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FYW Program 2015-2016

English 1103 is a four-credit-hour course that satisfies HPU’s gen-ed first-year writing requirement (FYW). Equivalent to 1103, the English 1101 and 1102 sequence “stretches” English 1103 over two semesters for non-native English speakers. All students are advised to complete the FYW requirement in either fall or spring of their first year. In 2015-2016 a total of 1,254 students completed FYW.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2015</th>
<th></th>
<th>Spring 2016</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENG 1101</td>
<td>ENG 1103</td>
<td>ENG 1101</td>
<td>ENG 1102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. grade</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FYW Program Activities and Achievement:**

The FYW Program sponsors ongoing support for teaching. Based on 2014-2015 assessment data, the FYW Program also saw the developments below to improve teaching and learning:

- Developed and Administered the HPU Census on Student Writing;
- Proposed curricular revisions to maximize potential for learning transfer;
- Conducted dynamic criteria mapping and assessed analysis outcome;
- Solicited three student essays for publication in “Student Spotlight”;

Developments explained below.
HPU Census on Student Writing

One program goal of AY 2015-2016 was to revise the FYW curriculum for transfer, or the likelihood that students will apply what they learn in ENG 1103 to their writing in other HPU courses. However, ENG 1103 is the only Gen Ed writing-designated course, and we have only anecdotal knowledge of the writing required in other courses.

To remedy this, the FYW director designed two IRB-approved surveys: one for faculty in other disciplines and one for HPU sophomores. Faculty members were emailed their survey in January 2016, and 17% responded (108/633). Sophomores were emailed their survey in March 2016 and 6% responded (62/1069). Selected results are given below.

Result: Large Gap in Beliefs about Student Preparedness

Figure 1 displays the gap in student and faculty perception of students’ preparedness for writing in Gen Ed courses. Note that while 97% of sophomores believe they were either “adequately” or “well” prepared, 56% of faculty indicated students’ preparation was “poor” and 0 faculty indicated students were “well” prepared.

Beliefs about Preparedness for Writing in Gen Ed Courses

These data can potentially make different arguments and will be used in faculty development contexts with both ENG 1103 instructors and HPU faculty through CITL, if possible.
Result: High Agreement and Overlap in Writing Tasks

The following data clarified for us and can help us demonstrate to students that the assignments, tasks, and expectations in ENG 1103 are also expected in HPU Gen Ed courses.

Sophomores were given a list of writing tasks or genres and asked to check off any they encountered in their Gen Ed courses. Figure 2 demonstrates how 5 of the 6 tasks selected by a majority of sophomores are also taught in ENG 1103: research paper, applied analysis, reflective writing, persuasive argument, and summary or abstract.

![Gen Ed Writing Tasks Identified by a Majority of HPU Sophomores](image)

**Figure 2**
Faculty members were asked to both identify writing tasks and then rate their importance. The writing tasks that sophomores identified as ones they encountered were rated by faculty as moderately or very important to Gen Ed writing at rates ranging from 42-68%.

Figure 3

Demonstrating these connections can help us create value for ENG 1103 students, an important element in the motivation to transfer. In their respective studies on writing transfer, Driscoll and Wells conclude that “the value students placed on tasks directly impacted their motivation to transfer; without value, students . . . fail to see situations in which transfer of knowledge could occur. The data revealed that ‘value’ for students was almost entirely based on student beliefs about future writing contexts.” The more ENG 1103 students believe the course is relevant to their other courses, the more likely they will be motivated to draw on prior knowledge and engage in meaningful abstraction.
Result: Most Sophomores See ENG 1103 as Relevant to Gen Ed Writing

Sophomores were asked to rate the relevance of ENG 1103 to their writing in Gen Ed courses. Figure 4 displays their responses: about 64% of sophomores indicated ENG 1103 as moderately or very relevant to their Gen Ed writing.

![Sophomores' Judgment of ENG 1103 Relevance to Gen Ed Writing](chart)

Figure 4

This high rate for relevance was unexpected but welcome. It can also help us create value, as we share this data with ENG 1103 students along with our desire to make ENG 1103 more relevant to future students through curricular revision and pedagogical innovation.

Complete survey data is available on the HPU FYW Program webpage.
FYW Curricular Revision

The following instructors comprised the FYW Curriculum Committee for 2015-2016: Matt Garite, Joe Goeke, Holly Middleton, Lynne Murray, Melissa Richard, Terri Scalf, and Leah Schweitzer. Holly Middleton chaired the committee.

The FYW Curriculum Committee oversees the FYW program to ensure it is: serving the needs of HPU students and the faculty who teach it; meeting professional standards and obligations; enacting best practices supported by research on writing; and responsibly negotiating its institutional context.

AY 2015-2016 Objective: Update FYW course description and shared requirements in relation to:

- Revised CWPA outcomes
- New Common Core state standards for English Language Arts
- FYS
- Results from the spring 2016 faculty survey
- Results from the spring 2016 sophomore survey
- FYW Program Report 2014-2015
- Assessment Materials for 2015-2016
- Program Analysis Guidelines
- Research on Transfer (See Woolf et al.'s “Knowing What We Know” in G folder)
- Increasing international student enrollment
- Its role in the Common Experience

The committee began by surveying ENG 1103 instructors in December 2015, reviewing program materials, and reading research on transfer. They met on the following days: 11/12/15; 2/2/16; 2/25/16; and 4/4/16. Proposed revisions were presented to all ENG 1103 instructors at an April luncheon. Feedback received at that time was used to finalize the proposed changes below.
Curricular changes:

- Add genre to the “inquiry” learning outcome;
- Uncouple reflection from essays in writing projects; substitute a midterm reflective essay for second essay;
- Eliminate composite writing project grading in favor of grading work on its own;
- Cultivate “openness” in our classrooms.

See Appendix for discussion of and rationale for each change.
Outcomes Assessment

Formative assessment of the Composition Program was conducted in AY 2012-2013 to improve teaching and learning of the following outcomes:

- Develop analyses through evidence-based claims;
- Adhering to conventions of Edited American Standard English (EASE)

Procedures

**Dynamic Criteria Mapping Procedure**

During AY 2012-2013, ENG 1103 instructors engaged in a streamlined version of *dynamic criteria mapping*, a qualitative method of identifying the values actually in play for instructors and thus the FYW program. From this descriptive data, programs can generate a shared vocabulary for normative evaluative criteria that can be used to develop classroom and assessment rubrics. Importantly, programs can also better articulate teaching practice to assessment practice. By implementing this procedure in 2012-2013, we were able to assess the outcome “integration,” make targeted changes, and measure gains in student performance the subsequent AY.

In fall 2015 the Director of FYW scheduled and conducted small group discussions of 3-5 ENG 1103 instructors. Participants were given the same two student analytical essays and asked to identify what they valued and did not value in each student’s work. Each group was led through the same four discussion questions and minutes were taken by the program director. From the compiled discussion minutes, the FYW director developed a criteria map and drafted a glossary that was revised and finalized by the six-member OA committee in early summer 2016. (See documents in Appendix). This glossary became the central assessment instrument.

In December 2015, an English department work-study identified a stratified random sample of 71 students enrolled in ENG 1103. Of the 60 selected students, 71 assignments were collected and all identifying information removed.
Assessment procedure

Six instructors served on the OA Committee: Michele Huffman, Holly Middleton, Lynne Murray, Melissa Richard, Karen Summers, and Scott Walker. Holly Middleton chaired the committee and Melissa Richard prepared materials for assessment by removing identifying information, assigning codes, and organizing essays for readers.

In order to finalize the glossary and rubric, committee members met several times via Google Hangout to discuss their readings of sample student work. They conducted the actual assessment on 6/15/16 and 6/16/16. Student essays were divided into three packets and each packet was assigned two readers on the OA committee. Readers were asked to assess each assignment in the following way:

1. Assign an Analysis score of 1-6.
2. Choose the criterion from the glossary that most informed your decision on the Analysis score.
3. Assign an edited American standard English (EASE) score of 1-6.

What do Scores Mean?

Scores associated with EASE:

6: no noticeable errors
5: 1-2 noticeable errors
4: more noticeable and perhaps consistent errors, but they do not impede meaning
3: consistent errors that impede meaning
2: errors impede meaning and damage writer’s ethos
1: unreadable

Scores associated with Analysis:

6: exceeds expectations for college writing for this outcome
5: clearly meets expectations for college writing for this outcome
4: barely meets expectations for college writing for this outcome
3: partially/almost meets expectations for college writing for this outcome
2: clearly does not meet expectations for college writing for this outcome
1: cannot be evaluated for this outcome
In both cases, the higher the score the stronger the performance. It is important to note, however, that the difference between 3 and 4 marked the distinction between work that was deemed successful/unsuccesful, competent/not competent, or passing/failing.

Once a reader made a decision regarding whether an essay had--ultimately--succeeded or failed on the outcome, they assigned a criterion from the glossary that most informed their judgment. Assigned criteria are value-neutral and always explain the reason for a judgment of success or failure. (See Appendix for complete criteria glossary).

In this way, the data can identify our program strengths and weaknesses so they can be targeted for improvement.

EASE Results

**Individual students**

We can approximate how many students were considered “passing” by combining both readers’ scores for each student. A combined score of 7 or higher is considered “passing.”

- “Failing”: combined score of 2-6: 0% (n = 0)
- “Passing”: combined score of 7-12: 100% (n = 71)

Students whose scores reflect distinction:

- Combined score of 10-12: 41% (n = 29/71)

**Analysis Results**

Two readers read each essay and assigned: a score of 1-6 and a criterion that informed their judgment.

**Individual students**

We can approximate how many students were considered “passing” by combining both readers’ scores for each student.

- “Failing”: combined score of 2-6: 38% (n = 27)
- “Passing”: combined score of 7-12: 62% (n = 44)

Students whose scores reflect distinction:

- Combined score of 10-12: 10% (n = 7/71)

To best determine the criteria that are driving these decisions, we look at the scores as a totality. Out of the 142 total assessments:
Scores of 1-3: 46% (n = 66/142)
Scores of 4-6: 54% (n = 78/142)

The most common criteria assigned scores of 1-3:

Approach: 33%
Complexity: 26%
Reasoning: 17%

Definitions from Glossary:

**Approach**: object of analysis is treated as such, even if the execution is poor (reads like an exercise, may be a "good" writer not stretching); primarily response, reaction, argument, summary

**Complexity**: degree of sophistication of task, of method, of approach, of claims

**Reasoning**: Infers and explains relationship between claim and evidence logically and sensibly

The most common criteria assigned scores of 4-6:

Approach: 28%
Development: 21%
Potential: 15%
Attentiveness: 12%

Definitions from Glossary:

**Approach**: (see above)

**Development**: may be thin; may substantially answer “how?”; returns to and builds claims; able to infer / identify / explain / explicate logical & reasonable relationships between ideas, rationales, evidence, texts, experiences, questions. “Raises questions and follows those questions—arriving at interesting conclusions.”

**Potential**: may indicate deep or shallow/contained learning; relating to method or thinking as transferable to other contexts; may “beg for revision” in a positive way; may imply or suggest a research direction

**Attentiveness**: level of scrutiny or care; quality or degree of selectiveness in what is noticed; a generative way of working may be implied
Student Spotlight

Cheryl Marsh chaired the Student Spotlight committee. Each semester she distributed a call for submissions of final essays; students can submit directly or their instructors can submit their work for them. A signed release is required for publication. During the summer Dr. Marsh and Michele Huffman read the submissions and selected three for publication. Dr. Middleton then worked with the winning students to revise for publication.

Students selected for student spotlight in 2015-2016 were: Michael Ionescu, Livy Beaner, and Taylor Cooley
Achieving 2014-2015 Objectives

Develop OA procedure for early analytical assignments rather than final essays, using findings generated this year.
   • This objective was fully achieved.

Develop and share classroom uses for Student Spotlight essays.
   • Some instructors used the essays but practices were not shared.

Develop and share classroom uses for Model for Source Integration.
   • Some instructors used it but practices were not shared.

Gather input on smaller shared textbook for ENG 1101/1102/1103 to adopt in 2016-2017.
   • *Reading Rhetorically* has been adopted for ENG 1101-1102, but we have kept the same pool of three textbooks. It was determined that given the new rental practice, a variety of textbooks don’t burden students.

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.
   • This objective was achieved.
Conclusions and Recommendations for 2016-2017

- Focus on improving student performance of approach, complexity, and reasoning in analytical writing.
  - The prevalence of “approach” indicates it is the most valued criterion for readers at all levels of achievement. If we look at combined scores of 10-12 (distinctive), 6/14 of the readers named “approach” to justify their score. This means rather than simply being a criterion indicating a passing/failing performance—the distinction between 3 and 4—it can indicate any degree of success or failure. Our efforts at improvement should be targeted here, along with complexity and reasoning.

- Determine program implications and generative uses of survey data; present to HPU faculty through CITL.

- Hold more regular meetings rather than Brown Bags. This means selecting two times to hold every meeting, because there is no open hour when no one is teaching.

- Increase number of submissions to Student Spotlight.
Appendix
Outcomes Assessment--June 15, 2016

Overview: This document contains instructions, the rubric glossary, and a worksheet. Make a copy of this Google Doc or download it in Word so you will have your own version to work with. When assessment opens, you will need access to all three: these instructions, the rubric, and the worksheet. You will also gain access to your packet just before assessment, when I share the folder with you via Google Drive. Assessment will take either one or two two-hour sessions.

Instructions: Each essay will be scored for the following outcomes: 1. conventions of Edited American Standard English (EASE); 2. SLO “Develop analysis with evidence-based claims.” Readers will note the criterion that most informed their judgment for outcome 2.

Open your packet in Google Drive and read the first essay. Using the worksheet on page 3 (or a system of your own), note the student ID, your scores and criterion, then proceed to the next essay in your packet. If you’re undecided, take notes as needed to record your thinking as you go.

When you finish your packet, or at the end of two hours, review your worksheets to finalize your scores and criteria. While several criteria may suggest themselves to you on the worksheet, remember that you will ultimately have to select only one score and the criterion that justifies that score. Transfer your scores and criteria to your “OA_Reader_Spreadsheet_2015_2016.” Enter your reader number in column B.

Review your spreadsheet to ensure that all student ID numbers are accurate and in order. Review your worksheets to ensure that your scores and criteria were accurately transferred to the spreadsheet.

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

Scores associated with EASE:

6: no noticeable errors
5: 1-2 errors
4: noticeable and perhaps consistent errors, but they do not impede meaning
3: consistent errors that impede meaning
2: errors impede meaning and damage writer’s ethos
1: unreadable

Scores associated with Analysis:

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

**Attentiveness**: level of scrutiny or care; quality or degree of selectiveness in what is noticed; a generative way of working may be implied

**Potential**: may indicate deep or shallow/contained learning; relating to method or thinking as transferable to other contexts; may “beg for revision” in a positive way; may imply or suggest a research direction

**Consistency**: in approach, in evidence

**Approach**: object of analysis is treated as such, even if the execution is poor (reads like an exercise, may be a “good” writer not stretching); primarily response, reaction, argument, summary

**Complexity**: degree of sophistication of task, of method, of approach, of claims

**Development**: may be thin; may substantially answer “how?”; returns to and builds claims; able to infer / identify / explain / explicate logical & reasonable relationships between ideas, rationales, evidence, texts, experiences, questions. “Raises questions and follows those questions—arriving at interesting conclusions.”

**Reasoning**: Infers and explains relationship between claim and evidence logically and sensibly

**Clarity**: precision and focus in analysis; straightforward; concrete; clear

**Significance**: Importance, relevance, or significance of findings for readers; shows ramifications of claims [purpose, relevance, audience]; may address “so what?” or “why?”.

**Application**: understanding and application of concepts such as: rhetorical appeals, argumentative strategies

**Context**: establishing / summarizing the big picture of the object or artifact of analysis; the “set up”; situation of the artifact in a larger conversation
**Worksheet**  
(For reader use only)

Student ID: __________________________

**Conventions (EASE)**  
(ie., spelling, punctuation,  
fragments, capitalization,  
verb tense, subject-verb  
agreement, run-on/fused sentences)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Develop Analyses with**  
Evidence-based claims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Criterion:** ________________ (from glossary)

**Notes:**  
(-) __________________________  
(+) __________________________

__________________________  
__________________________
Proposed Changes to FYW

FYW Curriculum Committee: Holly Middleton (chair), Matt Garite, Joe Goeke, Lynne Murray, Melissa Richard, Terri Scalf, Leah Schweitzer

Overview: To develop proposed changes to the FYW course, the curriculum committee drew on published scholarship, program data, policies, small-group discussion and instructor feedback, and surveys of ENG 1103 instructors, faculty, and HPU sophomores.

The text below outlines approved changes to the FYW course requirements and assignment sequence. The major ones are:

• Add genre to the inquiry learning outcome;
• Uncouple reflection from essays in writing projects; substitute a midterm reflective essay for second essay;
• Eliminate composite writing project grading in favor of grading work on its own;
• Cultivate “openness” in our classrooms.

Note: The 2016-2017 academic year will be used to test and tweak the changes below. Instructors can choose to adopt the proposed changes or to continue teaching their old syllabus for next year.

Text copied directly from the current requirements is underlined for easy reference. All proposed changes and the rationale for those changes are flagged in all CAPS.

Approved textbooks:

    Writing Analytically, 7th edition.
    Reading Rhetorically, 4th edition.

PROPOSED CHANGE #1: Add “genre” to outcome #2.

ENG 1103 STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (boilerplate)

In all sections of ENG 1103, students will:

1. Employ a variety of writing process strategies such as invention, drafting, research, annotation, peer review, revision, and editing, and become proficient in technologies that facilitate them.
2. Read and write to conduct inquiry, in the sense of: finding and evaluating relevant information, genres, and sources, demonstrating openness to new information, and integrating others’ ideas with one’s own.
3. Develop analyses grounded by evidence-based claims.
4. Reflect on one’s writing to strategize revisions and to demonstrate awareness of one’s learning.
5. Create texts that address audiences in informed and rhetorically appropriate ways.
6. Demonstrate knowledge of academic conventions regarding essay structure, use of sources, tone, citation, and sentence clarity.
RATIONALE:
• Offers a working vocabulary term for source evaluation and directs attention to audience and purpose;
• Responds to the desire for a link to 2200—"genre" is the only term or outcome not already covered;
• It can be exported to faculty in other disciplines;
• There is a lot of research on the transfer of genre knowledge, but we’re not aiming for that kind of heavy lifting. We’re looking for more of an attention to the possibility of using genre to reach other goals; Important to note: this does not portend an emphasis on writing academic genres in other disciplines;
• Even though we’re not doing major work for transfer, it would be easy to see if it is valuable to students when we redo the sophomore survey in two years.

PROPOSED CHANGE #2: Uncouple reflection from writing projects; substitute reflective essay for current second essay.

Add substantive reflection at midterm in lieu of “reflective component” attached to writing projects. The purpose would be to reflect on writing thus far and where the writer wants to go next as a writer and researcher.

Current (pre-2015) writing projects:

Two Writing Projects ~before midterm
• ~2000 words distributed across 2 writing projects, for example: 800-1000 words for WP1 and 1000-1200 for WP2). At least one must be an analytical essay; the other may be an analysis, a synthesis, an annotated bibliography, or any other academic genre relevant to the instructor’s goals for the course. Word count includes reflective component.

Proposed substitution (2016-2017):

Two Essays (analysis and reflection) ~before midterm (or approximately first half)
• One analytical essay and one reflective essay that looks both back and forward. Course work will scaffold different analytical approaches that can be developed into an essay; of a research question, inquiry, etc. for a longer project.

RATIONALE:
• Many instructors have id-ed lack of time for careful reading and interpretive practice for in-depth analysis as a problem; this would therefore free up more time to focus on that;
• “Potential” was identified as a highly valued aspect of analytical writing and can play a role in inquiry--scaffolding could be designed and graded with that in mind;
• Instructors and committee id-ed a desire to strengthen reflection and its importance to program identity. A substantive reflection essay around midterm would create opportunities for reflecting on more types of learning than a specific writing assignment. It can also offer time and space to write a more analytical reflection.
• This does not preclude instructors from assigning reflective work as previously, but it may need to be called something else for the sake of consistency.
• There is some dissatisfaction with the timing and grading process of the project-attached reflection. To be valuable, it should be done after work is submitted, but this increases turnaround time and can complicate grading.
• A reflection that requires students to take a longer view may make potential uses of earlier work evident to students.
• Would need to be an iterative process, where students are reflecting along the way (as course work, learning log, with mini-drafts, whatever works for the course).

RESULTING GRADE DISTRIBUTION (adapt within the ranges below)

Current (pre-2015) distribution:

Two writing projects: 25/30%
Course work: 15/20%
Final essay: 25%
Portfolio: 10-15%
Final exam period activity: 5%
Creative project: 5/10%

Proposed distribution (2016-2017):

2 essays: 10% and 15% (One reflective)
Course work: 20%
Final essay: 25%
Portfolio: 15% (Reflective)
Final Exam period activity: 5%
Creative project: 10%

PROPOSED CHANGE #3: Eliminate composite writing project grading.

A consequence in separating reflection from major writing assignments is that the component justifying project grading has been removed. This means that the grading cushion students have received for the last few years is no longer in place. The committee discussed the ramifications of this and members demonstrated a range of concern about this—from none to high. However, we do believe other changes will mitigate the impact:

• Students should have more time to focus on and practice the analytical moves required for the first essay—that increased class time can result in stronger analytical performance.
• As the second essay will ask students to reflect on their body of work to that point, they will be practicing recently learned moves on personal experience. That familiarity should, assuming student effort, result in a strong grade on the second essay.

PROPOSED CHANGE #4: Cultivate the disposition of openness in first-year writing.

• Experiences/Activities:
  • Debates
  • RTTP
  • Assign writing groups that students stay in all semester
• Assignments:
  • Privileging “conversation” metaphor in assignment design of all kinds
• Encouraging and rewarding open-ended exploration rather than demanding a thesis-driven argument early in the semester
• Midterm reflection will encourage this

RATIONALE:
• This is one of the “habits of mind” identified in the CWPA “Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing. Students who practice these habits or dispositions tend to be more successful learners;
• Our first-year students tend to score low on “openness to new ideas” (Lynne); (Is this where eighteen year-olds are at or specific to HPU?)
• “Openness” was voted the most important (of the eight habits) to success in Gen Ed writing in the ENG 1103 instructor, faculty, and sophomore surveys; so we have a consensus that can be shared with students and other stakeholders;
• It underlies many of the ways of thinking or doing that we already know can hinder learning, especially in the inquiry outcome.
• Important: This is NOT to be assessed. It would instead be articulated as a core value, identified by program data, that informs our pedagogy and assignment design.