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General Updates


2. **Assessment Committee Work for 2016-2017**: Developing an analytic rubric for Use of Language Grant (explained below); assessing Crown 80A (second-year study of the college); and leading faculty development workshops in consultation with the General Education Committee on the revised C1 and C2 Outcomes.

Major Findings from 2016 Study of the Crown Model

As noted at the First Fall Faculty meeting, we assessed the Crown Model in the 2015-2016 AY to measure the impact of W20 on students’ performance in 80A. We also did a comparative study of ELWR-Required students from the 2015 study of Nine and Ten, with permission of the Provosts.

Overall, we found positive results for W20 students that have direct implications for Senate Regulation to 10.5.2, which was revised by the Senate last year. Here’s the new language:

“Satisfaction of the Entry-Level Writing Requirement is a prerequisite for enrolling in a Composition 1 course, enrollment in every other university-level undergraduate course in English composition and for the Bachelor’s degree. (Am 30 Apr 69, 22 Oct 75; CC 1 Aug 77; CC 3 1 Aug 06).”

![Figure 1. Final Proficiencies of Writing 20 and Crown 79 Students](image)
(Percentage of Students Who Met or Exceeded Expectations)
Our comparative study of Nine and Ten with Crown College also revealed that students who scored a 6 on the AWPE benefitted from taking W20 before taking 80A. This point is worth noting because in the previous study, students with AWPE scores of 6 performed lower overall in comparison with Stretch and ELWR-Satisfied students. These findings suggest that ELWR students benefit from two quarters of writing instruction.

**Figure 2. Proficiencies of "6s" in Study 1 vs. Study 2**
(Percentage of Students Who Met or Exceeded Expectations)
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Use of Language Grant

The Writing Program applied for and was awarded a $38,000 grant by the Division of Student Success to study students’ “Use of Language” in Writing 20, a key criterion that we’ve been assessing since 2015. The purpose of this grant is to support students from underserved areas within the state of California, so we are specifically targeting ELWR-Required students who will take Writing 20 in the Winter 2017 Quarter.

Based on the Writing Program’s assessment of the College Core course (2015 and 2016) and Writing 20 (2016), we have found that one of ELWR-Required students’ lowest writing proficiencies tends to be “Use of Language,” the ability to write concisely, clearly, and grammatically at the sentence level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Met/Exceeded Expectations*</th>
<th>Demographics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composition 1 (2015)</td>
<td>28-39%</td>
<td>44-58% 88-95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing 20 (2015)</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>58% 82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition 1 (2016)</td>
<td>54-69%</td>
<td>59% 88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a result of these findings, the Writing Program applied for the grant so that we could implement an intervention to achieve equity in learning outcomes. The intervention we selected is Core Grammar for College, a self-paced online grammar program that has a pre-test component, followed by a series of lessons and a post-test. We selected four sections of Writing 20 to study: two that will include the CGC intervention and two that do not.

We selected “Use of Language” for several reasons: (1) students typically score low in this criterion; (2) the current rubric language we use to assess this criterion is not well defined (i.e., too many sub-criteria within the criterion); and (3) students’ performance in this criterion is highly correlated with a number of factors, including gender, first-generation status, and first language status.

**Assessment Committee’s Contributions**

Our old rubric language for “Use of Language” was too jam packed and did not allow us to understand what we were measuring. As a result, the Assessment committee will sub-divide the current “Use of Language” criterion into four criteria that will allow us to better assess student writing.

**Old Rubric Language**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C9: Use of Language</td>
<td>Writer uses clear language, strong verbs, and concision; the writer also demonstrates little to no systematic errors related to grammar and punctuation. The reader can easily move through the project without stopping for clarification.</td>
<td>Writer mostly uses clear language, strong verbs, and concision throughout the project with minor systematic errors or inconsistencies related to grammar and punctuation. The reader can move relatively easily throughout the project, only stopping for minor clarification.</td>
<td>For the most part, the writer uses good language but may need to improve his/her use of verbs, ability to create concise prose, and systematic errors related to grammar and punctuation. The reader can understand the writer’s main ideas but must stop for clarification several times throughout the project.</td>
<td>The reader cannot easily move through the project and must stop repeatedly to “puzzle out the meaning.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New Rubric Sub-Criteria**

- **Sentence structure and variety**: The ability to use a number of sentence structures, including but not limited to simple sentences, complex sentences, compound sentences, and compound-complex sentences. Additionally, the ability to vary sentence structure consistently throughout the project.

- **Word choice**: The ability to use appropriate words and terms that have the right connotation and usage.

- **Grammar conventions**: The ability to follow conventional grammatical constructions related to verb tense, word forms, word order, etc. We will exclude sentence structure from this category.

- **Punctuation conventions**: The ability to use punctuation to differentiate parts of sentences and to differentiate sentences from one another.
Assessment Updates
January 31, 2017 Faculty Meeting

We will develop the rubric with four levels of proficiency:

- **Proficient**: The writer demonstrates full ability, perhaps with only 1-2 or localized misuses of the criterion.
- **Competent**: The writer demonstrates acceptable ability, with a few localized misuses of the criterion.
- **Developing**: The writer demonstrates systematic challenges related to the criterion, but shows partial understanding. However, the inconsistency prevents the writer from demonstrating an “acceptable ability.”
- **Emerging**: The writer demonstrates systematic challenges related to the criterion and does not show partial understanding.

**Moving Forward**

1. Finalizing **Writing 2 Report on information literacy** from 2015-2016 AY. IRAPS is completing the data analysis of students’ pre- and post-survey results. Estimated timeline: end of winter quarter.

2. Completing the **second-year study of Crown 80A**, focusing on the Crown 79 cohort in order to see how well students develop critical reading, critical thinking, and writing proficiencies as a result of the two-quarter experience. Estimated timeline: end of spring quarter.

3. Consulting with **Oakes Provost and Core faculty on direct assessment of 80A**. Estimated timeline: end of winter quarter.