

# Liberal Studies English (LSE) 2017-2018 Annual Report

Compiled/Written by  
**Bryna Siegel Finer, PhD**  
Liberal Studies English Director  
**Marissa McKinley, 2017-2018**  
Assistant Writing Program Administrator  
**Jing Zhang, 2018-2019**  
Assistant Writing Program Administrator

Assessment Facilitated by  
**Katie Miller, PhD**  
LSE Assessment Data  
Compiled by  
**Katie Miller, PhD and**  
**Mary Stewart, PhD**

**Reviewed by**  
**the 2018-2019 LSE Committee**

**Submitted to**  
Provost Tim Moerland  
Dean Yaw Asamoah, College of Humanities and Social Sciences  
Dr. Gian Pagnucci, English Department Chair  
Dr. Edel M. Reilly, Director of Liberal Studies  
Dr. Shari Robertson, Provost's Associate

SUMMARY/HIGHLIGHTS .....	3
<b>PART ONE: THE LIBERAL STUDIES ENGLISH PROGRAM .....</b>	<b>4</b>
INTRODUCTION .....	4
LSE PROGRAM FEATURES .....	4
<i>Curriculum</i> .....	4
<i>Placement</i> .....	5
<i>Enrollment</i> .....	6
<i>Continued Initiatives</i> .....	7
The LSE Committee .....	7
National Day on Writing .....	8
The Crimson Quill .....	8
Teaching Circle: LSE & Lattes .....	9
Basic Writing (BW) Subcommittee .....	9
Multilingual Writing (MLW) Subcommittee .....	9
Subcommittee on Online Teaching and Learning .....	10
The Second Annual Celebration of LSE Student Writing .....	10
AWPA Position .....	11
PACT Internships .....	12
<i>New Program Initiatives</i> .....	12
Writing Skills Workshop (At-Risk Student Retention) Pilot .....	12
Revision to ENGL 101 Course Objectives .....	13
COSTS/BUDGET .....	14
<i>Reassigned Time</i> .....	14
<i>AWPA Salary</i> .....	14
<i>Assessment Costs</i> .....	14

<i>Other Costs</i> .....	14
PUBLICITY/PROMOTION.....	14
<i>Teaching LSE at IUP Facebook Page</i> .....	14
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF LSE COMMITTEE .....	15
<i>Graduate Student Representation</i> .....	15
(1.5.5).....	15
<i>Faculty Professional Development</i> .....	15
LSE SUSTAINABILITY .....	16
<i>Sustainability Indicators</i> .....	16
<i>Sustainability Challenges</i> .....	17
<b>PART TWO: LIBERAL STUDIES ENGLISH ASSESSMENT REPORT ON PROCESS AND RESULTS,</b>	
<b>2017-2018 .....</b>	<b>19</b>
ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT WRITING IN COMPOSITION II .....	19
<i>Summary</i> .....	19
<i>Assessment Costs</i> .....	19
<i>Assessment Design</i> .....	20
<i>Final Results</i> .....	24
ACTIONS TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING— “CLOSING THE LOOP” .....	29
<i>Level 1: Pedagogically</i> .....	29
<i>Level 2: Programmatically</i> .....	30
EVALUATION OF THE ASSESSMENT DESIGN .....	30
<i>Strengths and Weaknesses of the Assessment Design</i> .....	30
<i>Actions to Improve the Assessment Design</i> .....	31
<b>PART THREE: APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>33</b>
APPENDIX A: FIVE-YEAR REVIEW ACTION PLAN UPDATE .....	33
APPENDIX B: ENGL 101 COURSE OBJECTIVES REVISION .....	34
APPENDIX C: LSE DIRECTOR TASK LIST .....	37
<i>Fall and Spring Tasks</i> .....	37
<i>Summer Tasks (not under contract):</i> .....	38
APPENDIX D: LSE ASSESSMENT COORDINATOR TASKS .....	39
<i>Assessment Coordinator Tasks</i> .....	39
<i>Basic Writing Coordinator Tasks</i> .....	39
APPENDIX E: ENG 202 ASSESSMENT BUDGET.....	40
APPENDIX F: ENG 202 ASSESSMENT RUBRIC .....	41

## Summary/Highlights

This page includes a summary of highlights; in-depth description and analysis of each topic can be found within the report. Corresponding Goals, Strategies, and Tactics from the IUP 2020 Strategic Plan are listed below each section heading (in this format: #.#.#). **This report demonstrates how the LSE program achieves 15 of the 37 tactics listed in Goals 1 and 2 of the 2015-2020 IUP Strategic Plan.**

### Program Features

The LSE program has sustained several long-standing programs and developed new initiatives. Some of these include:

- The National Day on Writing Celebration
- The *Crimson Quill* publication
- Basic Writing, Multilingual Writers, and Online Teaching & Learning Subcommittees
- The Second Annual Celebration and Gallery of LSE Student Writing

### Assessment

- The 2016 Department Five Year Review lists increasing faculty participation in assessment as a primary goal. Participation in the 2017-2018 ENGL 202 assessment was 83%; we collected writing samples from 60 sections of ENGL 202 over the course of the 2017-2018 AY.
- The average score in Focus and Editing demonstrate that this group of students met our expectations for producing an informed inquiry that is guided by a central idea
- The other four variables fall below the cut-off score for competent (8), but above the cut-off score for inadequate (6): Holistic ( $M = 7.61$ ), Documentation ( $M = 7.71$ ), Synthesis ( $M = 7.14$ ), and Source Integration ( $M = 6.88$ ). These results indicate specific areas on which we can focus faculty development, which will begin in 2018-2019.
- Even while reading 355 samples in the final scoring session, sufficient levels of consensus and score consistency were maintained—a positive return on assessment investment.

### Sustainability

Sustainability **indicators** include:

- Commitment to assessment funding including reassigned time for the Assessment Coordinator
- LSE Director reassigned time
- AWPA position
- Instructor training

Sustainability **challenges** include:

- Late hiring of LSE instructors (teaching assistants and temporary faculty)
- The LSE director's workload is spilling into summer when she is not under contract, including enrollment/retention data collection and analysis, processing hundreds of requests for course overrides and transfer credit inquiries, and providing support for temporary faculty preparing fall courses
- The program has no discretionary budget and relies on the writing center and English department to fund programming

---

# Part One: The Liberal Studies English Program

---

## Introduction

Part One of this report includes the 2017-2018 Liberal Studies English (LSE) program features, current and new initiatives, progress, and sustainability indicators and challenges.

## LSE Program Features

### Curriculum

(1.4.1)

In 2017-2018, the LSE program at IUP served approximately 6148 students, up from 5860 the prior year, who enrolled in one or more of four courses: English 100 (Basic Writing,) English 101 (Composition I), English 121 (Humanities Literature), and English 202 (Research Writing) in Fall 2017, Winter 2017, Spring 2018, and Summer 2018. While English 100 is not technically part of University-Wide Liberal Studies, because it is for some students a pre-requisite to English 101, the LSE program considers the course (i.e., its curriculum, assessment, and instructor training) its responsibility.

Each of the three required courses introduces foundational concepts that ultimately teach rhetorical writing concepts and critical thinking skills. Ideally, students should take the Liberal Studies English courses in this order: English 101 (Composition I), English 121 (Humanities Literature), and English 202 (Composition II) in their first three semesters at IUP. These courses serve as a bridge to the writing and reading that students will do in their major courses. In English 101, students learn how to develop and reflect upon a composition process, produce rhetorically aware writing in different genres, and integrate others' texts into their writing. English 121 teaches students how to think critically about ideas and texts as well as practice close reading and analysis. By taking these courses in this order, students learn foundational composition skills in English 101 and critical thinking and analysis skills in English 121. Finally, when they move to English 202, students learn to synthesize the composition skills from English 101 with the critical thinking skills developed in English 121. In 202, students begin to sculpt their composition and ideas for academic and discipline-specific audiences, and, when applicable, they learn to write for the audiences for scholarly writing expected in their major. In particular, English 202 teaches students how to integrate research to support their own argument and analytical thinking, evaluate outside resources, and to write in an academic structure. This course allows students to understand research as a tool to amplify and articulate their own ideas. Students are prepared through 101, 121, and 202 to utilize rhetorically aware processes, read critically, and evaluate and synthesize researched sources.

## Placement

### (2.2.1)

In March, the LSE Director, the Assistant Coordinator of Writing Placement (PhD Candidate, Julia Grove), and five placement raters hired by the Department of English met to begin reviewing placement essays and portfolios submitted by incoming first-year writing students at IUP. Before reviewing all documents submitted by incoming students, they all participated in calibration workshops, where everyone read, discussed, and scored sample student essays to help understand the characteristics and the differences between an English 100 and an English 101 essay and/or portfolio. Criteria was then developed based on conversations about the characteristics and the differences between an English 100 and English 101 essay and/or portfolio. Raters used these criteria while reading submitted essays and/or portfolios to help them decide if students should be placed in English 100 or English 101. All placement decisions were recorded in a Microsoft Excel document, which was maintained by the Assistant Coordinator. Scores were emailed to the New Student Orientation Program to be transferred into student records and to the LSE Director who keeps data for assessment and tracking purposes. PhD student Sheila Farr took over as Assistant Coordinator for a period in June while Julia attended an NEH fellowship. We anticipate Julia Grove will stay on as Assistant Coordinator until she graduates.

Because portfolio placement is generally considered to be a more reliable method of placement (a more substantial sample of writing is collected), in 2017, we made efforts to encourage more students to submit portfolios:

- We revised the requirements for portfolios from four essays to three and redefined the types of essays to be included.
- We accepted portfolios over email.
- We accepted portfolios from students attending August orientations.

In 2018, we added an option for students to directly upload their portfolios from the New Student Orientation website into a Dropbox folder. While a smaller number of students submitted portfolios than in prior years, the percentage of students submitting portfolios compared to those taking the essay test is consistent with prior years. As in prior years, we continue to seek ways to increase portfolio submission, with the goal of making it simpler for more students to submit portfolios.

In 2017-18, a subcommittee of the LSE Committee also revised the writing placement essay prompt. The prompt was piloted in two ENGL100 sections and one ENGL101 section in spring 2018 with considerable consistency.

The following table captures the total number of students who took writing placement as of September 4, 2018 (the last day on which placement testing was given). Scores are separated by portfolio and essays test; the percentage of students placed into English 100 (separated by portfolio and essay test); and the total percentage of students who were placed into English 100.

### **Table 1 – Summer 2018 Placement Data**

	Total Number of Students Who Took Writing Placement		Percentage of Students into English 100		Total Percentage of Students into English 100
Year	Portfolio	Essay Test	Portfolio (of total portfolios)	Essay Test (of total essays)	
Summer 2018	204	1659	15%	23%	19%
Summer 2017	265	1979	15%	17%	16%
Summer 2016	209	2089	15%	14%	14%

The table shows three years' worth of data (previous data was not collected) in order to track how various changes to the placement process affect student placement. Consistent with enrollment, fewer students participated in writing placement in 2018 than in prior years (total = 1863 including those placed into MLW sections).

Notably, while portfolio placement into ENGL100 remains consistent, the percentage of students placed by essay into ENGL100 continues to increase (gray shaded column). We believe this could be for a few reasons:

- Students who submit portfolios tend to be more academically prepared; they also have the opportunity to work on their writing with teachers or parents before submission.
- The student population at IUP has been changing; admissions requirements have changed.
- Although raters unanimously agreed that the essays were easier to read and score, the new placement prompt could be more challenging. We will continue to test this prompt in 2018-19.
- Almost 200 students attended late orientations or late-tested in the first week of classes. Almost all of these students wrote very weak essays and were placed into ENGL100. We do not recall a year prior to this one when so many students took the writing exam this late in the summer and so close to the beginning of classes. The stressors of deciding to attend college at that time must be enormous.

## Enrollment

(1.4.1; 1.4.3)

In 2017-2018, the LSE program at IUP served approximately 6418 students who enrolled in one or more of four courses:

**Table 2: Enrollment Data**

	<b>Fall 2017</b>	<b>Winter 2017</b>	<b>Spring 2018</b>	<b>Summer 2018</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>ENGL 100</b>	299	0	39	0	<b>338</b>
<b>ENGL 101</b>	1024	0	1025	38	<b>2087</b>
<b>ENGL 121</b>	964	73	750	129	<b>1916</b>
<b>ENGL 202</b>	703	51	1169	154	<b>2077</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2990</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>2983</b>	<b>321</b>	<b>6418</b>

The following table captures percentages of the Fall 2017 and Spring 2018 enrollment for ENGL 100, 101, 121, and 202 – the top line represents the percentage of students enrolled in available seats. The bottom line indicates percentages of sections taught by part-time faculty.

**Table 3: Enrollment Data**

	<b>ENGL 100</b>		<b>ENGL 101</b>		<b>ENGL 121</b>		<b>ENGL 202</b>	
<b>Semester</b>	<b>Fall 2017</b>	<b>Spring 2018</b>	<b>Fall 2017</b>	<b>Spring 2018</b>	<b>Fall 2017</b>	<b>Spring 2018</b>	<b>Fall 2017</b>	<b>Spring 2018</b>
Enrollment	83%	98%	99%	99%	97%	88%	97%	97%
Percent of Sections taught by Temp/TAs	78%	0%	72%	62%	14%	11%	38%	33%

\*course sections were overenrolled

LSE course sections were healthily enrolled in 2017-2018, with no courses at lower than 83% of capacity.

## **Continued Initiatives**

### **The LSE Committee**

(1.4.2)

The 2017-2018 LSE Committee consisted of nine members (Dr. Bryna Siegel Finer, Dr. Lynn Shelly, Dr. Laurel Black, Dr. Emily Wender, Dr. Dan Weinstein, Dr. Oriana Gatta, Dr. Katie Miller, Dr. Curtis Porter, and Dr. Dana Driscoll), one English Department consultant (Dr. Ben Rafoth), one Literature and Criticism graduate student representative (Meghan Hurley), and one Composition and TESOL graduate student representative (Marissa McKinley). Committee members met five times throughout the Fall 2017 semester and four times throughout the Spring 2018 semester. During each LSE meeting, committee members

discussed items such as placement, assessment, revisions to the English 101 learning objectives and curriculum, and how to further support LSE instructors, who are mostly Teaching Assistants and Temporary Faculty members (all except one were graduate students in English department doctoral programs), through the mentoring programs established and facilitated by the doctoral programs.

As in prior years, in Fall 2017, the LSE committee reviewed our Action Plan Report as submitted for the department five-year review in 2015. The Action Plan Report indicated that the Department of English would fully implement a new LSE assessment plan, which would require a complete redesign of protocols and rubrics for ENGL 101, ENGL 121, and ENGL 202. Additionally, the report indicated that the Department of English should begin tracking the progress of ENGL 100 students. A summative table of the Five-Year Review Report and Action Plan Update can be found in Appendix A of this 2017-2018 Annual Report.

### **National Day on Writing**

(2.1.3)

For the fifth consecutive year, the LSE program, Writing Across the Curriculum, and the Jones White Writing Center collaborated to celebrate the National Day on Writing with a Writing Carnival in the lobby of the CHSS building. Attendees participated in activities such as an Idiom Freak Show, a WAC Duck Game, and Digital Story Writing. There was carnival music, costumes, balloons, candy, and popcorn. Throughout the carnival, Cirque du Papier artist, Michael Roy, performed. We can safely estimate that hundreds of students, faculty, and staff members traversed the HSS atrium that afternoon. October 20<sup>th</sup> is designated by Congress as the NDoW and is officially sponsored by the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE).

### **The Crimson Quill**

(2.3.6)

*The Crimson Quill*, a graduate student-run publication, originally began after a Composition and TESOL (C&T) graduate student approached Dr. Ben Rafoth in 2009 about her interest in creating a publication for undergraduate students enrolled in LSE writing courses. The graduate student's vision was that LSE students could submit their writing to the publication, a team of editorial staff from C&T could review the submissions, and the staff could publish student writing deemed excellent in *The Crimson Quill* at the end of each academic year. Each edition of the publication could later be printed, bound, and sold in IUP's bookstore. LSE instructors could then list *The Crimson Quill* as a required text on their syllabi. The publication could be used in LSE courses as models of writing produced by former LSE students.



After an editorial team of C&T students published two editions of *The Crimson Quill*, the publication was passed to an editorial team of Literature and Criticism (L&C) PhD students. L&C PhD students then published the third, fourth, and fifth editions of *The Crimson Quill*. After being on hiatus for a year after the fifth edition of *The Crimson Quill* was published, in Fall 2016, the LSE Committee took over the publication.

In 2017, the LSE Committee put out a call for new editors for the *Quill*. MATESOL students, Kimberly Bressler and Erika Hodges, were given the position; they posted a CFP for student writing, worked with students to edit their pieces, and published *The Crimson Quill* in the spring using the IUP iblog platform after a two-year hiatus.

### **Teaching Circle: LSE & Lattes**

(1.4.2)

In Fall 2012, the LSE Director created a teaching circle where LSE instructors could meet to talk informally about teaching LSE courses. Through the help of some mini-grants from the Center for Teaching Excellence, the group has been able to purchase shared reading material, publish one peer-reviewed article, and recently submitted a second article to a refereed journal. In Spring 2016, the teaching circle took on a new name: LSE & Lattes. Each month, the LSE Director joins instructors at Commonplace Coffeehouse for casual talk about teaching early college readers and writers. The LSE & Lattes coffee hour is an opportunity for LSE teachers to vent about classroom issues, to celebrate teaching successes, and to make suggestions for improving the LSE program. In fall 2017, nine LSE instructors attended at least one of three meetings. Because attendance was low, no meetings were held in the spring.

### **Basic Writing (BW) Subcommittee**

(2.2.2)

The BW Subcommittee was formed in 2015 to help streamline BW classes and support faculty teaching English 100 at IUP. 2017-2018 BW Subcommittee members included: Dr. Bryna Siegel Finer, Dr. Matt Vetter, Dr. Laurel Black, Dr. Lynn Shelly, Dr. Heather Powers, and graduate representative, Lara Hauer, and subcommittee Chair, Dr. Katie Miller. Throughout 2017-2018, the BW Subcommittee tackled the following tasks: discussions of BW placement retesting processes; updates and discussion of supplemental instruction one-credit course for at-risk students; ways to connect more with DVST instructors; best practices for embedded tutoring.

### **Multilingual Writing (MLW) Subcommittee**

(2.3.4)

The MLW subcommittee meets on occasion to discuss issues related to MLW sections of LSE courses. Members include Drs. Bryna Siegel Finer, Curt Porter, Gloria Park, and Brian Carpenter; occasionally a PhD student in C&T will be invited to join the subcommittee if they are teaching an MLW LSE course. To support MLW students enrolled in LSE courses

and their instructors, students in the MATESOL Practicum course taught by Dr. Curt Porter are assigned to MLW LSE courses each semester; they assist students and instructors in a variety of ways—through offering peer feedback to writers, occasionally serving as translators, and/or taking course notes for students and sharing those notes via Google Docs. MATESOL Practicum students share their classroom experiences with Dr. Porter through regular written responses; these students also meet regularly with Dr. Porter and the instructor of the course they are assisting.

### **Subcommittee on Online Teaching and Learning**

(1.4.4)

As our online course offerings have expanded, in Spring 2017, the Subcommittee on Online Teaching and Learning was formed to help support LSE instructors teaching online. Members of the subcommittee include Dr. Bryna Siegel Finer, Dr. Mary Stewart, Dr. Matt Vetter, Dr. Dan Weinstein, and Dr. Emily Wender. In AY 2017-2018, this subcommittee proposed guidelines for observing online LSE courses, which were passed unanimously in a vote by the English department. The subcommittee also hosted a fall and spring “D2L share session” in which department instructors came and shared their best D2L tip for teaching writing online. The sessions were screen-casted and shared via IUP itube for those who could not attend. The subcommittee also met with Distance Librarian Carrie Bishop, who developed an embedded librarian program for online ENGL202 sections. Together, they developed a survey tool to collect data from students in the courses with the embedded librarian; data is in the process of being analyzed.

### **The Second Annual Celebration of LSE Student Writing**

(2.3.6)

On Thursday, April 6, 2017, the First Annual Celebration of LSE Student Writing took place in the HSS Atrium. In 2018, in an effort to showcase the department hallways and faculty, the event was held on April 6<sup>th</sup> in the English Department (5<sup>th</sup> floor HSS). This event was planned and facilitated by Marissa McKinley, Assistant Writing Program Administrator. The event celebrated the writing of students enrolled in the LSE courses during the AY 2017-2018 semesters and was sponsored by the Department of English, Writing Across the Curriculum, LSE, and the Jones White Writing Center.

Prior to the event, Ms. McKinley distributed an email to LSE instructors, encouraging them to ask their student to submit writing they are proud of to a secure email address. Ms. McKinley received twenty-eight submissions, nine more than the previous year.

At the event, submissions were displayed in multiple ways throughout the 5<sup>th</sup> floor English department hallways. Some written texts, for instance, were displayed in memory albums, some were strung across corners hung from clothes pins, some were placed on stands, some were displayed electronically on television screens, and some texts were also placed

in photo frames. Students participated in a writing scavenger hunt, moving through the hallway collecting stamps at a variety of activity booths. They also enjoyed snacks and drinks. We were thrilled to see that this year, several students brought their parents to the event.

Awards for best writing were given to the following students: Ashley King (English 100); Heather Bair (English 101); Kristen Schlorff (English 121); and Wesley Kunda (English 202). Award winners received a certificate and a \$25 Amazon gift card. A news post about the celebration and the award winners was published in the *IUP Daily*.

Next year, we plan to emphasize recruitment more. We will add information about the English minor to the scavenger hunt. We also hope to target more BA-program faculty for attendance at the event. Award winners will be notified in advance and will be encouraged to bring their families and friends to the celebration.

### **AWPA Position** (2.3.5)

In early Spring 2016, Dr. Bryna Siegel Finer and Marissa McKinley, a PhD candidate from Composition/TESOL, drafted a proposal for the creation of an Assistant Writing Program Administrator (AWPA) position after Ms. McKinley approached Dr. Siegel Finer and expressed her desire to gain Writing Program Administrator (WPA) work experience so that she could be better prepared to undertake a WPA position after graduating from IUP. Once drafted, this proposal was forwarded to and approved by Department Chair Gian Pagnucci and Dean Yaw Asamoah.

Ms. McKinley was hired as the AWPA in August 2016 into a two-year position at five hours per week. During this time, she assumed the following job responsibilities:

- Attended Liberal Studies Committee meetings and subcommittee meetings (when possible) as a representative of the C&T graduate students, taking minutes, and fulfilling administrative tasks as needed related to meetings.
- Collected and analyzed data from LSE assessment samples and registrar data, including grades and enrollment.
- Collected and analyzed data from student placement essays and portfolios.
- Developed and implemented new initiatives to support and strengthen innovative, effective composition instruction (e.g., the LSE Celebration of Writing) at IUP by staying up-to-date with current scholarship and publications in the teaching and assessment of college writing.
- Planned and organized the First Annual Celebration of LSE Student Writing.
- Updated and created materials for the LSE Resources website.
- Worked with the Assessment Coordinator to facilitate LSE assessment by providing administrative support, helping to facilitate faculty information sessions, and creating documents and materials.

In January 2018, Marissa and the LSE Director sent out a call to English PhD listservs for a new 2-year AWP. Jing Zhang was hired and will be in the position through the end of the 2020 academic year.

*One challenge of this position is that funding is not available during the summer months, when the LSE Director does most of the data compilation and year-long planning. It would be an effective professionalization experience as well as a useful resource if this position could be expanded into summer.*

## **PACT Internships**

(2.3.5)

In 2017, the Professors and Associates Collaborating on Teaching (PACT) internship program was approved in the department and by the Dean of CHSS. PACT interns “job-shadow” a faculty mentor in the department as they teach a course from beginning to end. Interns participate by leading small group work, mini-lessons, discussions, conferences, and other activities as appropriate. These internships have the dual effect of giving the intern hands-on experience in a classroom setting, and they provide additional support for students in the LSE classroom. In 2017, one student was assigned as a PACT intern in a section of English 101.

## **New Program Initiatives**

In addition to our ambitious assessment program, in 2017-2018, we began four new initiatives. They include: (1) piloting a supplemental instruction course for Basic Writing Students; (2) revising the English 101 Course Objectives; (3) revising the writing placement exam prompts for new student orientation; (4) planning an embedded tutoring program for at-risk students.

## **Writing Skills Workshop (At-Risk Student Retention) Pilot**

(2.1.2)

As we anticipated more underprepared students enrolling at the Indiana campus due to the new Punxsutawney campus model, the LSE Director and Basic Writing Coordinator proposed a new 1cr workshop for students who might need more support in ENGL 100. In 2017, we added a new procedure to our placement process in which all essays placed as ENGL 100 were read a third time by both the LSE Director and BW Coordinator, who then also reviewed verbal/writing standardized test scores, and any other available information (e.g., the student’s Accuplacer reading score) and used the combined information to determine placement in ENGL101, ENGL100, or ENGL100 with a 1credit writing skills workshop (to be run as ENGL281 in the first 2-3 semesters) taught by expert basic writing faculty in our department. Throughout the summer and fall 2017, ENGL100 instructors received support and professional development from the LSE Director and Basic Writing

Coordinator to feel confident working with the varied level of student preparedness, and all 100 and 281 faculty met throughout the fall semester to assess the process. One hundred and one students placed into the 1-cr workshop, 26% of the total number of students placed into English 100. In spring 2018, we learned the course would be cut due to cost.

Although we cannot draw definite conclusions based on a one-semester pilot, we did collect some data. Seventy-two students registered for sections of no more than ten students each in fall 2017. Of those, 52 students re-enrolled at the university in spring 2018, a 72% retention rate (consistent with overall university retention numbers); 88% of those students earned 30 credits by the end of their first year. Thirty-six of those 52 students persisted to re-enroll in their sophomore year – 69%.

In a survey of students enrolled in the ENGL pilot, here is what we learned:

- 100% of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that they received individualized support and practice with their writing
- 100% of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that the course was a useful opportunity to work on writing that was assigned in ENGL100
- 100% of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that conferences with their ENGL281 instructor helped them improve their writing skills
- 78% of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that ENGL281 helped them complete a major project for their ENGL100 class
- 78% of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that attending the ENGL281 class meetings helped them improve their writing

While the pilot was not funded for a second semester, we do now have a sense that it could be beneficial for at-risk students. It is a model we could consider again should the university agree to fund it, perhaps as part of University College or as another retention effort.

## **Revision to ENGL 101 Course Objectives**

(1.1.2)

After assessing English 101 in 2016-2017, we determined the language of the English 101 objectives could be clearer and could better match that of national organizations that make recommendations about post-secondary composition. A subcommittee of the LSE Committee, Drs. Bryna Siegel Finer, Katie Miller, and Dana Driscoll, mapped the existing objectives onto those recommended outcomes.

On February 1, 2018, the LSE Committee voted unanimously to approve the revised objectives. The English Department also voted to approve the changes on March 8th. The revisions were approved by the UWUCC and then the university senate on May 1, 2018.

Please see the revised English 101 catalogue description and course objectives in Appendix B.

## **Costs/Budget**

### **Reassigned Time**

In 2017-18, the LSE Director received three credits of reassigned time in the fall and spring semesters, supported by the Department of English and the CHSS. A list of her tasks is supplied in Appendix C, including tasks performed in the summer for which no compensation is provided. The LSE Assessment Coordinator received three credits of reassigned time in the fall semester; a list of her tasks is supplied in Appendix D; in a 5-year review meeting on December 7, 2016, approval was given to expand that release time to spring – 6 credits total. The LSE program has no discretionary budget.

### **AWPA Salary**

The AWPA is paid \$8.25 per hour and works five hours per week during the academic year for a total of \$1,402.50, which comes out of the Department of English's budget.

### **Assessment Costs**

Assessment was our largest cost in 2017-2018. Please see page 20 and Appendix E for information on our assessment budget.

### **Other Costs**

The Second Annual Celebration of LSE Student Writing, as described above, was supported by the Writing Across the Curriculum program, the Jones White Writing Center, and the Department of English at no cost to LSE. The National Day on Writing was supported by the Kathleen Jones White Writing Center and the Writing Across the Curriculum Program at no cost to LSE.

## **Publicity/Promotion**

### **Teaching LSE at IUP Facebook Page**

(1.4.2)

In Fall 2016, the LSE Director created a Teaching LSE at IUP Facebook page; it is co-managed by the AWPA. Those who are currently teaching LSE courses at IUP and/or who have taught LSE courses at IUP are invited to join the group. Weekly, the LSE Director writes and shares posts that relate to writing praxis, and she encourages fellow LSE group members to respond to the posts. Occasionally, fellow LSE group members share their own

posts, which often relate to teaching writing or writing events celebrated on IUP's campus. The Teaching LSE at IUP Facebook group appears active, and it seems the page has helped fellow LSE instructors to connect and network with one another.

## **Professional Development of LSE Committee**

### **Graduate Student Representation**

(1.5.5)

In Spring 2016, Dr. Siegel Finer invited two PhD students to join and serve on the LSE Committee as representatives of Literature/Criticism and Composition/TESOL. Meghan Hurley finished her 2-year term in spring 2018 as the Literature/Criticism representative, and Marissa McKinley finished her 2-year term in spring 2018 as the Composition/TESOL representative. Both PhD students attended all LSE meetings and took part in making decisions relating to LSE writing courses.

### **Faculty Professional Development**

(1.5.6)

As members of the LSE Committee, permanent faculty should be active in performing and presenting research on what happens in LSE courses at IUP. In 2017-18, LSE Director Bryna Siegel Finer and LSE committee members Drs. Emily Wender and Katie Miller co-authored a peer-reviewed article about placement, assessment, and Basic Writing at IUP. LSE Committee member Dr. Daniel Weinstein has recently published a chapter on teaching multi-lingual writers in LSE courses and is working on an invited essay related to ENGL101 and 202 pedagogy. Many faculty on the LSE Committee (and other undergraduate-dedicated faculty) teach a 4-4 load with no release time, including 2-3 sections of LSE courses, which are extremely time-intensive in terms of grading (responding to student work takes a significant amount of time; there is no automated scoring in LSE courses). Our courses are already capped higher than national recommendations<sup>1</sup>. Resources to support department faculty who are committed to undergraduate education, particularly liberal studies courses, and regardless of LSE Committee membership, should be provided in order to encourage a healthy model of scholarship surrounding the teaching and processes

---

<sup>1</sup> The Conference on College Composition and Communication provides recommendations in section eleven of their position statement on best practices in the teaching of postsecondary writing: "No more than 20 students should be permitted in any writing class. Ideally, classes should be limited to 15. Remedial or developmental sections should be limited to a maximum of 15 students. No English faculty members should teach more than 60 writing students a term"

(<http://www.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/postsecondarywriting#principle11>)

involved in the program. **Any tenured or tenure-track faculty member who teaches two sections of LSE courses in any semester should receive release time in order to pursue research, especially if that research is devoted to general education pedagogy (retention/persistence).**

## **LSE Sustainability**

### **Sustainability Indicators**

#### *Commitment to Assessment Funding*

(1.1.2)

The university's commitment to funding LSE assessment is a significant indicator of sustainability for the program. When we do more rigorous assessment, we learn more about our students' successes and struggles, which in turn helps us adjust pedagogy accordingly. Having a dedicated assessment coordinator for LSE and providing them with resources including adequate release time and funding to hire and train qualified raters, almost guarantees reliable assessment that will directly affect the quality of both instruction and students' learning.

#### *LSE Director's Reassigned Time*

(1.4.1)

The university's commitment to providing adequate release time for the LSE director, whose position far exceeds the bounds of a nine-month contract, is another significant indicator of the program's sustainability. This commitment to a general education composition and literature program the size (40+ faculty per semester, 5000+ students a year) and scope (4 courses) of IUP's LSE program is a necessity for the program not only to develop new initiatives, but to maintain current ones.

#### *AWPA Position*

(2.3.5)

The AWPA position is a substantial boon to the LSE program. While the AWPA does not necessarily lighten the load of the LSE Director or Assessment Coordinator, having a person in this position ensures that new projects are developed, and that there is an extra hand on deck to assist with some minutiae associated with program facilitation and assessment. As a graduate student position, the AWPA also gets experience that will make her valuable on the job market, a boon to our PhD program as well.

#### *Instructor Training*

(1.4.2)

The formalized graduate student mentoring programs support Teaching Assistants (TAs) and Temporary Faculty (TFs) in their teaching at IUP and beyond. All TAs and TFs are assigned an individual mentor and attend group meetings within their PhD program group. All mentees teach LSE courses. In 2017-2018, Dr. Dana Driscoll was Mentor Coordinator for the C&T program, and Dr. Ken Sherwood was Mentor Coordinator for the L&C program. As



part of the programs, mentors assist mentees with developing and reviewing LSE course materials for the classes they teach. Each semester, mentees are also observed teaching their LSE courses by their assigned mentor and an assigned secondary observing mentor. Observation reports are drafted by both mentors and discussed one-on-one with mentees during a scheduled meeting.

Additionally, as part of the mentoring programs, mentors and mentees meet to discuss and listen to any challenges mentors and mentees are facing in their classrooms, to celebrate teaching successes that have occurred throughout the semester, to learn from one another through formal presentations, and to discuss how to improve the mentoring programs.

In 2016, the LSE Director and both Mentor Coordinators began meeting regularly to better coordinate efforts at training LSE instructors. Of primary importance in these discussions is to establish a list of recommendations that indicate the specific roles and responsibilities of mentors and mentees.

## **Sustainability Challenges**

### *Late Hiring of LSE Teaching Assistants and Temporary Faculty*

(1.4.2)

The late (and consistently later) hiring of temporary faculty will continue to be a hindrance to LSE program sustainability, particularly as it relates to two areas: (1) enrollment and (2) training temporary faculty. Over the last several years, the department has been granted approval to hire temporary faculty later and later into the spring, and this past year approval did not come until the summer. This means that we (1) lose many of our top ranked applicants to other positions, (2) must close sections of courses that are unstaffed, which causes substantial enrollment problems, and (3) do not have adequate time to train instructors to teach the courses, which could result in less effective teaching in courses that would otherwise be likely to aid in student retention. Typically, we hold a May LSE orientation for hired temporary faculty so that they have the summer to plan their courses. In 2017, for the first time ever, we had our LSE orientation at the beginning of the Fall semester (August 2017) instead of at the end of the spring semester (May 2017). *Without compensation, the LSE director provided a summer D2L mini-course/discussion group in which TAs and temporary instructors were given readings and other materials, received advice, and traded feedback on course design.* The August orientation focused on introducing the LSE program, considerations for first-day/week activities, and reporting results of ENGL101 assessment. There was no thorough, face-to-face group discussion of course design that would have set up instructors for a productive summer of planning.

### *Lack of Summer LSE Support*

(1.5.3)

The LSE Director does a significant amount of one-on-one mentoring of new instructors, materials development, and report writing during the summer. There is no financial support for the position over the summer, nor support for a GA or for the AWPA. This

means that the LSE Director has less time in the summer to fully commit to a research agenda.

*Lack of LSE Discretionary Budget*

(1.5.3)

The LSE Program has no discretionary budget. We therefore rely upon the charity of other programs (the Writing Center, the English Department, the CHSS), in order to facilitate our programs. At some point, it's likely these other programs will find it frustrating to continue with these hand-outs. This also puts the LSE Director in the continual position of putting more and more effort into events so that other programs feel their money was well spent.

---

## Part Two: Liberal Studies English Assessment Report on Process and Results, 2017-2018

---

### Assessment of Student Writing in Composition II

#### Summary

As indicated in the Five-Year Review Action Plan, LSE is implementing a revised assessment plan, which required a complete redesign of protocols for all LSE courses. In working to meet this need, and, specifically this year, in working to meet this need for Composition II (ENGL 202), our assessment coordinator, Dr. Katie Miller, created a rubric to assess writing students completed in their ENGL 202 courses, considering the various genres ENGL 202 instructors teach. Once the rubric was created, she introduced it to the LSE Committee to receive feedback, and then solicited feedback from the rest of the department faculty during two open rubric feedback sessions.

Feedback that was provided during these sessions was integrated into the rubric and was then brought back to the LSE Committee for further review. After approval of the rubric and document collection protocols, a pilot rating session was completed in December 2017, where rates scored 10% of the fall collection of ENGL 202 student writing.

Eighty three percent of faculty teaching English 202 submitted writing samples as requested in both semesters (50/60 sections). In Summer 2018, a group of expert raters were trained and read the ENGL 202 student writing samples. Data from the ENGL 202 assessment was analyzed to measure how well our students are writing in Composition II and has been archived for additional analysis in the future (e.g., comparison of score trends from year-to-year).

#### Assessment Costs

The 2017-2018 LSE assessment of ENGL 202 was ambitious in its goals to collect a representative sample of student writing that can yield results with a high enough confidence level (95%) to make inferential claims about the entire population of writers (2,077 students) enrolled in ENGL 202.

As noted below in Table 4, the total assessment costs for the year includes two rounds of rater training and two scoring sessions. In December 2017, the LSE Program held a **one-day pilot scoring session** with four raters to read a subsample of the student papers collected in the fall. This pilot scoring session was a trial run using the finalized ENGL 202

rubric that allowed us to calculate interrater reliability, better understand the variety of assignments raters will need to score, and monitor operational concerns (timing for scoring sessions, spatial arrangements for scoring, materials needed). We used information gathered from this December pilot scoring session to plan our second scoring session in May. In May, we held a **two-day scoring session** for *all* samples collected from fall and spring (355 student samples). We hired 13 raters in order to read and rate each paper twice and in order to conduct third reads for a small percentage of samples.

**Table 4—Total Assessment Expenses for 2017-2018**

See Appendix E for a full Budget Rationale.

<b>Expense</b>	<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Cost</b>
Rubric Testing with Trained Raters (2 hr x \$20/hr x 5 raters)	CHSS Dean	\$200.00
December Pilot Scoring (8 hrs x \$20/hr x 5 raters)	CHSS Dean	\$800.00
May New Rater Training & Scoring Session (\$15/hr x 19 hr x 2 raters)	CHSS Dean	\$570.00
May Returning or Faculty Rater Training & Scoring Session (\$19.21 or \$20/hr x 19 hr x 11)	CHSS Dean	\$4060.00
Food for Raters during May Scoring Session	English Dept	\$570
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$6,200.00</b>
<i>Note: The total cost is \$705 over the total estimated amount (\$5,495) prepared by Dr. Miller and approved by Dr. Moerland and Dr. Killmarx during meeting on Dec 7, 2016 with Dr. Siegel Finer and Dr. Pagnucci; that budget was prepared for English 101—assessed in 2016-17— with a different number of samples. It also did not include food.</i>		

This significant investment of resources helps sustain best practices in assessment, which in turn, provides the most valid and reliable data possible for the LSE Program and Liberal Studies Program. The ability to draw generalizable conclusions that will enhance teaching and learning is particularly important given the large population of students enrolled in these courses (2,077 students participated in ENGL 202 during 2017-18).

Going forward, programmatic assessment expenses may vary depending on the type of assessment conducted and the scope of the assessment. For example, the projected cost to assess ENGL 121 during 2018-2019 is approximately \$4,000 because fewer students are enrolled in the course and fewer samples will be needed.

## **Assessment Design**

### *Inquiry Question*

The ENGL 202 Assessment was driven by one primary question:

How well are students able to meet the most measurable Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for ENGL 202?

The 2017-2018 programmatic assessment of ENGL 202 was designed to gather aggregate data about student writing that could help us answer this question. The LSE Committee chose to focus on SLOs #3 and #4 because it can provide the most information about student writing ability at the end of ENGL 202.

**ENGL 202 Student Learning Objective #3:** Compose a focused and cohesive synthesis of sources.

**ENGL 202 Student Learning Objective #4:** Use a body of knowledge inside written work: paraphrase, quote, summarize, explain/interpret/comment, cite, and document (MLA or APA).

### *Sample Collection*

After consultation with LSE Committee’s recommendation, Dr. Miller used statistical techniques to design a method for collecting a representative sample of student writing from the general ENG 202 population. Specifically, she calculated a minimum sample size using course enrollment data from fall, anticipated spring enrollment, and the desired confidence level (95%).

The ENGL 202 assessment chose to measure student writing at a key point: the end of the term. Faculty members submitted final drafts of a major writing assignment from the second half of the semester. Identifying information such as instructor name, section number, and student names were removed from all samples and replaced with sample ID numbers.

A total of 355 student writing samples were collected, which provided a representative sample of the Fall and Spring ENGL 202 population (1872 for the 2017-2018 AY). The corpus of 355 student samples included writing assignments from traditional sections, MLW sections, online sections, and sections offered at Punxsutawney and Northpointe.

### *Faculty Participation*

The 2016 Department Five Year Review lists increasing faculty participation in assessment as a primary goal. Faculty participation in the 2017-2018 ENGL 202 assessment was 83%, meaning that most instructors teaching ENGL 202 during the 2017-2018 AY submitted samples from their section(s).

**Table 5—Number of Writing Samples Collection**

<b>Term</b>	<b># of Sections</b>
Fall	23
Spring	37
Total for 2017-2018 AY	60

### *Trial Session*

In December 2017, Dr. Katie Miller and a team of four expert raters read and scored a subsample of 37 papers using a preliminary draft ENGL 202 rubric. The purpose of this trial scoring session was twofold:

1. Test inter-rater reliability and internal consistency of the assessment design
2. Identify weaknesses in the rubric

The results of this trial scoring session were promising, and no major weaknesses in the rubric were identified.

When examining interrater reliability, Dr. Miller compared rates of score agreement to benchmarks established in writing program assessment literature. Score correlation between raters is typically defined as low (0.1 to 0.22), medium (0.27 to 0.56), or high (.57 to 1.0) Table 6 shows the interrater reliability for the Holistic score and for Source Integration and Documentation fall into the high range compared to established benchmarks for correlation, while Focus, Synthesis, and Editing fall into the medium range.

**Table 6—Interrater Reliability from Trial Scoring**

<b>FEATURE</b>	<b>Adj. Pearson r (2-tailed)</b>
1. Focus	.464**
2. Synthesis	.503**
3. Source Integration	.593**
4. Editing	.516**
5. Documentation	.921**
6. Holistic	.681**

\*p<.05 \*\*p<.01

Examination of central tendencies (average scores and score distribution) and correlations among each feature revealed no major weaknesses in the ENGL 202 rubric. However, some wording changes were made to the descriptions of Documentation, Source Integration, and Focus.

### *Final Scoring Session*

During the Spring 2017 term, Dr. Miller hired and trained a team of 13 raters (10 graduate students and 3 permanent faculty members). All but one rater had recent experience teaching ENGL 202. Raters attended a three-hour paid training and norming session to gain familiarity with the scoring procedures, discuss the feature descriptions on the rubric, and begin building consensus.

Dr. Miller, Dr. Siegel Finer, and the 13 raters then worked two 8-hour scoring sessions in mid-May to systematically score 355 student writing samples. The samples were read and

scored using the final ENGL 202 rubric (see Appendix F). The rubric measures five key features—Focus, Synthesis, Source Integration, Editing, and Documentation—and evaluated the writing overall with a Holistic Score. Each sample was scored using a six-point scale ranging from a score of 1 (“Not Competent”) to 6 (“Excellent”). Table 7 displays each feature, its definition, and description of a mid-range of 4.

**Table 7—Feature Descriptions from ENGL 202 Rubric**

<b>Feature</b>	<b>Feature Definition</b>	<b>Description for Score of 4 (Competent)</b>
<b>Focus</b>	Document reflects writer’s informed inquiry. The document is guided by a central idea, focused question, thesis, or purpose conveys critical inquiry into the topic, and shows writer’s critical thinking (e.g., knowledge of debates, recognition of contrary evidence, analysis of counterargument).	Document demonstrates student’s informed inquiry through consideration of multiple perspectives.  Has a developed central idea, focused question, thesis, or purpose that conveys a perspective on the topic.
<b>Synthesis</b>	Sources are not discussed as isolated arguments, but as part of a conversation or body of knowledge. Writer draws connections and conclusion about sources used. (Note: a “body of knowledge” may include primary or secondary sources, personal experience, observations, memory, field research).	Sources are presented in conversation with one another or are otherwise counterpoised.  More than one source is used in body paragraphs, when appropriate.  Clear conceptual connections are drawn between sources and perhaps to writer’s own ideas.  Interpretation goes beyond vague commentary about information from sources
<b>Source Integration</b>	Source integration techniques for introducing, contextualizing, and citing sources are effectively used (e.g., signal phrases with accurate attribution verbs; blended quotations). Writer has generated text as an extension or response to information referenced from sources.	Quotations are integrated into students own prose (i.e., no dropped quotes).  In-text citations are consistently used (if applicable to genre), but there may be some errors in citation conventions.  There may be repetition of attribution verbs or sentence structures for in-text citations (e.g., overuse of the verb “argues”)
<b>Editing</b>	The text demonstrates writer’s awareness of formal and informal guidelines for what is considered to be correct and appropriate in a piece of college-level writing.	Meets expectations for editing and proofreading student’s own work.  Shows awareness of sentence-level conventions with some errors, but they do not impede meaning.

**Documentation** Sources could be retrieved using bibliographic information provided; APA, MLA or another citation style is used consistently.

Sources could be retrieved using bibliographic information provided.

APA, MLA or another citation style is used consistently, though there may be occasional errors.

Two raters independently scored each sample, and the two scores were then combined for a composite score ranging between 2 and 12. Samples that received two scores that differed by more than one point (e.g., a score of 4 and 6) were sent to a third rater for adjudication.

## Final Results

This section presents results from the final scoring session in May.

### *Benchmarks for Competency*

Table 8 displays the measures of central tendency for this sample set (N=355). While the score range and standard deviation are important for assessment methodology, the mean scores for each feature and the holistic mean score provide one snapshot of students' writing ability, on average, and thus help us answer the original questions driving this programmatic assessment—how well are students able to meet the most measureable Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for ENGL 202?

**Table 8—Measures of Central Tendency for Final Scoring Session**

<b>FEATURES</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
1. Focus	3, 12	8.14	1.52
2. Synthesis	2, 11	7.18	1.90
3. Source Integration	2, 12	6.88	1.85
4. Editing	3, 12	8.14	1.57
5. Documentation	2, 12	7.71	2.49
6. Holistic	2, 12	7.61	1.59

Spring 2018 (N=355)

The LSE Committee, LSE Director, and LSE Assessment Coordinator find the above means to be promising. The average score in Focus ( $M = 8.14$ ) and Editing ( $M = 8.14$ ) demonstrate that this group of students met our expectations for producing an informed inquiry that is guided by a central ideal, and that the students produced correct and appropriate college-level writing.



The other four variables fall below the cut-off score of 8. As a midrange score, a 7 is a combination of one score from the lower range (3) and one score from the upper range (4); it reflects work that is developing, but not yet demonstrating competency. Mean scores for all indicators were above 6.5, which means no feature was scored in the inadequate range (6 or below). As an aggregate group, the student writers in this sample earned at least one score of 4 (“competent”) on each indicator. Students performed especially well in Focus ( $M = 8.14$ ) and Editing ( $M = 8.14$ ). Average Holistic scores ( $M = 7.61$ ) and Documentation ( $M = 7.71$ ) were also well above the competency benchmark. The lowest average scores were for Synthesis ( $M = 7.14$ ) and Source Integration ( $M = 6.88$ ).

Although we find the results of this initial assessment informative and promising, the LSE Committee has identified a combined score of 8—a combination of two scores of 4 or “competent”—as a satisfactory average score for this programmatic assessment. Given this benchmark for competency, then how did this student group perform? As Table 4 demonstrates, only two features have a mean score above that competency cut-off. The average score in Focus ( $M = 8.14$ ) demonstrates that this group of students did meet our expectations for producing an informed inquiry that is guided by a central ideal, and the average score in Editing ( $M = 8.14$ ) demonstrates that this group produced correct and appropriate college-level writing. The other four variables fall below the cut-off score of 8, indicating that on average students are not yet meeting SLO #3 (cohesively synthesize sources) and SLO #4 (use a body of knowledge inside written work) for ENGL 202.

The table below shows the percentage of samples that earned an 8 or higher for each feature.

**Table 9—Percentage of Samples Demonstrating Competency**

Feature	% of Samples that Earned an 8 or higher
Focus	68%
Synthesis	44%
Source Integration	35%
Editing	68%
Documentation	66%
Holistic	55%

Although the overall percentage of samples is a helpful statistic, it is more helpful to breakdown those percentages for more granular analysis. Table 10 provides a detailed breakdown of the percentage of samples that earned each possible score (ranging from 2-12). Rows in green earned an 8 or higher for the feature.

**Table 10—Detailed Breakdowns of Samples Demonstrating Competency**

Feature	Score	Number	Percent	Feature	Score	Number	Percent
FOCUS	2	-	-	SYNTHESIS	2	8	2.2

3	2	0.5
4	3	0.8
5	11	3.1
6	27	7.6
7	71	20.0
8	99	27.9
9	76	21.4
10	46	12.9
11	18	5.1
12	2	0.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>100</b>

3	8	2.2
4	11	3.1
5	34	9.5
6	53	14.9
7	83	23.4
8	64	18.0
9	64	18.0
10	14	3.9
11	13	3.7
12	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>100</b>

Feature	Score	Number	Percent
<b>SOURCE</b>	2	10	2.8
<b>INTEGRATION</b>	3	9	2.5
	4	11	3.1
	5	40	11.3
	6	67	18.9
	7	93	26.2
	8	59	16.6
	9	45	12.6
	10	12	3.4
	11	8	2.2
	12	1	0.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>100</b>	

Feature	Score	Number	Percent
<b>EDITING</b>	2	-	-
	3	1	0.3
	4	3	0.8
	5	16	4.5
	6	31	8.7
	7	62	17.5
	8	86	24.2
	9	96	27.0
	10	34	9.5
	11	23	6.5
	12	2	0.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>100</b>	

Feature	Score	Number	Percent
<b>DOCUMENTATION</b>	2	33	9.3
	3	3	0.8
	4	8	2.2
	5	12	3.4
	6	20	5.6
	7	45	12.6
	8	84	23.7
	9	79	22.3
	10	39	11.0
	11	21	5.9
	12	10	2.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>100</b>	

Feature	Score	Number	Percent
<b>HOLISTIC</b>	2	1	0.3
	3	3	0.8
	4	7	2.0
	5	23	6.5
	6	46	12.9
	7	78	22.0
	8	91	25.6
	9	71	20.0
	10	27	7.6
	11	7	2.0
	12	1	0.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>100</b>	

The LSE Committee would be more satisfied if a higher percentage of the sample received an average score of 8 on each feature, which would be evidence that student writing, on average, meets the program's expectations for college-level writing. The LSE Director has

already applied these findings to programmatic professional development by incorporating a report of the ENGL 202 results within the orientation for LSE instructors in August 2018 (described in more detail in the following section). As the LSE Assessment Coordinator, Dr. Stewart will continue to share a synopsis of these findings in the Literature and Criticism mentoring program, the Composition and TESOL mentoring program, and department meetings. Dr. Stewart will also host ENGL 202 share sessions that specifically invite ENGL 202 instructors to share strategies for teaching source integration and synthesis. As always, this report is shared with the Provost, Dean of CHSS, and the Director of Liberal Studies. Regular and systematic program assessment allows the LSE Program to study student achievement, refine curriculum, improve instructor preparedness, and most efficiently allocate resources.

Learning to write in college takes time and practice. As a community of teachers, we recognize that students may not reap the rewards of sound writing instruction in only one semester of college-level writing. However, our goal is that student writing from the end of ENGL 202 would earn two scores from the upper range, thus equaling an 8 or above. The LSE Committee will continue review student mean scores for each feature to identify ways in which Student Learning Outcomes #3 and #4 are not being adequately met (a score at or below 7), which are being met adequately (a score 8), and which scores suggest superior work (score of 9 and above).

Establishing satisfactory average scores and then working to slowly increase these average scores to consistently demonstrate competency is an essential part of closing the loop for programmatic assessment in LSE. This year’s important advancements were made possible by the significant investment of resources from the University, the College of Humanities and Social Sciences, and Liberal Studies Program which have all already received returns on their investment. The LSE program anticipates further returns in the coming years *if funding levels remain consistent*. Any reduction in funding for assessment work in the LSE program will impact the scope and statistical significance of LSE assessments, which will also limit the value of assessment data for LSE, the Liberal Studies Program, the College of Humanities and Social Science, and the University.

### Score Correlations

Scores were also analyzed to look for positive or negative correlations among individual features. These correlations can illuminate relationships between the scores for individual features on our rubric. For example, there was a strong positive relationship between the Focus and Holistic scores, and between the Synthesis and Holistic Scores.

**Table 11—Summary of Score Intercorrelations**

	Source				
	Synthesis	Integration	Editing	Documentation	Holistic
Focus	.623**	.531**	.508**	.396**	.767**
Synthesis	—	.726**	.422**	.424**	.794**

Source Integration	—	.428**	.406**	.770**
Editing		—	.351**	.591**
Documentation			—	.660**
Holistic				—

\* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ .

Under the Pearson correlation, the adjudicated Holistic score—an important variable for measuring the quality of student writing overall—achieved very strong positive correlations with Synthesis ( $r = .794, p < .01$ ), Source Integration ( $r = .770, p < .01$ ), and Focus ( $r = .767, p < .01$ ). Holistic scores were also positively correlated with Documentation ( $r = .660, p < .01$ ) and Editing ( $r = .591, p < .01$ ), but not as strongly. The positive relationship between the Holistic score and Synthesis, Source Integration, and Focus suggests that these features are good indicators of the overall quality of the composition. As such, it makes sense to continue emphasizing these elements in our teacher training and pedagogical share sessions.

### Regression Analysis

That last analysis was a test of our assessment model’s internal consistency. Dr. Stewart performed a regression analysis of each of the 5 features (Focus, Synthesis, Source Integration, Editing, Documentation) as independent variables to the holistic score. The next two tables show the results of a regression analysis.

**Table 12—Regression Analysis of Features and Holistic Scores**

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.923 <sup>a</sup>	.853	.850	.615

a. Predictors: (Constant), Documentation, Editing, Source Integration, Focus, Synthesis

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>					
Model 1	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	764.166	5	152.833	403.502	.000 <sup>b</sup>
Residual	132.189	349	.379		
Total	896.355	354			

a. Dependent Variable: Holistic  
b. Predictors: (Constant), Documentation, Editing, Source Integration, Focus, Synthesis. Each individual predictor is statistically significant in this model, at the  $p = .000$  level.

Drs. Miller and Stewart conclude that the 2017-2018 ENGL 202 assessment yielded excellent levels of internal consistency, and, thus, demonstrates an empirical validity that is difficult to capture with other models. Each of the five criteria on our rubric (Focus, Synthesis, Source Integration, Editing, and Documentation) are statistically significant predictors of the Holistic Score that the raters gave to the writing samples, on average.

Furthermore, 85% of the variance in scores is accounted for in our model, which is slightly better than similar published studies on writing program assessment that report  $R^2 = .83$  (White, Elliot, and Peckham, 2015). In other words, we created an effective measurement tool for evaluating student writing that has produced results that we can confidently use to inform our future approaches to ENGL 202 teacher training and faculty development.

## Actions to Improve Student Learning— “Closing the Loop”

### Level 1: Pedagogically

As with last year, the assessment results were embedded within the New Instructor Orientation for LSE in August 2018. Dr. Siegel Finer presented a synopsis of score trends to instructors, highlighting areas in which students seem to excel and areas of struggle. In addition, she used statistical analysis to point out score correlations among certain variables (e.g., scores in the “synthesis,” “source integration,” and “focus” categories tended to have a strong positive correlation with holistic scores).

Dr. Siegel Finer highlighted two key findings at the New Instructor Orientation and suggested some possible implications for teaching for faculty to discuss in breakout sessions (see Table 13).

**Table 13—Key Findings and Implications Presented at New Instructor Orientation**

Key Finding	Possible Implications for Teaching
<p>1. The <b>Holistic</b> score—an important variable for measuring the quality of student writing overall—achieved very strong positive correlations with <b>Synthesis</b> (<math>r = .794, p &lt; .01</math>), <b>Source Integration</b> (<math>r = .770, p &lt; .01</math>), and <b>Focus</b> (<math>r = .767, p &lt; .01</math>).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As teachers, this can help us focus our attention on certain elements of academic writing. For example, emphasizing synthesis and source integration could potential result in stronger writing overall. Editing and documentation of source, while still valued writing traits, do not appear to be as impactful on evaluation of overall writing quality.</li> </ul>
<p>2. <b>Source Integration</b> had the lowest average scores (6.88).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On average, students were not earning a “Competent” rating from either rater. This is a concern given the student learning objectives of ENGL 202 include “Use a body of knowledge inside written work: paraphrase, quote, summarize, explain/interpret/comment, cite, and document (MLA or APA).</li> </ul>

- 
3. **Focus** had the lowest IRR, meaning it was more difficult to score consistently when two raters read the same paper.
- There may not have been different definitions of “critical thinking” among the raters. We can facilitate extended discussions of what “critical thinking” is in the context of ENGL 202 and why it is an important goal of this course. During the norming sessions, we defined critical thinking as “knowledge of debate, recognition of contrary evidence, analysis of counterargument.”
  - Similarly, ENGL 202 instructors can define “informed inquiry” and discuss its role in this course.
- 

These conversations will continue throughout the 2018-2019 year, as Dr. Stewart hosts ENGL 202 share sessions with current, former, and future ENGL 202 instructors. The sessions will focus on particular features—synthesis, source integration, and focus—and invite instructors to share their strategies for teaching these concepts.

## **Level 2: Programmatically**

Results will be discussed by the LSE Committee in their fall meetings to establish programmatic benchmark scores for competency. Results from the 2017-2018 assessment will also be used to inform the ENGL 121 assessment for 2018-2019, as well as our plans for Phase II of LSE Assessment. Results will be archived for future comparative analysis with a new corpus of student writing.

Based on these results, the Assessment Coordinator and LSE Director make the following recommendations:

- Continue to embed assessment results within the New Instructor Orientation for LSE instructors by presenting data and facilitating conversation about score trends, new strategies for improving student learning;
- Provide professional development to LSE instructors via handouts, workshops, and other resources;
- Share resources for encouraging content development in student writing, including effective assignment prompts, workshop and revision activities, and reflective tasks;

The LSE Committee may make further recommendations based on comprehensive review of assessment results in Fall 2018.

## **Evaluation of the Assessment Design**

### **Strengths and Weaknesses of the Assessment Design**

#### *Strengths of Current Design*

- Assessment process overall helped ensure that faculty retained freedom to teach according to their strengths and preferences, thus enhancing faculty buy-in.

- The rubric appeared to be very genre-neutral and helped raters to reliably score very diverse samples of writing, which also helped contribute to the high faculty participation rate.
- The current method of collection and communication of reminders (via email, during meetings in-person) also contributed to the high faculty participation rate;
- Excellent internal consistency, as established by the most recent literature on program assessment.
- Trial scoring between fall and spring terms scoring sessions allowed Assessment Coordinator to further train raters, establish scoring logistics, and revise rubric as needed.
- While increasing the number of samples scored from the small subsample of 37 in trial scoring session to 355 in final scoring session, we maintained sufficient levels of consensus and score consistency.
- Interrater reliability remained high, with the exception of the Focus feature.
- Score range improved from the trial rating session to the final scoring session, which shows that raters were more comfortable using all possible scores on the rubric.
- Raters reported very high level of satisfaction with the scoring experience (100% of raters surveyed said that they recommend being an assessment rater to another graduate student).

#### *Limitations of Current Design*

- Rubric development and scoring sessions relied almost exclusively on temporary faculty and teaching associates, though we recruited more permanent faculty members (n=3) than last year (n=1). Continuing to recruit permanent faculty members is important so that the rater pool does not experience high turnover and so that we benefit from the extensive teaching experience of permanent faculty members.
- Collecting, organizing, and analyzing so many samples could potential result in human error with score transcription; a smaller sample size that can still yield statistics significant results would be ideal.
- The paper-based scoring session uses resources (paper, pens, folders, etc.).
- Scoring session relied, in part, on one-time money from Liberal Studies for food and refreshments during the two-day final scoring session; raters mentioned that the food and refreshments helped them stay focused during the two-day scoring sessions.

### **Actions to Improve the Assessment Design**

Based on the assessment of students' writing, the LSE Director and Assessment Coordinator have made the following recommendations:

- Continue to incorporate assessment data in instructor training and professional development.
- Build assessment vertically from ENGL 101 to ENGL 202, considering the foundational skills students should take from class to the next.

- The LSE Committee should consider the usefulness of year-to-year comparisons and consider assessing ENGL 202 on an annual rather than on a three-year cycle.
- Continue to build on systems for disseminating assessment data within the department and institutionally.
- Investigate options for paperless scoring.
- Recruit more permanent faculty members to participate in future scoring sessions.

Overall the design for this assessment worked very well in our departmental context. The Assessment Coordinator highly recommends adopting a similar approach with future assessments for other LSE courses.



## PART THREE: APPENDICES

### Appendix A: Five-Year Review Action Plan Update

<i>Liberal Studies English Program</i>				
Goals	Action Plan	Steps to be Taken	Date	Status as of Spring 2018
1. Fully implement new LSE assessment plan.	Complete redesign of protocols and rubrics for all three LSE courses, and begin tracking ENGL100 students.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Approval of rubrics and protocols in LSE committee.</li> <li>2. Test rubrics and protocols with summer raters.</li> <li>3. Work with small faculty groups for input on rubrics and protocol.</li> </ol>	<p>Spring 2016</p> <p>Summer 2016/ Fall 2016</p> <p>Fall 2016/ Spring 2017</p>	<p>Completed for ENGL101 and 202</p> <p>Completed for ENGL101 and 202</p> <p>Completed for ENGL101 and 202</p>
	Transition assessment responsibilities from LSE Coordinator to newly hired LSE Assessment Coordinator.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. LSE Coordinator and Assessment Coordinator run faculty workshops together.</li> <li>2. LSE Coordinator and Assessment Coordinator run winter pilot and present department results together.</li> <li>3. Assessment Coordinator facilitates final revisions and takes over assessment for first full assessment series.</li> </ol>	<p>Fall 2016</p> <p>Winter/Spring 2017</p> <p>Summer 2017</p>	<p>Completed for ENGL101 and 202</p> <p>Completed for ENGL101 and 202</p> <p>Completed ENGL101 and 202</p>
	Require faculty to participate in LSE assessment, with the goal of closer to 100% participation in a sampling process, in order to ensure reliability of results.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Department Chair and Dean of College speak to department about assessment responsibilities.</li> <li>2. Design protocol for collecting assessment samples in a central location that ensures both confidentiality and compliance.</li> </ol>	<p>Fall 2016</p> <p>Spring 2017</p>	<p>Completed, 100% participation for ENGL101, 83% for 202</p> <p>Completed Fall 2016</p>

## Appendix B: ENGL 101 Course Objectives Revision

### Rationale

- Update the objectives in response to our 2016-17 assessment data.
- Help newer teachers better understand program goals for English 101.
- Help students understand more clearly what they will learn in English 101.
- Align objectives with best practices in the field of Composition Studies.

Current Catalogue Description	Proposed Catalogue Description
A first-year writing course. Students use a variety of resources to create projects in a variety of writing genres. Resources for writing include but are not limited to memory, observation, critical reading and viewing, analysis, and reflection. Students will use writing processes to draft, peer review, revise and edit their projects.	In this first-year writing course, students compose projects in multiple written genres that address specific rhetorical situations. Students use memory, observation, critical reading and viewing, analysis, and reflection as they draft, peer review, revise and edit their projects.

Current Course Objectives	Proposed Revision to ENGL 101 Course Objectives
At the conclusion of English 101, students should be able to:	At the conclusion of English 101, students should be able to:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. use writing processes to generate, develop, share, revise, proofread and edit major writing projects.</li> <li>2. produce essays that show structure, purpose, significant content, and audience awareness.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify and apply writing processes including drafting, sharing, developing, revising, editing, and proofreading to both short and more sustained writing tasks.</li> </ol>

3. produce a variety of essay genres.
  4. understand and integrate others' texts into their own writing.
  5. reflect on their own writing process and rhetorical effectiveness.
2. Write in a variety of genres in response to specific rhetorical situations (i.e., recognize the role of audience, purpose, and context in creating and analyzing text) that take place in diverse print and digital environments.
  3. Analyze their own writing and the writing of others for rhetorical effectiveness and rhetorical choices (i.e., read like a writer), and integrate the writing of others into their own writing.
  4. Reflect critically on their own writing process, rhetorical effectiveness, and how learned skills and concepts can be applied in other writing contexts by cultivating effective habits of mind (e.g., curiosity, openness, metacognition).
  5. Demonstrate critical thinking (through reading, discussion, and/or writing) by interpreting, responding, critiquing, and acknowledging diverse perspectives in relation to their own.

<b>Alignment with Best Practices in the Teaching of Writing</b>				
<b>CURRENT</b>	<b>PROPOSED</b>	<b>C's Principles<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>CWPA Outcomes<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>CWPA Framework<sup>4</sup></b>
1. use writing processes to generate, develop, share, revise, proofread, and edit major writing projects.	1. Identify and apply writing processes including drafting, sharing, developing, revising, editing, and proofreading to both short and more sustained writing tasks.	1. Sound writing instruction emphasizes the rhetorical nature of writing. 5. Sound writing instruction recognizes writing processes as iterative and complex. 3. Sound writing instruction recognizes writing as a social act.	Learn and use key rhetorical concepts through analyzing and composing a variety of texts Develop facility in responding to a variety of situations and contexts calling for purposeful shifts in voice, tone, level of formality, design, medium, and/or structure	Rhetorical knowledge – the ability to analyze and act on understandings of audiences, purposes, and contexts in creating and comprehending texts;  Writing processes – multiple strategies to approach and undertake writing and research

<sup>2</sup> C's Principles for the Postsecondary Teaching of Writing: <http://ccc.ncte.org/ccc/resources/positions/postsecondarywriting>

<sup>3</sup> CWPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition: <http://wpacouncil.org/positions/outcomes.html>

<sup>4</sup> CWPA Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing: <http://wpacouncil.org/framework>

<p>2. produce essays that show structure, purpose, significant content, and audience awareness.</p> <p>3. produce a variety of essay genres.</p>	<p>2. Write in a variety of genres in response to specific rhetorical situations (i.e., recognize the role of audience, purpose, and context in creating and analyzing text) that take place in diverse print and digital environments.</p>	<p>2. Sound writing instruction considers the needs of real audiences</p> <p>4. Sound writing instruction enables students to analyze and practice with a variety of genres.</p> <p>Sound writing instruction emphasizes relationships between writing and technologies.</p>	<p>Gain experience reading and composing in several genres to understand how genre conventions shape and are shaped by readers' and writers' practices and purposes</p> <p>Develop facility in responding to a variety of situations and contexts calling for purposeful shifts in voice, tone, level of formality, design, medium, and/or structure</p> <p>Match the capacities of different environments (e.g., print and electronic) to varying rhetorical situations</p> <p>Learn and use key rhetorical concepts through analyzing and composing a variety of texts</p>	<p>Knowledge of conventions – the formal and informal guidelines that define what is considered to be correct and appropriate, or incorrect and inappropriate, in a piece of writing;</p> <p>Abilities to compose in multiple environments – from using traditional pen and paper to electronic technologies.</p> <p>Rhetorical knowledge – the ability to analyze and act on understandings of audiences, purposes, and contexts in creating and comprehending texts;</p>
<p>4. understand and integrate others' texts into their own writing.</p>	<p>3. Analyze one's own and the writing of others for rhetorical effectiveness and rhetorical choices (i.e., read like a writer), and integrate the writing of others into one's own writing.</p>	<p>8. Sound writing instruction supports learning, engagement, and critical thinking in courses across the curriculum.</p>	<p>Read a diverse range of texts, attending especially to the relationships between assertion and evidence, to patterns of organization, to the interplay between verbal and nonverbal elements, and to how these elements function for different audiences and situations.</p>	<p>Critical thinking – the ability to analyze a situation or text and make thoughtful decisions based on that analysis, through writing, reading, and research;</p>
<p>5. reflect on their own writing process and rhetorical effectiveness.</p>	<p>4. Reflect critically on their own writing process, rhetorical effectiveness, and how learned skills and concepts can be applied in other writing contexts by cultivating effective habits of mind (e.g. curiosity, openness, engagement)</p>	<p>5. Sound writing instruction recognizes writing processes as iterative and complex.</p> <p>8. Sound writing instruction supports learning, engagement, and critical thinking in courses across the curriculum.</p>	<p>Reflect on the development of composing practices and how those practices influence their work</p>	<p>Habits of mind refers to ways of approaching learning that are both intellectual and practical and that will support students' success in a variety of fields and disciplines. They include: Curiosity, openness, engagement, creativity, persistence, responsibility, flexibility, metacognition</p>
<p>6. N/A</p>	<p>5. Demonstrate critical thinking by interpreting, responding, critiquing, and acknowledging diverse perspectives in relation to their own.</p>	<p>Sound writing instruction supports learning, engagement, and critical thinking in courses across the curriculum.</p>	<p>Separate assertion from evidence</p> <p>Interpretation, synthesis, response, critique and design/redesign</p> <p>Use composing and reading for inquiry, learning, critical thinking, and communicating in various rhetorical contexts</p>	<p>Critical thinking – the ability to analyze a situation or text and make thoughtful decisions based on that analysis, through writing, reading, and research</p>

## Appendix C: LSE Director Task List

### Fall and Spring Tasks

- Chair LSE Committee
  - Create agenda for and facilitate meetings every three weeks throughout the academic year
  - Report on meetings to Chair and full department
  - Facilitate meetings of the Multilingual Writers subcommittee and Online Teaching and Learning subcommittee and report on those to the general LSE Committee
  - The LSE Committee has the following responsibilities:
    - Update LSE curriculum as necessary
    - Develop and revise LSE mission and create cohesive curriculum model
    - Update all handbooks and teaching materials
    - Take charges and perform tasks as requested by college Dean, department Chair, and department
- Plan and facilitate annual orientation for LSE faculty
- Maintain web and print resources for faculty teaching LSE courses
- Provide support to LSE faculty and students in grade appeals, exemptions, placement, academic integrity violations, and other administrative issues
- Coordinate with Registrar and Admissions on exemptions, transfer, dual-enrollment, and placement
- Evaluate courses from outside institutions for transfer-credit approval in coordination with Admissions
- Provide pedagogical support and direction to temporary faculty and teaching associates
- Facilitate LSE Teaching Circle
- Provide LSE-related data to the Chair and Dean upon request
- Respond to requests for LSE data by department colleagues and graduate students for their scholarship
- Serve on English Department Leadership Council
- Write LSE portions of department five-year review and yearly updates to department annual review
- Serve on hiring committees for Teaching Associates and Temporary Faculty in both graduate programs
- Write rationales for permanent faculty hires for LSE-dedicated positions
- Prior to the hire of a Basic Writing Coordinator in Fall 2016, performed the following duties (now assist with as needed):
  - Provided support for instructors teaching Basic Writing (ENGL100)
  - Updated ENGL100 handbook and other materials in print and online
- Prior to the hire of an Assessment Coordinator in Fall 2016, performed the following duties (now assist with as needed):
  - Facilitated annual LSE assessment and reported on assessment to Chair and Dean

- Updated all assessment materials

**Summer Tasks (not under contract):**

- Plan and facilitate annual orientation for LSE faculty or online orientation when hiring occurs late
- Maintain web and print resources for faculty teaching LSE courses
- Write LSE Annual Report
- Provide support to incoming students on course exemptions and transfer credits; respond to incoming student and parent inquiries via email
- Coordinate with Registrar and Admissions on exemptions, transfer, dual-enrollment, and placement
- Compare courses from outside institutions for transfer-credit approval in coordination with Admissions
- Provide pedagogical support and direction to temporary faculty and teaching associates; respond to inquiries from all faculty teaching LSE courses
- Serve on hiring committees for Teaching Associates and Temporary Faculty in both graduate programs
- Review and approve all LSE syllabi
- Work with Department Chair and Assistant Chair on LSE enrollment issues

# Appendix D: LSE Assessment Coordinator Tasks

## Assessment Coordinator Tasks

- Write strategic plan for LSE assessment
- Maintain strategic plan through continual revisions based on assessment results
- Design sampling plans for all LSE assessments (including budget for expense)
- Design rubrics for all LSE assessments
- Test rubrics through pilot sessions and continually refine as needed
- Provide recommendations to LSE Committee about assessment projects
- Consult with LSE Director about assessment projects and curriculum development
- Coordinate collection of samples from LSE courses under assessment
- Prepare samples for reading
- Hire raters (qualified TAs and permanent faculty)
- Train raters through norming sessions
- Facilitate faculty feedback sessions on assessment process
- Facilitate and participate in scoring sessions
- Run assessment scorings sessions (1-2 per year with 10+ raters)
- Data analysis for assessment results (e.g., qualitative analysis, descriptive statistics, inferential statistics)
- Establish a digital initiative for LSE assessments including collecting longitudinal data
- Write annual LSE assessment report
- Report LSE assessment findings through appropriate channels (English Department, Dean's office, LSE website, etc.)
- "Close the loop" by using assessment data to inform curriculum change, review coverage and content in LSE classes, create new resources for faculty development, research possible support opportunities for students (i.e., tutorial course, new course models)
- Consult with LSE Committee about using assessment data to improve course alignment
- Assist LSE Director with revision to first-year placement exam and portfolios in summer, exemption portfolios for ENG 101
- Assist LSE Director in tracking data for ENG 100 (retention rates, completion rates)

## Basic Writing Coordinator Tasks

- Develop and revise mission and create cohesive curriculum model
- Update curriculum as necessary
- Facilitate meetings of the Basic Writing faculty subcommittee and report on those to the general LSE Committee
- Update handbooks and teaching materials
- Facilitate session as part of annual orientation for LSE faculty
- Maintain web and print resources for faculty teaching BW
- Coordinate and maintain relationship between faculty teaching English 100 and Writing Skills Workshop, including shared database of textual materials
- Lead professional development sessions for new BW instructors at LSE orientation and provide other pedagogical resources as necessary

## Appendix E: ENG 202 Assessment Budget

Expense	Amount
Rubric testing with trained raters (2 hr x \$20/hr x 5 raters)	200.00
December pilot scoring (8 hrs x \$20/hr x 5 raters)	800.00
New rater training and scoring (\$15/hr x 19 hrs x 2 raters)	570.00
Returning rater training and scoring (\$19.21 x 19 hrs x 11 raters)	4060.00
Food for May rating sessions (13 raters, breakfast & lunch for 2 days)	570.00

<b>Total</b>	<b>\$6200.00</b>
--------------	------------------

### Rationale

This budget will sustain the high-quality programmatic assessment practices initiated during the 2016-2017 academic year. Specifically, the budget will cover personnel expenses for rubric testing, rater training, and scoring sessions. In November, Dr. Miller will test the new ENGL 202 rubric with four trained raters. In December 2017, the LSE Program will hold a one-day pilot scoring session with four raters to read a subsample of the student papers collected in the fall. This pilot scoring session will be a trial run for the finalized ENGL 202 rubric that will allow Dr. Miller to calculate interrater reliability and better understand the variety of assignments from ENGL 202. Additional raters will be hired and trained during the spring semester. In May, Dr. Miller will facilitate a two-day scoring session during which *all* samples collected from fall and spring will be systematically read and scored. The number of raters is the same used for the ENGL 101 assessment in 2016-2017 during which 483 writing samples were scored.

### Additional Assessment Design Notes

- Nearly 1900 students will enroll in ENG 202 over the 2017-2018 academic year.
- Nearly **500 samples** of student writing across all sections of ENGL 202 will be collected:
  - Collecting this many samples will result in a large enough representative sample to make inferential claims about the entire population of 202 students at high confidence level.
- Graduate students from the English Department who are working as Temporary Faculty and who have recently taught ENGL 202 will be hired as expert raters.
  - Expert rater pay has traditionally been \$15 for new raters and \$20 for experienced raters who have previously worked as assessment raters or placement readers.
- To systematically score this many samples, the LSE Assessment Coordinator has created a rubric to measure how well students are meeting ENGL 202 Student Learning Objectives.
  - This rubric should be tested twice in the fall to insure validity and reliability of the results.
- To create strong interrater reliability, raters must be adequately trained with the new rubric.
- Last year, Liberal Studies paid for breakfast and lunch for the raters, but these funds may not be available for the 2017-2018 academic year. In a post-event survey, raters noted that the food helped them sustain focus over two full days of professional work and improved morale since the food breaks offered a chance to socialize with colleagues. Dr. Miller also noted raters tended to rate more consistently when given regular meal breaks.



**Evaluates student learning objective #3 and #4**

3. Compose a focused and cohesive synthesis of sources.
4. Use a body of knowledge inside written work: paraphrase, quote, summarize, explain/interpret/comment, cite, and document (MLA or APA).

## Appendix F: ENG 202 Assessment Rubric

Feature	Exemplary 6	Strong 5	Competent 4	Developing 3	Emerging 2	Unacceptable 1
<b>Focus—</b> Document reflects writer's informed inquiry. The document is guided by a central idea, focused question, thesis, or purpose conveys critical inquiry into the topic, and shows writer's critical thinking (e.g., knowledge of debates, recognition of contrary evidence, analysis of counterargument).	Has an impressive central idea, focused question, thesis, or purpose that conveys a unique or creative perspective on the topic.  Consistently interprets information in accurate and highly insightful ways.	Has a well-developed central idea, focused question, thesis, or purpose that conveys the writer's informed perspective on the topic.  Demonstrates the significance of each claim by contextualizing, explaining, and interpreting information for audience.	Document demonstrates student's informed inquiry through consideration of multiple perspectives.  Has a developed central idea, focused question, thesis, or purpose that conveys a perspective on the topic.	Document <u>does not</u> demonstrate student's informed inquiry through consideration of multiple perspectives.  The central idea, focused question, thesis, or purpose is either unclear or inconsistent.	The writing severely lacks coherency and consistency.  The central idea, focused question, thesis, or purpose is generally unclear.  Writer's position is underdeveloped.	The document has little-to-no focus. The document may feel like a string of loosely-connected quotations or paraphrases with little or no commentary or explanation by writer.  There is no identifiable central idea, focused question, thesis, or purpose.
<b>Synthesis—</b> Sources are not discussed as isolated arguments, but as part of a conversation or body of knowledge. Writer draws connections and conclusion about sources used. (Note: a "body of knowledge" may include primary or secondary sources, personal experience, observations, memory, field research).	The writer connects sources to each other and to own ideas to create an accurate and insightful conversation among sources.  There is insightful collective interpretation of sources.  Multiple sources are used in nearly all body paragraphs, when appropriate.	The document connects sources to each other and gestures to connections with writer's ideas.  The writer offers some interpretation by constructing a meaningful conversation among sources or counterpoising ideas.  Multiple sources are used in nearly all body paragraphs, when appropriate.	Sources are presented in conversation with one another or are otherwise counterpoised.  More than one source is used in body paragraphs, when appropriate.  Clear conceptual connections are drawn between sources and perhaps to writer's own ideas.  Interpretation goes beyond vague commentary about information from sources	Some synthesis is present.  Document combines sources and/or writer's own ideas, but connections between them are at times superficial.  Document creates inaccurate conversation between sources (interprets incorrectly or uses them one-sidedly).  <u>Does not</u> adequately contextualize, explain, and/or interpret information for audience.	Synthesis is limited.  Sources are used, but there is no attempt to build a conversation between sources OR connections appear arbitrary or haphazard.  Sources are discussed in isolation and the writer provides no interpretation  Writer includes mostly vague commentary about information from sources or restates information without interpretation.	No synthesis is present.  Sources are discussed in complete isolation. There is no attempt to connect or compare sources.  Does not use sources.  Does not include more than one source.
<b>Source integration—</b> Source integration techniques for introducing, contextualizing, and citing sources are effectively used (e.g., signal phrases with accurate attribution verbs; blended quotations). Writer has generated text as an extension or response to information referenced from sources.	All quotes, paraphrases, and/or summaries are smoothly blended with writer's own prose.  Purposeful variation of attribution verbs enhances signal phrases (i.e., writer doesn't rely on verbs such as "argues").  Document shows command of in-text citation style conventions.	Sources are introduced, contextualized, and cited (if necessary for genre) consistently and effectively.  Purposeful variation of attribution verbs enhances signal phrases (i.e., writer doesn't rely on colloquial verbs such as "says").  In-text citations are used consistently with few lapses in style conventions.	Quotations are integrated into students own prose (i.e., no dropped quotes).  In-text citations are consistently used (if applicable to genre), but there may be some errors in citation conventions.  There may be repetition of attribution verbs or sentence structures for in-text citations (e.g., overuse of the verb "argues")	Some claims are unattributed to a source (citation absence).  Ineffective use of quotations, paraphrasing, or summary.  Writer may rely on imprecise or unprofessional signal phrases (e.g. "says").	Writer uses primarily uses dropped quotations or block quotes that are not properly integrated.  Signal phrases may be inappropriately used (e.g., creating an incomplete sentence).	Majority of the sentences are not the writer's own.  In general, there is unclear boundary between writer's words and the words/ideas of others.

Feature	Exemplary 6	Strong 5	Competent 4	Developing 3	Emerging 2	Unacceptable 1
<b>Editing—</b> The text demonstrates writer's awareness of formal and informal guidelines for what is considered to be correct and appropriate in a piece of college-level writing.	Exceeds expectations for knowledge and command of sentence-level conventions with very few, if any, errors in punctuation or sentence mechanics.  The text appears to be virtually error-free.	Exceeds expectations for editing and proofreading own work.  Demonstrates awareness of sentence-level conventions with infrequent errors in spelling, punctuation, and sentence mechanics.	Meets expectations for editing and proofreading student's own work.  Shows awareness of sentence-level conventions with some errors, but they do not impede meaning.	Does not meet expectations for editing and proofreading student's own work.  Errors in sentence-level conventions are frequent enough to be a distraction to the reader.	Does not meet expectations for editing and proofreading student's own work.  Errors may impede meaning and/or cause reader to stop and reread sentences.	The text does not appear to be proofread or edited.  Errors frequently impede meaning and/or cause reader to stop and reread numerous sentences.
<b>Documentation of Sources—</b> Sources could be retrieved using bibliographic information provided; APA, MLA or another citation style is used consistently.	Sources could be retrieved using bibliographic information provided.  APA, MLA or another citation style is used consistently with virtually no errors.	Sources could be retrieved using bibliographic information provided.  APA, MLA or another citation style is used consistently with only a handful of errors.	Sources could be retrieved using bibliographic information provided.  APA, MLA or another citation style is used consistently, though there may be occasional errors.	Documentation of sources impacts source retrievability.  APA, MLA or another citation style is used inconsistently.	Documentation of sources impacts source retrievability.  Works cited page, reference list, or bibliography is present, but appears incomplete.  Style may not be recognizable as either APA or MLA (e.g., a list of hyperlinks).	Sources could not be retrieved using bibliographic information provided.  The document does not include a works cited page, reference list, or bibliography.
<b>Holistic Score</b>	The writing demonstrates superior work in ENGL 202.	The writing demonstrates very good work in ENGL 202.	The writing demonstrates average work in ENGL 202.	The writing demonstrates below average work for ENGL 202.	The writing demonstrates work that at the level of near-failure for ENGL 202.	The writing demonstrates work that at the level of failure for ENGL 202.