Millikin University
Report on Student Learning in Critical Writing, Reading & Research I & II
IN 150 & IN 151 MPSL First-Year Writing Requirement
Academic Year 2009-2010
by Dr. Peiling Zhao, CWRR Director
July 1, 2010

Executive Summary

Strongly committed to quality teaching and dynamic partnerships with other programs and departments, the Critical Writing, Reading, and Research Program is part of Millikin's five University Studies sequential courses required of all students and fulfills some of the university-wide student learning goals—critical reading, writing, inquiry, and expression of self. Its four student learning outcome goals—critical reading, writing, research, and reflective thinking skills—are vital to a successful transition to college and to the academic, professional, and personal success of a diverse student body, including traditional, Honors, Enhanced and Professional Adult Comprehensive Education (PACE) students.

To assess how the CWRR program has helped students achieve learning outcome goals, we generally use three assessment methods. Our primary method directly assesses all learning outcome goals through evaluating a ten-percent sampling of three student artifacts—a reading response, a research essay and a reflection piece—collected from all sections of CWRR II. A newly-developed stand-alone CWRR Student Survey, required of all CWRR II sections, is another comprehensive tool of assessment, which allows the program to see students' perceptions of how well they feel they have achieved each of the four learning outcome goals. The assessment report from the library on CWRR library instruction offers us a focused and indirect assessment on the learning outcome goal for research and inquiry.

Our assessment of the CWRR program in 2010 reveals that our students are close to successfully reaching the goals. Assessment of the three student artifacts clearly indicates that students are performing at adequate and excellent levels in achieving all of the four learning outcome goals: **Advanced Yellow for Goal 1, Goal 2, Low Green for Goal 3, and Low Yellow for Goal 4**. This assessment is consistent with the assessment through Student Survey. Analysis of student artifacts also indicates that students are performing at adequate and excellent levels in all of the three artifacts: **Low green** for the research essay artifact, **Advanced Yellow** for the reading response artifact, and **Low yellow** for the reflection piece.

Seven improvement plans are recommended for further improving the performance of the CWRR program. The CWRR Program should 1) continue to monitor its trends in class size, staff overload, and the use of technology: 2) continue to refine its assessment process; 3) enhance its delivery of Goal 4, Goal 2, and Goal 1; 4) build stronger relationships between CWRR I and CWRR II; 5) explore venues for sharing, among CWRR faculty and students, writing assignments, student writings, and other CWRR-related discourse.

This assessment report will be delivered electronically to all CWRR faculty by the end of July 2010 and discussed at First CWRR meeting in August, 2010. Such delivery and discussion will help CWRR faculty make appropriate adjustments to their CWRR courses in Fall 2010 and Spring 2011. The subsequent monthly CWRR meetings in 2010-2011 will 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. Upon completing Critical Writing, Reading and Research I &II requirements, students will be able to:

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

As a result of a collective reflection on our assessment process, the CWRR faculty revised the language for Goal 1 and for Goal 4 for better clarity in guiding delivery of these two goals. The new language was approved by the Council on Curriculum, voted by university faculty in Fall 2009. The revised Goal 1 and Goal 4 read the following:

Goal 1: Read critically to comprehend, analyze and evaluate texts;
Goal 4: Reflect formally on engagements with critical reading, writing and research to acquire, examine and present self-awareness about those engagements.

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. For example, CWRR Goals 1 & 2 helps prepare students for professional success; the additional emphasis on research and academic inquiry in CWRR II/IN151 (Goal 3) further prepares students for professional success by introducing them to qualitative inquiry methods and general technological literacy; asking students to reflect on the uses of reading and writing (Goal 4) prepares them 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.

2. Snapshot: Overview of CWRR Program in 2009-2010

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 2009-2010 academic year.

2.1 Trends in Staff
The following chart gives an overview of the types and numbers of faculty teaching CWRR courses per semester. Compared to the last three years, staffing in 2009-2010 was largely consistent with the trend in the last three years.

	Spring 2010	Fall 2009	Spring 2009	Fall 2008	Spring 2008	Fall 2007	Spring 2007	Fall 2006	Spring 2006	Fall 2005
Full-time tenure-track faculty	11	11	9	9	8	8	8	9	10	10
Full-time contractual faculty	1	1	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3
Part-time adjunct Faculty	5	4	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2
Total	17	16	13	14	13	13	13	14	15	15

The following bulleted list shows the trend in staffing in the past four academic years remains stable and our commitment to full-time teaching is consistent though there is a noticeable increase in party-time faculty hiring.

- **73**% (compared to 82% in 2008-2009, 85% in 2007-2008, 85% in 2006-2007, 86% in 2005-2006) of the staff is composed of **full-time faculty**;
- **67%** (compared to 67% in 2008-2009, 65% in 2007-2008, 65% in 2006-2007, 70% in 2005-2006) of the staff is composed of **full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty** with terminal degrees.
- **3%** (compared to 15%in 2008-2009, 22 % in 2007-2008, 22% in 2006-2007 & 2005-2006) of the staff is composed of **full-time, contractual faculty** without terminal degrees.
- **27%** (compared to 18% in 2008-2009 15% in 2007-2008, 15% in 2006-2007, 14% in 2005-2006 &) of the staff is **part-time faculty** without terminal degrees.

2.2 *Trends in Types and Numbers of Courses Taught*

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

The above trend chart reveals that the total number of CWRR courses offered in 2009-2010 was 4 sections more than that in 2008-2009, following a general increase in enrollment university-wide. A breakdown of different types of course shows the following trends: we offered 2 more CWRR I, 4 more CWRR II, the same number of Honors and of PACE. Overall, the distribution of different types of CWRR courses followed the trend in the past four years.

2.3 Syllabi Review
In Chapter Three of *The Higher Learning Commission Handbook of Accreditation*, under "Criterion Three: Student Learning and Effective Teaching," **Core Component 3a** recommends that "[t]he organization's goals for student learning are clearly stated for each educational program and make effective assessment possible" (3.1-4). Annual faculty syllabi audits measure how clearly the learning goals are communicated. All faculty submitted a syllabus audit form along with their syllabi, to ensure that the goals of the program appeared on the first page of the syllabus. Though such syllabus audit form was not required of the CWRR faculty, a review of the submitted syllabi shows that 100% of CWRR syllabi in both Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 contained the learning outcome goals for the program. This is consistent with the compliance rates in the past four years: 100% in 2009-2010, 2007-2008, average of 92% in 2006-2007.

2.4 Class Size and Staff Workload
According to the guidelines, policies and recommendations of the professional groups in the field, the Association of Departments of English (ADE) and the Modern Language Association (MLA), the number of students in each section of any writing course "should be fifteen or fewer, with no more than twenty students in any case" (*ADE Bulletin 2002*, 73). These guidelines also state that "class size should be no more than fifteen in developmental (remedial) courses" (*ADE Bulletin 2002*, 73).

Trends in Class Size:

The average class size for any one section during 2009-2010 was 19, compared to 18.58 in 2009-2010, 18.07 in 2007-2008, 18.6 in 2006-2007, and 19.51 in 2005-2006. The average class size for Fall 2009 was 18.3, for Spring 2010 was 19.6. In Fall 2009, the average class size was 15.5 for Enhanced CWRR, 17.7 for Honors, 9 for PACE, and 21.5 for Traditional. In Spring 2010, the average class size for Honors was 15.8, 15 for PACE, 19 for Traditional. The general trend was that the class size

for Traditional CWRR was always bigger than that for other types of courses. If the data for PACE Sections were excluded from the assessment, the average size for any section was 19.62, exceeding the cap by 4.62.

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 faculty in 2009-2010 was 2, which was consistent with the trend in the past four years (2.15 in 2009-2009, 2.19 in 2007-2008, 2.15 in 2006-2007, and 2.06 in 2005-2006). In Fall 2009, 1 full-time contractual faculty taught 4 CWRR sections; in Spring 2010, 1 tenure faculty and 1 full-time contractual faculty taught 3 CWRR sections.

2.5 Trends in Facilities
In 2009-2010, CWRR courses were taught in the following locations: Shilling Hall, Staley Library, ADM-Scovill Hall, LTSC, and Weck. Following the trend in the past four years, the majority of the sections were taught in Shilling Hall, more courses were taught at Staley Library (due to the assignment of SL 29 to Honors), and a small percent of sections were taught in Scovill, LTSC, and Weck. With the classroom request system firmly in place, we now have more autonomy in our choices for teaching spaces. The following data regarding the percent of CWRR courses taught with technology is even more significant given the extent to which we control the environments in which we teach. More and more CWRR faculty are requiring facilities equipped with technology for teaching the two courses. Over half (55%) of CWRR courses are taught in such spaces. The trend remains toward teaching with technology, with most instructors choosing to teach in either a classroom with technology available to the instructor or a traditional/computer lab split configuration.

Percent of CWRR Courses Taught with Technology

	Traditional without Technology	Traditional w/ Technology	Traditional/Computer Lab Split	Computer Lab
2009-2010	22% (14 sections)	57%	21% (13 sections)	0% (0 sections)
2008-2009	45% (25 sections)	32% (18 sections)	21% (12 sections)	2% (1 section)
2007-2008	43% (25 sections)	30% (17 sections)	28% (16 sections)	0% (0 sections)
2006-2007	40%	31% (18 sections)	22% (13 sections)	7% (4 sections)
2005-2006	32%	52%	0%	16%

In 2009-2010, there was a significant increase in the use of traditional classrooms with technology, a significant decrease in the use of traditional classrooms without technology, due both to the increased preference with the former and updates done to classrooms in the past years. This year also followed that trend in the past years that there was a consistent preference for holding part of the classes in a traditional classroom with or without technology and other part of the classes in a computer lab. According to the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC)

"Position Statement on Teaching, Learning, and Assessing Writing in Digital Environments," "[i]ncreasingly, classes and programs in writing require that students compose digitally." This document uses the phrase "compose digitally" to mean writing "that occurs when students compose at a computer screen, using a word processor, so that they can submit the writing in print," but also to mean "participating in an online discussion trough a listserv or bulletin board . . .[,] creating compositions in presentations software . . .[,] participation in chat rooms or creating web pages . . .[or] creating a digital portfolio." CCCC sees the future focus of first-year writing programs moving toward two types of literacy: "a literacy of print and a literacy of the screen." The position statement argues that each "medium is used to *enhance learning* in the other" (italics added).

The CWRR Program is moving in the direction of these priorities, providing an increasing number of facilities for teaching CWRR courses in electronic lab classrooms. As we continue to hire faculty with experience teaching first-year writing in a technologically equipped classroom, and as the effectiveness of such instruction continues to be demonstrated, necessity and demand for it will necessarily increase in the CWRR Program. The program should continue to advocate for more provision of such facilities.

2.6 Support Structures: Leadership and CWRR Faculty Development

The CWRR Program has developed a strong tradition of leadership structure and support. Appointed by the Dean of Teaching and Learning, Director of CWRR Program leads the program, serves as a member of the University Studies Advisory Committee, working with the Dean of Teaching and Learning and the Director of First Year Experience to help build and coordinate a high quality program. The Director 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.

2.7 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 to grow their intellectual inquiry. The class emphasizes vital skills for academic and professional success. Students investigate and research a topic of their choice. In both courses, emphasis is placed on the importance of reading, writing, research, and reflection for personal and professional growth in all learning areas and situations.

3. <u>Assessment Process</u>

3.1 Assessment Methods
1. Library Entrance and Exit Surveys will measure effectiveness of research instruction.
2. Stand-alone CWRR Student Survey administered through a Moodle course will measure students' perceptions of their successful completion of the goals
3. Student Artifacts (Reading Response, Research Paper, and Reflection Piece) will provide substantial qualitative data about student performance in each goal area.

To assess how the CWRR program has helped students achieve learning outcome goals, we generally use three assessment methods. Our primary method directly assesses all learning outcome goals through evaluating a 10% sampling of three student artifacts—a reading response, a research essay and a reflection piece—collected from all sections of CWRR II through a general Moodle course open to all CWRR students and faculty. A newly-developed stand-alone CWRR Student Survey, required of all CWRR II sections, is another comprehensive tool of assessment, which allows the program to see students' perceptions of how well they feel they have achieved each of the four learning outcome goals. This survey is administered anonymously through a Moodle course open to all CWRR students. The assessment report from the library on CWRR library instruction offers us a focused and indirect assessment on the learning outcome goal for research and inquiry. The librarian coordinating CWRR library instruction and workshops, in consultation with the CWRR faculty and the librarians, design pre-test and post-test and deliver library instruction and annual CWRR Library and Research Assessment Report to Director of the CWRR program, who will incorporate it into the annual CWRR Assessment Report.

We conduct indirect quantitative assessment of student learning outcome goals by way of 1) Library Instruction Coordinator's library assessment surveys and 2) a survey of student perceptions on how successfully they accomplished the four goals for the two courses. Most importantly, we conduct direct qualitative assessment by collecting and evaluating student artifacts from CWRR II. We use rubrics to assess the four learning outcome goals that are imbedded in the three types of student artifacts. The Staley Library Instruction Coordinator reports on data results from library surveys. (Disregard that.)

Full-time CWRR faculty members collect and assess student artifacts annually. Each year, there are three CWRR faculty members serving on the CWRR Assessment Team: Director 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 twice to complete the assessment. They first meet for a pre-assessment meeting, where they discuss the rubrics, score the same artifacts with the same rubrics, and then compare their scores with each other. After which they discuss the similarities and discrepancies among the three scores and use this discussion as a way to generate consensus about using the rubrics. Each assessment team member will individually score the artifacts assigned to them and meet again for a post-assessment meeting, where they share their scores, observations, and reflections and make recommendations on improving assessing and delivering the program. The Director collects the assessment results and their recommendations, makes tabulations and charts and 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

Library Entrance and Exit Surveys (See Self-Study Report on Library Instruction)
The Library Entrance and Exit surveys are developed and administered by the Staley
Library faculty, whose instruction is integrated into CWRR I & II classrooms in order
to deliver training on library use and research collection and evaluation. These
surveys will help us assess learning outcome goal for conducting research to
participate in academic inquiry.

Student Artifacts
All CWRR II students are asked at the end of CWRR 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 the traffic signal analogy (red, yellow, green) to evaluate and assess.
Rubrics have been developed for evaluating each of these student artifacts to
determine to what extent we deliver on all four program student learning goals. The
reading response helps assess IN 151 students' various 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 and writing in their public and personal lives to better
understand themselves, their communities and the world.

CWRR Student Survey

The CWRR faculty held workshops in Fall 2009 and Spring 2010, where they revised
the questions from the old CWRR survey attached in the past to the First Year
Experience Survey administered through the Office of Institutional Research. The
revised survey is administered toward the end of CWRR II to all CWRR students
through a general Moodle course, where students submit their own perceptions of
how well they have achieved the four outcome goals by answering 13 questions (see
Appendix). The Survey Moodle generates automatically the survey results, which
will be collected and included in the assessment report.

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

- Library entrance and exit surveys measure the effectiveness of library
  instruction on students' ability "to conduct research to participate in academic
  inquiry," CWRR goal 3.
- 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
Library entrance and exit survey			X	
Reading Response	X	X		
Research Essay		X	X	
Reflection		X		x
Student Survey	X	X	X	x

3.4 Assessment Rubrics: Performance Indicators

Each point of data collection will receive a performance indicator using the following rubric. All student artifacts are assessed carefully with rubrics (see Appendix for Reading Response Assessment Rubric, Research Essay Assessment Rubric, and Reflection Piece Assessment Rubric). Due to changes to the language for Goal 4 (on reflection, the Reflection Assessment Rubric was also revised.

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).

NOTE: The library instruction assessment report provides performance indicators for library entrance and exit survey.

4. Assessment Analysis

This report will analyze the data collected and evaluate the effectiveness of our courses in helping students meet the CWRR learning goals.

4.1 Assessment Analysis of Library Entrance and Exit Survey: Low Green

The research and instruction librarians devote a majority of their instructional activities to the CWRR program. During the 2009-2010 academic year, the librarians conducted 98 sessions for in-sequence CWRR classes, and 10 sessions for the off-sequence sessions. For IN150, this includes one session per section. For IN151, research instruction is the equivalent of one week; this includes three sessions for MWF sections and 2 sessions for T/Th sections. Debbie Campbell coordinates the research instruction program, and shares in the instruction with librarians Cindy

Fuller, Denise Green, Joe Hardenbrook, and Amanda Pippitt. The Instructional Services Coordinator, as with the other librarians, reports to the Library Director.

The 2009-2010 academic year was the fourth complete year of data collected via a pre- and post-test. The assessment questions were modified for the 2009-2010 academic year. For the 2009-2010 academic year, the pre-test was administered via a quiz in Moodle before the students in IN150 met with a librarian, and the post-test data was collected during the library instruction sessions via clickers. Data from off-sequence and PACE CWRR sections was disregarded due to the small survey sample.

The evaluation of library entrance and exit surveys accounts, in part, for the effectiveness of library instruction on students' abilities to "conduct research to participate in academic inquiry (Goal 3)." This point of data collection received a low Green indicator: the average score was **62%** on the pre-test and **75%** on the post-test, with an improvement of 13%. This point of data collection received, in Joe Hardenbrook's Self-Study Report on Library Instruction for 2005-2006 and for 2006-2007, a **Green** indicator. In 2006-2007 the average score on the pre-test was **9.8/15** points (312 participants) and **11.4/15** points (265 participants) on the post-test, the difference between the two scores (1.6%) indicating the growth of students in this category. Consistent with the trend in the last two years, the 2007-2008 Library Instruction report by Debbie Myers indicates similar results: the average score for the pre-test was **10.32/15** points (311 participants), or **69%**, and the post-test scores **11.43/15** (208 participants), or **76%**. In Debbie Campbell's 2008-2009 Library Instruction Report, the average score for pre-test was **10.33/15** points (305 participants), or **69%** while the post-test received an average score of **11.15/15** points, or **74.33%**, another **green** indicator.

Library Instruction Assessment Scales:

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

For the 2009-2010 Academic year, overall from pre-test to post-test, students improved their scores on 13 questions (numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 15, &16). Question number 13 demonstrated no change, while three questions (numbers 9, 11, &14) showed a decrease in correct responses from the pre- to the post-test. See Appendix A for a complete explanation of answers and percentages, and Appendix B for a graphical representation.

Between pre-test and post-test, students showed an average score increase of 13%, with several individual questions showing a significant increase of greater than 10%. These questions are listed in the following table.

Question Number	Pre-Test Percentage	Post-Test Percentage	% Increase
>9000	61%	80%	19%
5	27%	75%	48%
6	46%	75%	29%
7	50%	65%	15%
8	62%	74%	12%
16	54%	73%	19%

Although question #4 showed improvement from pre-test to post-test, during the in-class Clicker assessment, many students vocalized confusion with the wording of this question, despite displaying an understanding of the process through the in-class activities. As such, if the traditional pre- and post-test are used for the 2010-2011 academic year, this question will need to be rewritten for clarity. With question #14, during the in-class Clicker assessment, many students commented that they purposely chose the "funny answer," which was also the incorrect answer. The "funny factor" will need to be taken into consideration for future in-class assessments. See the "Improvements" section of this report for more information on future modifications to the CWRR Library Instruction program and assessment.

Grouping each of the quiz questions with the corresponding Staley Library learning goal(s) allows the librarians to measure the effectiveness of instruction. The ratings coincide with the CWRR Artifact Performance Indicators Scale (Based on Percents), with Nominal (Red-Stop) 0-52%, Adequate(Yellow—Caution) 53-74%, Excellent (Green-Go) 75-100%.

Learning Goal	Rationale	Rating
1. Library Resources (Question Numbers: 1,2,3,4,5,7)	Pre-Test: 56% (62% removing question #4) Post-Test: 73% (81% removing question #4) When all questions for this section are averaged together they score 73%, if question #4 is removed because of student confusion with the wording as explained above, the average percentage for this goal increases to 81%. In the table above, three of the questions associated with this goal showed greater than 10% improvement between pre-test and post-test. So despite the lower average percent for this goal, the student improvement for these questions is substantial.	**Yellow (Green)**
2. Plagiarism/Citing Sources (Question Numbers: 14, 15,16)	Pre-Test: 67% Post-Test: 78% Question 15 was added to the assessment to provide students with the opportunity to think about timing in regards to the recording of citation information, to make the citation process easier. Due to issues with the way the data gathered from the clickers and Moodle can be compared, data from question #14 is not included in the percentage for this goal.	*Green*
3. Retrieval of Information (Question Numbers: 4,5,6,7,8)	Pre-Test: 42% (46% removing question #4) Post-Test: 64% (72% removing question #4) When all questions for this section are averaged together they score 64%, if question #4 is removed because of student confusion with the wording as explained above, the average percentage for this goal increases to 72%. While still a percentage in the yellow range, as shown in the table above, four of the questions associated with this goal showed greater than 10% improvement between pre-test and post-test. So despite the lower average percent for this goal, the student improvement for these questions is substantial.	*Yellow*

4. Evaluation of Information (Question Numbers: 6,9,10,11,12,13,16)	Pre-Test: 65% Post-Test: 76% As the second highest score among the four learning goals, the students display a bettered understanding for evaluating the information they find. As evidenced by the number of questions on the assessment which support this goal, an understanding of the evaluation of information is an important focus of library instruction. Due to issues with the way the data gathered from the clickers and Moodle can be compared, data from questions 11 & 12 are not included in the percentage for this goal.	*Green*

The research instruction program now has five years worth of post-test data to analyze. Although each sample (i.e., freshmen class) is different, the average post-test scores do not differ greatly in our five years of data.

	Post-Test Spring 2006	Post-Test Spring 2007	Post-Test Spring 2008	Post-Test Spring 2009	Post-Test Spring 2010
Average Score	12/15 points (80%)	11.4/15 points (76%)	11.43/15 points (76%)	11.15/15 points (74%)	points not available (75%)

The Librarian's Recommendations on Improving Library Instruction and Assessment

The 2009 revisions to the pre and post-test questions helped to clear some confusion and update the content of the assessment to better fit the structure and activities of the library instruction sessions. The usage of clickers for the post-test increased the participation for the post-test as hoped, making the collected data a better representative sample of all IN 151 sections.

For the 2010-2011 academic year, the Library Instructional Services Coordinator will continue to collaborate primarily with the CWRR Director and the CWRR Assessment Team, and also with the CWRR faculty through discussions and meetings. During the Spring of 2010, the librarians began discussing the possibility of modifying the CWRR instruction sequence into a 2:2 session structure; the topic was brought up with the CWRR professors at the final CWRR meeting of Spring 2010. Throughout the next year, discussions about the modification of the sequence will be held, with any possible changes to content and structure occurring during the 2011-2012 academic year.

The questions used for the 2009 Revision of the pre- and post- test will be reviewed during the summer of 2010, both for clarity and to make sure they are properly assessing instruction. The possibility of a qualitative instead of quantitative (pre & post test) type of assessment will also be discussed with all constituents, and may be piloted in a few sections next year.

The 2009-2010 Library Instruction Report assigns this point of data collection a low Green performance indicator. According to the performance indicators, a **Green**

indicator suggests that the program is headed in the right direction in teaching research, and that immediate change is not necessary. Our partnership with the library is clearly headed in the right direction and shows few areas that need immediate attention or improvement. See Debbie Campbell's 2009-2010 annual Library Instruction Report for full assessment and initiatives for improvement.

4.2 Analysis of Three Types of Artifacts

Analysis of student artifacts is based on assessment of 10% of artifacts submitted. Approximately 269 reading responses were submitted and 30 assessed; approximately 332 research essays submitted and 28 assessed; approximately 308 reflection pieces submitted and 25 assessed. The CWRR Program's Self-Study Assessment Team applies the same performance indicators to all analysis. The assessment team assigns an Advanced Yellow indicator for this point of 2009-2010 data collection. This assignment is based on the following performance indicator scale and the average score for each artifact collected.

For the academic year 2009-2010, the average mean score for student artifacts range from **58.2%%** to **77.13%**, indicating that the majority of students are performing at adequate and excellent levels on each artifact, a level close to the last three years. Following the trend in the past three years, the reflection piece in 2009-2010 received a LOW yellow indicator (58.2%), 3.5% higher than that in 2008-2009 (54.71%); the reading response paper received a low green indicator (75.5%), 1.2% lower than that in 2008-2009 (76.79%); the research essay received a low green indicator (77.13%), 3.2% lower than that in 2008-2009(80.34%).

CWRR Artifact Performance Indicators (Scale Based on Percents):

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

Performance Indication of Each Artifact 2009-2010

Artifact	Nominal (Red—Stop)	Adequate(Yellow--Caution)	Excellent (Green—Go)
Reading response	**23%**	**23%**	**54%**
Research Essay	**3%**	**43%**	**54%**
Reflection	**44%**	**40%**	**16%**

4.2.1 Analysis of Reading Response Performance 2009-2010 (Low Green)

Reading Response Artifact received a Low Green performance indicator (75.55%). 77% (compared to **90%** in 2009-2010 and to 96% in 2007-2008) of our students performed at adequate or excellent levels on the Reading Response Artifact. **23%** (compared to **10%**) of students performed at a red level Reading and writing were significantly higher than critiquing. In comparison to 2009-2010, reading component was 7% higher, critiquing component was 7% lower, and writing component was 1% lower. Overall, the score for this artifact was 1.2% lower than that in 2009-2010.

Reading Response 2008-2009

Excellent (Green—Go)	Adequate(Yellow--Caution)	Nominal (Red—Stop)

10.5-13	7-10.5	1-6
16/30=53%	11/30=37%	3/30=10%

Reading Response 2009-2010

Excellent (Green—Go)	Adequate(Yellow--Caution)	Nominal (Red—Stop)
10.5-13	7-10.5	1-6.9
16/30=54%	7/30=23%	7/30=23%

Average	Reading	Critiquing	Writing	Overall
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 Four Years

Year	Nominal (Red—Stop)	Adequate(Yellow--Caution)	Excellent (Green—Go)
2006-2007		**68.95%**	
2007-2008			**80.61%**
2009-2010			**76.79%**
2009-2010			**75.5%**

   4.2.2 Analysis of Research Essay 2009-2010 (Low Green)
Research Essay artifact received a Low Green performance indicator (77.13%). 97% (compared to 94% in 2008-2009) of our students performed at adequate or excellent levels on the Research Essay while 3% (compared to 6%) of students performed at the red level. Academic audience and polished writing were significantly higher than informed and polished. In comparison to 2008-2009, research was 4.6% lower, informed 4.1% lower, academic audience 6.8% lower, and polished writing 7.8% higher. Overall, the score for this artifact was 3.2% lower than that in 2009-2010.

Research Essay 2009-2010

Excellent (Green—Go)	Adequate(Yellow—Caution)	Nominal (Red—Stop)
12-15	8-11.9	1-7.9
15/28=54%	12/28=43%	1/28=3%

Research Essay 2008-2009

Excellent (Green—Go)	Adequate(Yellow—Caution)	Nominal (Red—Stop)
12-15	8-11	1-7
21/34=62%	11/34=32%	2/34=6%

Research Essay

	Research	Informed	Audience	Polished	**Total**
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 (87.74%)	1.485 (74.26%)	12.06 (80.39%)

Research Essay Performance in the Past Four 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%

4.2.3   Analysis of Reflection Artifact 2009-2010 Low Yellow

**Reflection Artifact Received a Low Yellow performance indicator (58.2%).
56%** (compared to 69% in 2008-2009, 97% in 2007-2008) of our students performed at adequate or excellent levels on the Reflection piece while 44% (compared to 30%) in 2009-2010 of students performed at the nominal level. In 2009-2010, the score for component of critical examination and evaluation of self-awareness was 4% higher than the score for the two other components. Because of the changes to the language for this goal and the rubric for assessing this artifact, no comparison could be further made between individual components across years. Overall, the overall score for this artifact was 3.5% higher than that in 2008-2009.

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
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 2009-2010

Excellent (Green—Go)	Adequate(Yellow—Caution)	Nominal (Red—Stop)
12-15	8-11	1-7
4/25= 16%	10/25=40%	11/25=44%

Reflection 2008-2009

Excellent (Green—Go)	Adequate(Yellow—Caution)	Nominal (Red—Stop)
12-15	8-11	1-7
4/29= 14%	16/29=55%	9/29=31%

Reflection Performance in the Past Four 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%**	

The average of the overall score for each of the three types of artifacts in 2009-2010 was 70.28%, an advanced yellow level, which was close to 70.35% in 2009-2010. The average of the percentage of students performing at excellent or adequate levels in each artifact was 77%, a low Green level. Such comparison shows that the overall performance of the CWRR Program was consistent with the trend in the past four years. Overall, the CWRR program has been very successful in reading response and research essay but weak in reflection piece.

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%	

4.3. 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 at each goal.

Artifact	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3	Goal 4
Reading response: comprehending and critiquing	X			
Reading Response: writing		X		
Research Essay: informed, audience, polished	X	X		
Research essay: research, informed	X		X	
Reflection: Identification and articulation of self awareness		X		
Reflection: reflect for public audience		X		X
Reflection: Critical Examination and evaluation of self awareness	X	X		X
Reflection				X

Overall Performance of Each Learning Goal

	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3	Goal 4
Average Score	69%	71%	75%	58%
Performance indicator	Advanced Yellow	Advanced Yellow	Low Green	Low Yellow

Goal 1— Read critically to comprehend, analyze and evaluate text (Advanced Yellow 73%)

Goal 1 is assessed by a combination of four criteria: the "Reading" and "Critiquing" criteria from the Reading Response, the "Informed" criterion from Research Essay, and the "AWSM" criterion from the Reflection Piece. In 2008-2009, Goal 1 received an Advanced Yellow indicator, indicating that Goal 1 is heading in the right direction but needs immediate attention from the program to adjust strategies and approaches in order to reach higher level of performance.

Goal 2—Students will be able to write polished, informed essays for personal, public and/or specialized audiences. (Advanced Yellow 71%)

Goal 2 is assessed by a combination of the following seven criteria: the "Critiquing" and "Writing" criteria from the Reading Response, the "Informed," "Audience" and "Polished" criteria from the Research Essay, and the "Identification and articulation of self awareness" and "presentation of self awareness to public audience" criteria from the Reflection Piece. According to our assessment of these seven criteria, the CWRR Program's Self-Study Assessment Team concludes that Goal 2 should receive an Advanced Yellow indicator (71%).

Goal 3—Students will be able to conduct research to participate in academic inquiry. (Low Green 75%)

 Goal 3 is assessed by the "Research" and "Informed" criteria from the Research Essay student artifact rubric. Combining assessment of these criteria, the CWRR Program's Self-Study Assessment Team concludes that Goal 3 should receive a Low Green indicator, which is the same as that from the Library Research Assessment Report.

Goal 4— Reflect formally on engagements with critical reading, writing and research to acquire, examine and present self-awareness about those engagements (Low Yellow 58%)

Goal 4 is assessed by the three 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 Low Yellow (58%) performance indicator. Assessment of individual criterion indicates that while there has been a general decline in all three criteria, the intrapersonal audience, though always low in the past two years, receives a red indicator in 2008-2009. The general decline and the warning signal suggest that more effective strategies should be developed by faculty to improve performance for this goal.

4.4. Analysis of CWRR Student Survey
146 students participated in the CWRR Student Survey on the Moodle. Two classes of 40 students participated in a hard copy survey, which was not consistent with the format of this survey. Therefore, the data from these two classes were not tabulated into assessment. Students are asked to evaluate their performance and experience by rating at a scale from 1 to 4. The 12 questions are designed to measure students' perceptions of their performance in Goal 1, Goal 2, Goal 3, and Goal 4. Here is a mapping of questions with learning goals. Question 13 is an open-ended question that asks students to write down their successes and failures with the CWRR

program (see Appendix). The response rate for each question ranges from 97% to 99%.

	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3	Goal 4
Questions 1,2,3	x			
Questions 4,5,6		X		
Questions 7,8,9			X	
Questions 10, 11, 12				x

The following chart shows how students perceive their performance in each question and each goal. Analysis of scores for individual questions shows that students perceive their performance excellent (above 50%) in questions 1, 5, 6, and 8, adequate (30%-50%) in questions 2, 3, 4, and 7, and weak(below 30%) in questions 11 and 12 .

Question/Rating	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Very often	53%	30%	40%	35%	56%	61%	32%	58%	40%	30%	27%	14%
Often	39%	47%	39%	46%	36%	27%	50%	31%	45%	40%	38%	21%
Sometimes	5%	21%	17%	15%	6%	9%	16%	10%	14%	24%	29%	34%
Rarely	1%	1%	1%	3%	0%	2%	1%	0%	0%	5%	5%	29%

Further analysis of the average score for each goal shows that
- 82% of students rate their performance in Goal 1 as excellent or adequate while 16% of students rate their performance in Goal 1 at nominal level.
- 86% of students rate their performance in Goal 2 at excellent or adequate levels while 12% of students rate their performance in Goal 2 at nominal level.
- 86% of students rate their performance in Goal 3 at excellent or adequate levels while 10% of students rate their performance in Goal 3 at nominal level.
- 53% of students rate their performance in Goal 4 at excellent or adequate levels while 42% of students rate their performance in Goal 4 at nominal level.

Performance indicator	Goal 1 High Green	Goal 2 High Green	Goal 3 High Green	Goal 4 Yellow
Excellent	41%	50%	44%	21%
Yellow	41%	36%	42%	33%
Red	16%	12%	10%	42%

Comparison between Student Artifact and Student Survey
Although our primary data comes from student artifact assessment, a comparison between student artifact assessment and student survey assessment reveals that Goal 1, Goal 2, and Goal 3 received higher ratings from the student survey than from student artifacts while Goal 4 received a slightly lower rating from the student survey than from student artifacts. Regardless of the differences between these two sets of assessment, the trend remains the same: Goal 2 and Goal 3 receive higher rating than two other goals while Goal 4 remains the lowest among the four goals.

	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3	Goal 4
Student Artifact	Advanced Yellow	Advanced Yellow	Low Green	Low Yellow
Student Survey	High Green	High Green	High Green	Low Yellow

Final Rating	Advanced Yellow	Advanced Yellow	Low Green	Low Yellow

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

Synthesizing information on staffing, class size, staff overload, and facilities with assessment results from student artifacts, library entrance and exit tests, and student survey, the CWRR Program Assessment Team makes recommendations and improvement plans that further enhance the quality of the program. Our detailed assessments of each learning outcome goal and of each criterion in student artifacts as well as overall assessment of student artifacts suggest that both the student artifact assessment and library instruction assessment have been useful and effective in assessing our CWRR program. While believing that we need to continue the three assessment methods, the Assessment Teams recommends the following plans for further improving our CWRR program.

1. The CWRR program should continue to monitor its trends in class size, staff overload, and the use of technology. Although there has been no direct measurement of how much class size, staffing, staffing overload, and classroom setting could affect the delivery of student learning outcome goals, several trends in 2009-2010 were factors that could have affected the delivery of learning outcome goals. 1) a significant decrease (13% in comparison to 2005) in staffing the CWRR courses with full-time tenure-track faculty and a significant increase (13% compared to 2005) in staffing them with part-time adjunct faculty definitely merit our attention; 2) rising to the level (19.5) of 2005, the average class size exceeded the cap by 3, and the average class size (21.5) of traditional CWRR courses in Fall 2009 exceeded the cap by 5.5; 3) overloading of 3 full-time faculty with more than 2 CWRR courses, though consistent with the trend in the past four years, was not effective in delivering student learning outcome goals for the CWRR program. Although university-wide enrollment increase and unfavorable financial and budgetary situations do contribute to these trends, these external factors play significant role in delivering the student learning goals. While trends in use of facilities remain largely the same, the CWRR program should continue to encourage the use of traditional classrooms with technology and more frequent use of computer labs. More frequent use of computer labs will further facilitate the assessment by increasing students' participation in submitting student artifacts and in the student survey on the Moodle.

2. The CWRR Program should continue to refine its assessment process. The Moodle has been a valid tool for collecting student artifacts and student survey. However, asking students to submit three artifacts and participate on Student Survey to two different Moodle courses at about the same time at the end of the semester could be both confusing and overwhelming. Such configuration could potentially have contributed to the low participation rate for the Student Survey 44% (146 out of 329).This In addition, the open-access to students' artifacts within the CWRR students could cause potential illegal borrowing or plagiarism. Therefore, in response to the feedback from CWRR students and faculty, the CWRR Program should continue to work with Educational Technologist in enhancing the use of the Moodle and making submission and participation easier and safer. Meanwhile rubrics of using student survey results should be developed to make sure that data from this source could be better utilized for assessment.

3.The CWRR Program should continue to enhance its delivery of Goal 4. In both assessment through student artifacts and assessment through student survey, Goal 4 (the reflection piece) has continued to receive the lowest score. Workshops on revising the language for the goal and on discussing on assignments and strategies for teaching reflection might have contributed to the 3.5% increase in rating for the reflection piece in 2009-2010; however, due to changes made to reflection assessment rubric, 3.5% increase might also be a result of such changes. Regardless of whether there was an increase or not, that 44% of students performed at nominal level should receive our urgent attention. The Assessment Team recommends that several plans to improve the delivery of Goal 4: 1) start introducing the concept of reflection in CWRR I; 2) develop more informal and less risky reflective exercises and assignments in CWRR I; 3) continue to explore and share writing assignments and reflection essay prompts in CWRR II; 4) continue to share best practices of building reflective thinking and writing into other components of CWRR II; 5) continue to build a data pool of best reflection essays and articles that help faculty understand reflection.

4. The CWRR Program should continue to enhance its delivery of Goal 2. Although Goal 2 received an Advanced Yellow and Research Essay received a Low Green, immediate attention should be given to improve students' performance in research, informed, and academic audience. According to results from both student artifact assessment and student survey assessment, students performed lower (compared to 2009-2010) in these categories. The Assessment Team recommends that CWRR faculty 1) encourage students to find research sources of more variety and better quality; 2) teach students the difference between research essays and research reports/summaries; 3) encourage students to integrate various sources and formulate an insightful opinion about the topic; 4) continue to collaborate with the librarians in enhancing the library workshops and administering the entrance and exit test.

5. The CWRR Program should continue to enhance students' performance in Goal 1, especially in "critiquing" component. In 2009-2010, the score for this category was both lower than that in 2009-2010 and than those for other two components. The trend over the past five years shows that student do not feel that they have the authority to critique texts. The Assessment Team recommends that earlier, easier, and shorter versions of reading response should be taught in CWRR I.

6.The CWRR Program should continue to build stronger relationships between CWRR I and CWRR II even though all student artifacts and data are collected form CWRR II. The Assessment Team recommends that CWRR I should teach earlier versions of the three student artifacts, introduce and practice the skills assessed in CWRR II.

7. The CWRR Program should continue to explore venues, such as anthology of student essays, an interactive CWRR website, and networking space such as Face book, for sharing, among CWRR faculty and students, writing assignments, student writings, and other CWRR-related discourse.

This assessment report will be delivered electronically to all CWRR faculty by the end of July 2010 and discussed at First CWRR meeting in August, 2010. Such delivery and discussion will help CWRR faculty make appropriate adjustments to their CWRR courses in Fall 2010 and Spring 2011. The subsequent monthly CWRR meetings in 2010-2011 will be devoted mainly to implementing the recommendations made in this report.

Appendix
CWRR Student Artifact Descriptions and Assessment Rubrics 2009

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

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	An adequate reading response contains only some careful, supported and positioned judgments and/or passive engagement with the reading.	A nominal response contains no judgments about the reading. [1 point]	

	reading. [5 points]	[3 points]		
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 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.

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	An adequate research essay demonstrates inconsistent attempts to find and use a variety of reliable	A nominal research essay demonstrates little or no attempt to use	

	sources in order to assimilate, synthesize, make judgments about/use these sources to participate in ongoing academic conversations and inquiries. [5 points]	sources & to evaluate and synthesize these sources. Student may make an attempt to enter academic conversations. [3 points]	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 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.

	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 in reading, writing, and research processes	An adequate reflection demonstrates the student's attempt to clearly identify and articulate new knowledge about the self in reading, writing, and research processes [3 points]	A nominal reflection lacks attempt to identify and articulate new knowledge about the self in 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 in 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 in reading, writing, and research processes [3 points]	A nominal reflection lacks attempt to critically analyze and evaluate the new knowledge about the self in 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

2009-2010 Student Survey on Learning Goals in CWRR I and II

Please refer to your experiences with CWRR I and II at Millikin while answering the following questions. Rate your answers with a scale of 1-4.
THIS IS AN ANONYMOUS SURVEY.
NO IDENTIFYING INFORMATION WILL BE RECORDED.
1. I read to comprehend the main idea of a text.

Response	Average		Total
4 - very often		53%	78
3 - often		39%	57
2 - sometimes		5%	8
1 - rarely		1%	2
Total		99%	145/146

2. I analyze the structure, language, and details/examples that a text uses to make a point.

Response	Average		Total
4 - very often		30%	44
3 - often		47%	68
2 - sometimes		21%	30
1 - rarely		1%	1
Total		98%	143/146

3. I evaluate a text by drawing upon opinions of others and my personal experiences.

Response	Average		Total
4 - very often		40%	58
3 - often		39%	57
2 - sometimes		17%	25
1 - rarely		2%	3
Total		98%	143/146

4. I consider my audience's assumptions and interests when writing.

Response	Average		Total
4 - very often		35%	51

3 - often	46%	67
2 - sometimes	15%	22
1 - rarely	3%	4
Total	99%	144/146

5. I consider the overall structure of my writing.

Response	Average	Total
4 - very often	56%	82
3 - often	36%	52
2 - sometimes	6%	9
Total	98%	143/146

6. I consider my own voice when writing.

Response	Average	Total
4 - very often	61%	89
3 - often	27%	40
2 - sometimes	9%	13
1 - rarely	2%	3
Total	99%	145/146

7. I integrate other people's opinions into my own writing when appropriate.

Response	Average	Total
4 - very often	32%	47
3 - often	50%	73
2 - sometimes	16%	23
1 - rarely	1%	2
Total	99%	145/146

8. I use research to help me develop questions and ideas for research essays.

Response	Average	Total
4 - very often	58%	85

3 - often	31%	45
2 - sometimes	10%	14
Total	99%	144/146

9. I evaluate, select, and integrate a variety of sources for research essays.

Response	Average	Total
4 - very often	40%	58
3 - often	45%	65
2 - sometimes	14%	21
Total	99%	144/146

10. I acquire stronger self awareness through reflections on my reading, writing, and research process.

Response	Average	Total
4 - very often	30%	44
3 - often	40%	58
2 - sometimes	24%	35
1 - rarely	5%	7
Total	99%	144/146

11. I use reflections to examine the self in reading, writing, and research processes.

Response	Average	Total
4 - very often	27%	40
3 - often	38%	55
2 - sometimes	29%	43
1 - rarely	5%	7
Total	99%	145/146

12. I share my reflections with public audiences.

Response	Average	Total
4 - very often	14%	21
3 - often	21%	30

2 - sometimes		34%	49
1 - rarely		29%	42
Total		97%	142/146