ABSTRACT

In 2014-2015, 1,280 students completed the first-year writing requirement, ENG 1101-1102 or 1103. The FYW Program saw the following developments: increased student contact and more high-impact teaching practices; a publication venue for excellent first-year writing called “Student Spotlight”; a visual model for source integration developed for research and pedagogical purposes; preparation for the Common Experience; and Outcomes Assessment (OA) of the student learning outcome (SLO) “develop analyses through evidence-based claims.”
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FYW Program Overview: ENG 1103 in 2014-2015

English 1103 is a four-credit-hour course that satisfies HPU’s gen-ed first-year writing requirement (FYW). Equivalent to 1103 are English 1101 and 1102, two-credit-hour courses that “stretch” English 1103 over two semesters for international students who need more time and support. All students are advised to complete FYW in either fall or spring of their first year. In 2014-2015 a total of 1,280 students completed FYW.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall, 2014</th>
<th>Spring, 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>ENG 1101</td>
<td>ENG 1103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Grade</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program description, research, reports, and model student work can be viewed at [http://www.highpoint.edu/firstyearprograms/first-year-writing-program/](http://www.highpoint.edu/firstyearprograms/first-year-writing-program/).

FYW Program Activities and Achievements

In addition to regular faculty development events, the FYW Program saw the developments below to improve teaching and learning:

- Increased student contact and implemented more high-impact teaching practices;
- Launched “Student Spotlight,” a venue for publishing excellent student work completed in ENG 1103;
- Created a visual model for integrating sources in writing;
- Six FYW instructors led teaching workshops at the FYS/ENG 1103 workshops in May 2015;
- Achieved objectives set in 2013-2014;
- Assessed analysis student learning outcome (SLO).

These developments are explained below.

Increased Student Contact and Implemented More High-Impact Teaching Practices

This year ENG 1103 enrollment caps were lowered to 20, which for the first time brought the cap in line with professional recommendations of 15-20 students (NCTE, CWPA, CCCC).
Instructors took advantage of smaller class sizes to increase personal contact with students and engage in more high-impact teaching practices.

In January, all instructors engaged in discussion of how to implement more high-impact practices and were surveyed in April asking what they implemented. The survey categorized the practices as “teaching strategies,” “feedback,” and “increases in personal contact.”

All nineteen instructors responded to the survey; 2 indicated they made no changes and 17 (89%) indicated that they implemented a practice to take advantage of smaller class sizes.

Those 17 then elaborated on the kind of changes made. Over half of these instructors indicated the three practices below:

1. “I planned more collaborative work.” (9 instructors)
2. “I held more student conferences.” (10 instructors)
3. “I increased or improved my contact with students with attendance problems or insufficient grades.” (12 instructors)

(#3 has been condensed to “contact with struggling students” on the “Increases in Personal Contact” graph below). It is important to note that this data does not indicate the introduction of practices, but the increase or improvement. For example, “returned work” means that work was returned to students sooner. An array of the changes can be seen in the tables below; numbers on the left indicate number of instructors:
Student Spotlight: A Publication Venue for First-Year Writers

In AY 2014-2015 the FYW Program launched “Student Spotlight,” a venue to showcase excellent writing in English 1103. In January, committee chair Dr. Cheryl Marsh emailed a call for submissions to all ENG 1103 instructors that they could then forward to students; instructors were also invited to submit student work. All submissions had to be accompanied by a signed standard release form. Drs. Marsh and Middleton reviewed submissions in May.

Out of 17 submissions, 4 student essays were selected for publication on the “Student Spotlight” page on the FYW website and will receive $50 cash awards. Dr. Middleton worked with all winning authors to revise for publication and will lead a workshop on the pedagogical uses of student writing in August.

Student Spotlight is designed to: offer models for English 1103 instructors and students to engage in class; provide a snapshot of the work of ENG 1103 to stakeholders; and provide valuable editorial experience and recognition for high-achieving students.

Model for Source Integration

As part of the FYW program’s last two years improving the teaching of source integration as well as collaborative research on undergraduates’ research practices, Drs. Middleton and Scheidt created a visual model for understanding how HPU FYW instructors value students’ use of sources. This model is a SoTL project and was presented to HPU faculty in an April HPU EdTalk and to the March national CCCC meeting in Tampa, Florida.

Using a random sample of 33 essays used in the 2012-2013 OA, Scheidt and Middleton developed codes for how students used sources at the level of the t-unit (more or less the sentence). When these codes were developed, they arranged each essay on a spreadsheet and first coded each t-unit for the presence of a source reference, then coded the type of reference. Types included: inform, explain, develop, connect, react. Results were then arranged to create the model on the next page, in order of the score assigned by readers during OA 2012-2013. The results demonstrate patterns of source use across essays and how instructors evaluate those patterns.

In the model below, each column represents a single coded essay, and essays are arranged left to right in ascending order of Outcomes Assessment score. The codes and the OA scores were assigned by different groups of people two years apart.
When presented to FYW faculty in April, instructors had the following ideas for how the model could be used to improve teaching or program knowledge:

- The model can demonstrate to students that despite individual variation, there are significant shared ways of valuing student writing across faculty.
- The model offers a way to have students color code their own (or others’) work for types of source use.
- The model can be used as an infographic, to teach how to read research results visually.
- The model can illustrate that writing is worthy of research.
• The model can demonstrate FYW program activity to external stakeholders.

The Common Experience: Leadership and Preparation

Beginning August 2015, all ENG 1103 and FYS sections will participate in HPU’s Common Experience program. In 2014-2015, interested ENG 1103 instructors prepared by leading and attending brown bags on the topic, and Dr. Melissa Richard created chapter summaries of Wes Miller’s The Work that were distributed to all faculty as a teaching resource. In addition, six ENG 1103 instructors led faculty workshops on teaching first-year students at the May FYS/ENG 1103 faculty workshop.

Assessing the Analysis SLO in ENG 1103

Overview of Outcomes Assessment in FYW

FYW Program Outcomes Assessment (OA) yields no direct consequences for students such as placement, course grades, etc. Instead the purpose of OA is to:

• gather data about the program as a whole in order to
• create knowledge of what the program yields, and
• use the results to improve teaching and learning.

The FYW Program adheres to a criterion-based (rather than norm-based) assessment philosophy. Consistent with this commitment, between 2012-2014 we conducted an analytical assessment of the SLO “integration of sources” to make targeted improvements in teaching that demonstrated gains in student performance. (For more information see the FYW Program Reports for 2012-2013 and 2013-2014). This year we turned our attention to analysis.

Methods

Assessment Design

Through a survey administered in September 2014, ENG 1103 instructors indicated analysis as the desired focus of assessment for AY 2014-2015. We therefore implemented an analytic OA process for the SLO “develop analyses through evidence-based claims.” The final essay was selected for OA after follow-up discussions in September on what constituted analysis, and instructors contributed broad definitions of how they conceived of and recognized analytical moves in writing. This opportunity to define analysis in the final essay was important because the final essay shared requirements stipulate “independent research” and “deep revision” of earlier work that may include analysis—not explicitly analysis itself.
Under supervision of the FYW Program director, an English department work study gathered a simple random sample of 54 final essays completed in fall 2014, deleted all identifying information, assigned each essay a number, and (in Google Drive) distributed the essays among two packets. The FYW Director drafted a rubric according to language contributed in September. Over several meetings in April and May, a committee of four English 1103 instructors revised and finalized this rubric. The committee revised and finalized this rubric by applying it to sample essays collected for training. When the rubric was completed, paired committee members scored the essays in the packet assigned to them.

The SLO was broken down into 3 components--Approach, Development, and Evidence--that were each assigned a score of 1-6. (See Appendix for rubric and procedure).

OA Committee Members (hereafter referred to as Readers) also assigned 1-6 scores for Edited American Standard English (EASE) and indicated the presence or absence of a statement of purpose or thesis statement.

Analytical Methods

Data was analyzed in two ways: quantitatively, to determine correlations, construct validity and inter-rater reliability; and qualitatively, to determine the basis for judgment and to contextually validate decisions made regarding the uses of assessment data (see Gallagher; Broad; Huot; O’Neill and Huot). Both forms of interpretation serve valuable functions, but it should be noted here that the uses of construct validity and reliability are limited and not taken to be definitive. Instead, the results of that statistical analysis raised questions and were analyzed in the context of the program to validate the uses of the data. In this way, ”[v]alidity refers to the degree to which evidence and theory support the interpretations of test scores entailed by proposed uses of tests” (American 9). In a program committed to refining judgments through difference and criterion-based assessment, statistical analysis can help refine judgments but should not drive assessment decisions alone.

Results

QU1: Is There a Correlation Between EASE Score and Overall Essay Score?

There is no correlation between EASE scores and Overall Essay Score as measured by the average of Approach, Evidence, and Develop (AvgAED).

First readers: Correlation between EASE1 and AvgAED1 is: 0.11199 (p = 0.4112),
Second readers: Correlation between EASE2 and AvgAED2 is: 0.20638273 (p = 0.127).
**QU2: Is There a Correlation Between Strong Analytical Performance and a Thesis Statement?**

Drawing conclusions about correlations between the presence or absence of a thesis statement proved to be difficult. One finding is that both readers agreed that a thesis statement was present 40/54 times, or 74% of the time. This means that ENG 1103 students are including thesis statements most of the time.

The remaining 14 essays indicated disagreement between readers about the presence or absence of a statement; at no time did both readers agree there was no statement. When the 74% IR is adjusted using Cohen’s Kappa, IR between first and second readers on "statement" is .1538. (High IR is above .70).

The lack of agreement on whether an essay has no thesis statement may attest to the sense that an essay has a purpose whether or not it is stated explicitly. It definitely attests to variation among expert readers on interpreting this seemingly obvious aspect of academic writing. During training sessions, for example, committee members disagreed on how to identify an essay’s thesis statement more than once. This finding can enrich our discussions of how a thesis statement contributes (or does not) to our experience as readers.

**QU3: Are There Correlations Between Scores for Approach, Develop, and Evidence?**

Approach and Develop scores are shown to have a positive linear correlation, and the correlation is highly significant (p<.0001). The same results were found between Evidence and Approach and Approach and Develop. (For Simple Linear Regression results, see Appendix).

Given that these categories were designed to disaggregate what we mean by analysis, these correlations are not necessarily surprising. The original question was raised to determine whether there was an aspect of analysis where we should target our teaching strategies.

**Scores for Analysis**

**What Combined Scores Mean:**

- A combined score of **1-6** indicates that both readers agreed the essay demonstrated below college-level expectations for the outcome;
- A combined score of **7-10** indicates that both readers agreed the essay met or almost met college-level expectations for the outcome;
A combined score of 11-12 indicates that both readers agreed the essay either clearly met or exceeded college-level expectations for the outcome.

For reporting purposes these categories are named:

- 1 - 6 = “below”
- 7 - 10 = “meets”
- 11 - 12 = “exceeds”

Readers’ combined scores for all three categories—Approach, Develop, and Evidence—indicated high rates of “meeting” and “exceeding” expectations. These results can be seen in the pie charts and table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Below</th>
<th>% Meets</th>
<th>% Exceeds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Develop and Evidence show rates of combined “exceeding expectations” scores of 18.5 and 9.2 percent, respectively. Combined “exceeding expectations” scores for Approach reach almost half of all essays at 48%.

Implications of Statistical Analysis

While scores on Approach “exceeded expectations” on 48% of all essays, I read this as an indicator of the difficulty of assessing the category of Approach in the final essay assignment. Based on instructor feedback in September, the rubric broadly defined this category to capture what it might look like across sections, which enabled readers to recognize a variety of performance types as an “analytical approach.” These high scores seem to indicate high inter-rater reliability (IR), or the consistency with which a performance receives the same score.

Simple percentage agreement between readers is calculated by dividing readers’ duplicated or adjacent scores by total number of decisions. In other words, paired readers’ scores of 4-4 and 4-5 both count as agreement. When agreement is calculated as percentage agreement between first readers (R1 and R2) and second readers (R3 and R4), the results are:
Approach: 79.6%
Develop: 70.3%
Evidence: 66.7%

As percentage agreement is “high” at .70, these results seem strong.

However, when agreement between paired readers is broken out, the percentages skew: the Reader 1/3 pair falls to 55-65%, while the Reader 2/4 pair increases to 77-92%. A two-way analysis of variance was run to determine intra-class reliability, or to adjust for the interaction between essay and reader and the fact that not all readers read all essays. For intra-class reliability the standard for “high” is .50. The results are below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Readers</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent Agreement</th>
<th>Intra-Class Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 3</td>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>.3410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>-.024 (invalid result)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>.4157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &amp; 4</td>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>-.0346 (invalid result)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>-.3064 (invalid result)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A negative number in the Intra-Class Reliability column indicates an invalid result due to a narrow range of variation. These results tell us that despite apparent high agreement for Readers 2 and 4, reliability for both pairs is low for different reasons. Readers 1 and 3 had low agreement as a simple percentage and when adjusted. Readers 2 and 4 had high percentage agreement, but their range of agreement was so narrow (ie: no shared combined scores of “below” expectations”) that their results are invalid. (See two-way ANOVA tables in the Appendix).

A high degree of IR is sometimes demanded when OA translates into consequences for students; an acceptable level of IR is therefore determined by the program’s context. As our OA carries no consequences for students, this low IR can generate further analysis.

How do we refine our understanding of the differences between readers? Consensus between readers is desirable insofar as it provides similar student experiences across sections of FYW. But difference, rather than norming, has been the articulated goal of much research on writing, in this program’s previous assessments, and in the FYW director’s conference presentations and research (see Moss; Gallagher).
Qualitative Analysis

To better understand difference between readers, each reader was reassigned one essay from their packet and asked to comment on stand-out passages and write a rationale for their scores.

Because their scores diverged in general, Readers 1 and 3 were given an essay that demonstrated that gap (5-5-5 and 2-2-2, respectively). Because their scores were similar, Readers 2 and 4 were given an essay they scored exactly the same (6-5-6).

Analysis of Readers 1 and 3

Marginal Comments.

What stood out about this pair’s comments is that for the most part, they highlighted different parts of the essay to comment on, thereby paying it different kinds of attention. Reader 1 highlighted passages they read as demonstrating the student’s sustained evidence-based reasoning, and Reader 2 highlighted passages they read as demonstrating a primary stance of response rather than analysis.

There is one notable exception: when they highlight the same passage but read it differently. For example, both readers highlighted portions of the passage below; the red tag indicates which reader highlighted the text preceding it:

Goodell should have taken action immediately. He should have punished Rice much more and told the media that the NFL does not allow players to act in a disturbing manner, as Rice did, and there will be severe consequences for those who choose to do so [Reader 3]. Because Goodell looked over this scandal with little punishment for Rice, people were convinced the NFL tolerates domestic violence [Reader 1].

Reader 1’s comment: “Student draws a conclusion based on timeline of evidence and Goodell’s response (although the connection could be made clearer).”
Reader 3’s comment: “Writer takes a position here, but it is one that is independent of analysis. It sets up the expectation that this essay will be a fairly simplistic response.”

Reader 1 focuses on the relationship between the conclusion and the evidence, while Reader 3 focuses on the sophistication of the conclusion itself. Both readings are supported by the rubric.

Their end comments also demonstrate that each reader selected a different part of the rubric to determine their scores:

Reader 1: “I scored this paper with a 5 for approach because the writer communicated the “shaping role of context” by outlining the Ray Rice event in the elevator, the response of the commissioner, and the response of other football players via social media. The writer provided appropriate evidence from sources through both summary and direct quotations.”
Reader 3: “The writer does a good job establishing a clear context, but it is a context familiar to readers because it was such a huge news story. For this reason, this essay read like a response paper to me, which is a very common high school assignment… The common knowledge aspect and its brevity limit the consistency and sophistication this essay can achieve. Because it was clearly not passing, I assigned it a 2 on approach, development, and evidence.”

Both readers therefore exercised professional judgment and drew on the rubric to arrive at very different scores.

Analysis of Readers 2 and 4

Readers 2 and 4 highly valued their sample essay, and their comments reveal a way of reading the moves of the essay as analytical, even when the primary move was not analysis. The rubric accommodated this reading.

Here Readers 2 and 4 justify their scores on all three categories—Approach, Development, Evidence—based on the introduction and literature review sections.

Reader 2: “Student scores highly in ‘clear distinction between voices and origin of claims; degree of complexity and refinement of claims; complicating, modifying, or refining an idea or position’ [Development] and selected evidence with a high degree of discernment [Evidence].”

Reader 4: “This entire synthesis section, though obviously part of what the assignment sheet asks for, demonstrates an analytical method for me. The writer compares and contrasts the three positions, while also commenting on the validity (to the writer’s mind) of each of the positions. I scored Approach a 6 because of the analytical method employed here.”

Reader 4 elaborated on the writer’s analytical method of engaging and interpreting sources:

“This provides further evidence for a score of 6 in Development. I feel that the writer fully explained how he/she was interpreting the research, rather than leaving it up to the reader’s interpretation.”

This reading of analysis is also supported in other ways. One is that the textbook used by most instructors, Writing Analytically, articulates a broad definition of analysis that these instructors share and one that can be seen on the rubric. This definition includes an orientation to information that demonstrates rhetorical awareness rather than viewing information as flat, for instance. This also evolved from our previous work on the “integration of information and ideas” SLO and is therefore what we value as a program.

Discussion

The decision to assess final essays was driven, in part, by the desire for fairness, defined in the assessment literature as the condition that gives students the opportunity to demonstrate their best work (Gallagher 13). The writing project designated as primarily “analytical” is assigned before midterm and many students who end up doing well in the course do not perform well on
this particular assignment. For this reason, it raised questions of fairness. A way to determine proficiency on this assignment may be to first determine the relation between this assignment and the other work of the course.

The high scores on this assessment, in part, reflect the condition of the final essay—students had an opportunity to recursively revise this work over 16 weeks. Yet students are also encouraged to conduct inquiry and generate their own research questions, which ideally will take them in different directions. There are also thematic and pedagogical differences between sections. An assessment of final essays will need to better capture this variation in meaningful ways.

One conclusion we can draw is that the previous two years’ focus on the SLO integration is evident in the final essays, rubric, and assessment results. As a program, instructors have honed their teaching of source evaluation, use, and synthesis. The gains are evident in last year’s assessment, but the ways this effort has permeated the program are also seen in the rubric (“distinction between voices”) and the extent to which students are creating and entering conversations in the assessment sample.

Most final essays took the form of a purposeful argument supported by a variety of evidence and sources. This lent itself to application of a rubric that highly valued and named both “evidence” and “development.” It was also difficult for readers to evaluate the SLO independent of purpose, as the purpose guided reading.

Although the rubric was too broad to yield assessment results on its own, the OA process has yielded meaningful data that will guide our teaching of analysis and next year’s assessment design.

**Closing the Loop**

These results tell us that we cannot assess the SLO “develop analyses through evidence-based claims” at the end of the semester in the final essay assignment as it is currently described. The Evidence and Development named in the SLO are present in the final essay, but the analysis that grounds the SLO varies by definition and sophistication.

To assess analysis in AY 2015-2016 we will:

- Assess a shared analytical essay assigned early in the semester that defines analysis as the primary SLO of the assignment;
- Determine the purpose of analysis in a curricular sequence, including the relationship between the early analytical assignment and the later final essay;
- Determine a method of determining assessment proficiency on an early difficult assignment, perhaps by collecting data on the relation between students who instructors judge as “below” expectations on the analytical WP but “meeting” or “above” on the final essay.
- Develop a rubric that asks readers to record their criterion for judgment rather than disaggregating analysis. For example: readers could assign a score and the categories Approach, Development, and Evidence could be among criteria selected that informed the judgment.
Achieving 2013-2014 Objectives

Progress on the objectives from the 2013-2014 report is detailed below.

**Implement guidelines for analytical essay assignment.**

During regular meetings, Dr. Middleton led two workshops on improving the teaching of analysis through scaffolding and clarifying the assignment's purpose. The practice of “nutshelling” the course seemed to gain traction with some instructors, as it became part of program vocabulary this year. This will be built on in August 2015 as we focus on the early analytical assignment for assessment.

**Develop OA rubric for analytical or final essay assignment/conduct OA.**

See above.

**Provide support for more efficiency in course management, assignment design, classroom planning, and grading./Provide more targeted faculty development opportunities.**

Attendance and circulation of Brown Bags improved this year due to a new strategy: instructors submitted topic suggestions at the beginning of each semester. A day and time was then selected convenient for the instructor who submitted the topic and all were invited to attend. The discussion was framed as one to help an instructor solve a teaching problem, and minutes captured the discussion and suggestions offered by other instructors. These minutes were then shared via email.

Organizing Brown Bags this way appeared to generate more specific discussions that were helpful to the instructor who initiated the Brown Bag, which made them very practical for all who attended. Several instructors who did not attend nevertheless responded positively to the minutes, as the structured discussion was helpful.

This reliance on Brown Bags partly stemmed from the fact that we do not have a shared hour when all FYW instructors can attend the same meeting. Unfortunately, this will continue in 2015-2016. While it is not ideal to have program meetings that exclude any instructors, in 2015-2016 we will resume meeting 2-3 times per semester to keep a program-wide discussion going. Instructors were again organized into self-guided teaching teams, assigned by desired level of involvement.

**Develop Adjunct Evaluation Procedure**

A committee developed a university-wide evaluation procedure for adjuncts, which was completed for all part-time instructors in English.
Review textbooks for common adoption in 2015-2016.

It was announced in September that ENG 1103 would be integral to the Common Experience initiative starting 2015-2016, including implementing a common read. For this reason, textbook review was delayed until AY 2015-2016 in order not to introduce too many changes at once.

Objectives for 2015-2016

In addition to ongoing program activity, the following objectives have been defined for 2015-2016:

- Develop OA procedure for early analytical assignments rather than final essays, using findings generated this year;
- Develop and share classroom uses for Student Spotlight essays;
- Develop and share classroom uses for Model for Source Integration;
- Gather input on smaller shared textbook for ENG 1101/1102/1103 to adopt in 2016-2017;
- Continue what has been informal outreach to faculty across the disciplines to determine the demands for student writing across the curriculum. This may take the form of a survey.
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Appendix
OA Procedure and Rubric

**Purpose:** The purpose of our annual FYW assessment is to create a snapshot of what student performance of a specific outcome looks like in our program and gather data to improve teaching and learning of that outcome. It is important to note that, unlike many other types of assessment, there are no consequences for students in this process. An assessment score is a reflection of the program, not the student.

Our goal is to design the rubric and score in a way that will give us the most helpful data possible. This year the analysis outcome has been disaggregated so we can see what we are doing well and what we can improve upon as a program. In this way we can make targeted program improvements.

*Instructions:* Each essay will be scored for: 1. conventions of American Edited Standard English (EASE); 2. analysis learning outcome for ENG 1103: “develop analyses through evidence-based claims.”

The “analysis” outcome is scored on three traits elaborated in the rubric: approach, evidence, and development. The presence or absence of a statement of purpose will also be indicated.

**OA Instructions:**

Open your packet in Google Drive. For each essay, complete a worksheet and then proceed to the next essay in your packet. When the packet has been scored, review your worksheets to finalize scores and transfer the data to your spreadsheet.

When you have completed and reviewed your spreadsheet, save your initials at the end of the document title and email it to me.

**Assessment Scoring**

The middle of the 6-point scale designates the line between “passing” and “failing.”

- 1-3 designate degrees of failing, of a performance that is not college-level for the learning outcome.
- 4-6 designate degrees of passing, of a performance that is college-level for the learning outcome.

EASE is limited to spelling, punctuation, fragments, capitalization, verb tense, subject-verb agreement, run-on/fused sentences.

**Scores associated with EASE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>no noticeable errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1-2 errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>noticeable and perhaps consistent errors, but they do not impede meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>consistent errors that impede meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>errors impede meaning and damage writer’s ethos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>unreadable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The distinction between 3 and 4 is therefore a quite meaningful one that forces the reader, if they are struggling, to come down on the side of either “passing” or “failing.” Notice that for EASE the distinction between passing and failing (3 and 4) relies on the reader’s ability to make meaning.

Scores associated with Analytical traits:

6: exceeds expectations for college writing for this trait
5: clearly meets expectations for college writing for this trait
4: barely meets expectations for college writing for this trait
3: partially/almost meets expectations for college writing for this trait
2: clearly does not meet expectations for college writing for this trait
1: cannot be evaluated for this trait

The same scale holds for Analytical traits. A good rule of thumb is to make the 3-4 border the center of gravity and give it the weight it deserves. If you are struggling to decide between 4 and 5, you should probably assign a 5—note that the 5 definition is “clearly meets expectations,” so you are not reading that performance as having the possibility of failing. It therefore “clearly meets expectations.” The same holds for the distinction between 2 and 3—if you can’t decide between these two, you are by definition clear on the fact that it deserves a failing score and should therefore assign a 2 for “clearly does not meet expectations.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EASE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(ie., spelling, punctuation, fragments, capitalization, verb tense, subject-verb agreement, run-on/fused sentences)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tests for Correlation Between EASE Score and Overall Essay Score (QU1)

There is no correlation between EASE scores and Overall Essay Score (as measured by the average of Approach, Evidence, and Develop) for the first readers: Correlation between EASE1 and AvgAED1 is: 0.11199 (p = 0.4112), or the second readers: Correlation between EASE2 and AvgAED2 is: 0.20638273 (p = 0.127).

Tests for Correlations Between Scores for Approach, Evidence, and Develop (QU3)

For A=Approach, E=Evidence, D=Develop, and O=Overall (A+E+D), the percent agreement between the first reader (Readers 1 & 2) and the second reader (Readers 3 & 4) is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%agreeA</th>
<th>%agreeE</th>
<th>%agreeD</th>
<th>%agreeO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79.63%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>70.37%</td>
<td>40.74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When readers 1-3 and 2-4 are split out:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%agreeA1-3</th>
<th>%agreeE1-3</th>
<th>%agreeD1-3</th>
<th>%agreeO1-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%agreeA2-4</th>
<th>%agreeE2-4</th>
<th>%agreeD2-4</th>
<th>%agreeO2-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92.59%</td>
<td>77.78%</td>
<td>85.19%</td>
<td>48.15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following six regression analyses and scatterplots indicate that for both sets of readers, the correlations between approach and develop, approach and evidence, and evidence and develop are positive, linear and significant.
Correlation between Approach and Develop
First readers (readers 1 & 2): p<0.0001

Dependent Variable: Develop1
Independent Variable: Approach1
Develop1 = 1.1353949 + 0.75971584 Approach1
Sample size: 54
R (correlation coefficient) = 0.72997003
R-sq = 0.53285625
Estimate of error standard deviation: 0.65666553

Analysis of variance table for regression model:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F-stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>125.5771</td>
<td>25.577159</td>
<td>31.4771</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22.4229</td>
<td>0.43120962</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation between Approach and Develop
Second readers (readers 3 & 4): p<0.0001
Simple linear regression results:
Dependent Variable: Develop2
Independent Variable: Approach2
Develop2 = 1.5796928 + 0.59365649 Approach2
Sample size: 54
R (correlation coefficient) = 0.57156514
R-sq = 0.32668671
Estimate of error standard deviation: 1.13875

Analysis of variance table for regression model:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F-stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>132.71706932</td>
<td>32.7170694</td>
<td>25.230022</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>67.4310791</td>
<td>1.2967515</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100.14815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation between Approach and Evidence
First readers (readers 1 & 2): p<0.0004

Simple linear regression results:
Dependent Variable: Evidence1
Independent Variable: Approach1
Evidence1 = 2.6903468 + 0.42916841 Approach1
Sample size: 54
R (correlation coefficient) = 0.46561869
R-sq = 0.21680076
Estimate of error standard deviation: 0.75301957

Analysis of variance table for regression model:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F-stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.1621473</td>
<td>8.1621473</td>
<td>14.394345</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>29.486001</td>
<td>0.56703848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37.648148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation between Approach and Evidence
Second readers (readers 3 & 4): p<0.0001

Simple linear regression results:
Dependent Variable: Evidence2
Independent Variable: Approach2
Evidence2 = 1.0239378 + 0.7540395 Approach2
Sample size: 54
R (correlation coefficient) = 0.78342395
R-sq = 0.61375308
Estimate of error standard deviation: 0.79924526

Analysis of variance table for regression model:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F-stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>152.782765</td>
<td>52.78276582</td>
<td>628905</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33.217235</td>
<td>0.63879298</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation between Develop and Evidence
First readers (readers 1 & 2): p<0.0001
Simple linear regression results:
Dependent Variable: Develop1
Independent Variable: Evidence1
Develop1 = 1.762912 + 0.61977373 Evidence1
Sample size: 54
R (correlation coefficient) = 0.54888878
R-sq = 0.3012789
Estimate of error standard deviation: 0.80310231

### Analysis of variance table for regression model:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F-stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.461387</td>
<td>14.461387</td>
<td>22.421683</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33.538613</td>
<td>0.64497332</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation between Develop and Evidence
Second readers (readers 3 & 4): p<0.0001

### Simple linear regression results:

Dependent Variable: Develop2
Independent Variable: Evidence2
Develop2 = 0.67484927 + 0.81007752 Evidence2
Sample size: 54
R (correlation coefficient) = 0.75067913
R-sq = 0.56351916
Estimate of error standard deviation: 0.91685864
### Analysis of variance table for regression model:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F-stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56.435401</td>
<td>56.435401</td>
<td>67.134669</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>43.712748</td>
<td>0.84062976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100.14815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Graph showing a scatter plot with a fitted line indicating a positive correlation between Develop2 and Evidence2.](image)