spring and Fall semesters. As last year, reflection artifacts were collected in IN150. Research essays and reading responses were collected in IN151. A total of 410 reflection artifacts, 291 reading responses, and 293 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, 29 reading responses, 29 research essays and 41 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 2013-2014 (Green)

Reading Response Artifact received a Yellow performance indicator (76%).

Average	Reading	Critiquing	Writing	Overall
2013-2014	3.8 (76%)	3.6 (72%)	2.5 (83%)	9.88 (76%)
2012-2013	3.8 (76%)	3.4 (68%)	2.1 (70%)	9.3 (72%)
2011-2012	3.6 (72%)	3.1 (62%)	2.5 (83%)	9.2 (71%)
2010-2011	Data Missing	Data Missing	Data Missing	Data Missing
2009-2010	3.86 (77%)	3.43 (68.6%)	2.52(84%)	9.82 (75.5%)
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%**	
			76%

4.2 Research Essay 2013-2014 (Yellow)

Research Essay artifact received a Yellow performance indicator (69%).

	Research	Informed	Audience	Polished	Total
2013-2014	3.5 (70%)	3.5 (70%)	2.4 (80%)	1.2 (60%)	**10.4 (69%)**
2012-2013	3.4 (68%)	3.3 (67%)	2.1 (70%)	1 (51%)	**9.8 (65%)**
2011-2012	3.7 (74%)	3.6 (72%)	2.4 (80%)	1.5 (75%)	**11.1 (74%)**
2010-2011	Data Missing	Data Missing	Data Missing	Data Missing	**Data Missing**
2009-2010	3.87 (77.4%)	3.625 (72.5%)	2.428 (80.9%)	1.642 (82.1%)	**11.57(77.13%)**
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%**	
		69%	

4.3 Reflection Artifact 2013-2014 Green

Reflection Artifact Received a Green performance indicator (65%).

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
2013-2014	3.5 (70%)	3.3 (66%)	3 (60%)	9.78 (65%)
2012-2013	4.3 (86%)	3.9 (78%)	3.9 (78%)	12 (80%)
2011-2012	4.1 (82%)	3.8 (76%)	4.1 (82%)	12.02 (80%)
2010-2011	Data Missing	Data Missing	Data Missing	Data Missing
2009-2010	2.65 (53%)	2.88 (57.6%)	2.68 (53.6%)	8.74 (58.2%)
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%
		65%	

The average of the overall score for each of the three types of artifacts in 2013-2014 was 70%, a strong yellow level. The overall performance of the CWRR Program is consistent with the trend in the past four years, and it is strong this year particularly in the area of reading. Overall, the CWRR program shows success with one artifact: the reading response. Continued work on the research essay will continue to improve student success on this artifact. We should also refresh our instruction on the reflection essay, which showed a decrease in score this academic year.

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%	
		70%	

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 (74%)			
Reading Response: writing		Green (83%)		
Research Essay: informed, audience, polished	Green (75%)	Yellow (60%)		
Research essay: research, informed			Yellow (68%)	
Reflection: Identification and articulation of self awareness				Yellow (70%)
Reflection: Critical Examination and evaluation of self awareness				Yellow (66%)
Reflection: Presentation of self awareness		Yellow (60%)		

Overall Performance of Each Learning Goal

	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3	Goal 4
Average Score	75%	68%	68%	68%
Performance indicator	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow

Goal 1—Read critically to comprehend, analyze and evaluate (Green 75%)

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 2013-2014, Goal 1 received a Green indicator, indicating that Goal 1 is heading in the right direction.

Goal 2—Write polished, informed essays for personal, public and/or specialized audiences. (Yellow 68%)

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 (68%), with need for further improvement on this goal.

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 (Yellow 68%)

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 Yellow (68%) performance indicator. Efforts to improve reflective learning in CWRR has been successful in the past. Faculty should review what they are doing with regard to teaching reflection.

5. <u>Recommendations and Improvement Plans</u>

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, 3 & 4, the writing, research, and reflection goals;
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
5) Work to define what performance-learning means for the CWRR program faculty and students.
6) Improve pedagogical instruction on all four student-learning outcomes. Focus on the difference between summary and analysis in both reading responses and reflections. Focus on integration of research, direct citation, and proper documentation for the research essay.
7) Utilize the department mentor program to help improve the teaching of writing, reading, research, and reflection.
8) Reduce the number of adjuncts teaching in the program. Support and mentor the adjuncts we do retain.

This assessment report will be delivered electronically to all CWRR faculty in Fall 2014 and discussed at the First CWRR meeting. Such delivery and discussion will help CWRR faculty make appropriate adjustments to their CWRR courses in Fall 2014 and Spring 2015. The subsequent monthly CWRR meetings in 2014-2015 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 2013-2014

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

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

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