Columbus State University

Quality Enhancement Plan Annual Report

2007 - 2008

Prepared by

Dr. Jim Owen
Director, Faculty Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning

Dr. Robert Cummings
QEP Writing Specialist

Dr. Bill Hortman
Executive Director of Institutional Effectiveness

Table of Contents

I. Executive Summary

2007-08 was the first full year of QEP activities. With the Director of the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning position filled by Dr. Jim Owen and the QEP Writing Specialist position filled by Dr. Robert Cummings, the QEP began in earnest. The first concern of the year was creating a baseline measurement of student writing level using CLAQWA. After English 1101 and 1102 writing samples were gathered and assessed to create the baseline measurements in 2006, the QEP continued to measure student writing in 2007-08. Comparisons were made between the spring 2007 prompt and the spring 2008 prompt which indicated gains in all but one of the sixteen areas of measurements.

The QEP team continued to bolster the CSU's efforts to teach writing to competent and professional writers. Through its defined interventions of fellowships, course reassignments, and grants, multiple faculty and students experienced substantive writing skill improvement. Several events were created to both keep a campus focus on the QEP and to provide practical writing skill improvement. In the spring of 2008, the QEP also created the first Celebration of Student Writing to showcase the interaction between its successful initiatives at the competent and professional levels.

The challenge of revising the assessment plan to make it more learner-centered was addressed in this important year, and the QEP team remains optimistic that it will be able to meet the goals as defined in its plan.

II. Report on Progress toward Goals

A. Goal 1: To Provide an Infrastructure for Professional Development Activities to Improve Student Writing

The framers of the QEP took seriously the SACS goal of bringing about cultural change on campus. While the purpose of any QEP must be to improve student learning, the key to improving student learning is developing faculty into more effective teachers. At the time that CSU was focusing its QEP, CSU lacked a central structure for professional development. Hence, step one of our QEP was the establishment of the Faculty Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning to serve as the infrastructure for all faculty development activities related to CSU's writing initiative. Both the QEP plan and the QEP budget specify that the Faculty Center have a Director, a QEP Writing Specialist, and an Administrative Assistant.

The nation-wide search for a director for the Faculty Center began in Fall 2006. Jim Owen, Professor of English, was hired to begin July 1, 2007; he continues to teach for the English Department. Robert Cummings, Director of First Year Composition and Assistant Professor of English, was hired as QEP Writing Specialist beginning August 1, 2007; in addition to continuing his duties as FYC Director, Dr. Cummings continues to teach for the Department of English. In August 2007, Ms. Sharron Caldwell was hired as Senior Administrative Assistant; she took on the task of gathering and analyzing data, scheduling and promoting QEP events, and handling all materials related to fellowships, grants, reassignment time applications, and teaching awards. Ms. Caldwell held this position until July 2008; she left because of relocation. CSU as placed under a hiring freeze, and her position has not been filled.

The Faculty Center is housed in a small suite of offices in the basement of Richards Hall. It contains a small conference room, a storage room, the senior administrative assistant's office, and the Director's office. The small conference room contains a library of books about teaching and about the teaching of writing.

> Objective 1: Establish an Infrastructure for Faculty Development Related to Student Writing

Once the Director was hired and office space was secured, the QEP was required to establish an Advisory Committee and an Oversight Committee. The Advisory Committee is set up in such a fashion that faculty are in charge of all major decisions regarding faculty development issues. The membership of the committee is composed of a faculty member from each of CSU's academic units; these representatives serve two-year terms. The chair of the QEP Advisory Committee must be a faculty member. In addition, the Advisory Committee must have staff and student representation.

There are currently six ex officio members of the QEP Advisory Committee: Dr. Joyce Hickson, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs; Dr. Gina Sheeks, Vice President of Student Affairs; Dr. Bill Hortman, Director of Institutional Research; Dr. Bob Cummings, QEP Writing Specialist; Dr. Jim Owen, Director of the Faculty Center; and Dr. Noreen Lape, Director of the Writing Center. From the QEP Advisory Committee, various subcommittees are formed to

examine faculty applications for Fellowships, Mini-Grants, Reassignment Time, and Outstanding Teacher of Writing Awards. The subcommittees make recommendations to the full committee.

In addition, Drs. Hickson, Hortman, Owen, and Cummings make up the QEP Oversight Committee which meets weekly to address QEP-related issues. During our first year of operation, most of our time has been devoted to coming up with an assessment plan that fits the nature of our project.

Professors Owen and Cummings, along with members of the QEP Advisory Committee, are the central recruiters for faculty members interested in undertaking QEP-related activities and projects.

Objective 2: Provide Incentives for Faculty to Participate in Professional Development Activities

When faculty focus groups were asked what it would take to get them to alter their teaching methodologies, there were four answers: (1) the opportunities for ongoing professional development; (2) time; (3) money; and (4) recognition. During our first year of operation, the Faculty Center effectively met each of these challenges.

First, Drs. Cummings and Owen designed and implemented a full-year Faculty Writing Fellowship Program. We put out a call for fellowships at the beginning of Fall 2007 and received 16 applications for 5 available slots; the quality of applications were so good that the Advisory Committee recommended funding an additional fellowship. Fellows meet regularly as a group with the Writing Specialist in the fall term planning for ways to incorporate writing into at least on of their spring classes; during spring term they institute changes that they have designed and assess the ways that the teaching of writing has affected their students' learning. As a culmination of their fellowships, these faculty members' students make presentations at the CSU Celebration of Student Writing. In academic year 2007-2008, we had six Faculty Writing Fellows: Drs. John Barone, Tina Butcher, Jennifer Pitts, Amanda Rees, Bonita Williams, and Orion Wertz. (Each academic unit had at least one Faculty Writing Fellow in this first year's group, which was important in that the Advisory Committee recommend that extra care be taken in recruiting faculty participants from across campus.)

B. Goal 2: To Improve and Faculty and Staff Knowledge, Skills, and Attitudes Related to Student Writing

In AY 2007-2008, the QEP has made tremendous strides toward improving faculty knowledge, skills and attitudes toward student writing. The QEP is nothing less than a visible affirmation of the campus's ethos as a whole, and in particular its concern about writing. Faculty looked at wide-range of topics in planning for the QEP and the selection of writing indicated a broad consensus and common desire to improve student writing across campus. This common

denominator in the CSU community indicates an awareness from teachers of all disciplines not only that the vitality of the degrees we confer depends upon our graduates' abilities communicate what they learn at CSU, but that indeed writing is not only a tool to present that knowledge but to obtain it.

To empower the faculty's good will in to effective writing instruction, in 2007-08 the QEP conducted the following activities.

<div align="center">Objective 1: Identify and Recruit Faculty and Staff Participants</div>

Writing Fellows, Reassignment Time Recipients, Grant Recipients

One of the largest, most visible, and most significant outreach programs in the QEP is the faculty fellows program. Faculty with the desire to improve writing in their classes are assisted by the QEP Director and Writing Specialist in a number of ways.

Writing Fellows

Writing Fellows propose a plan to enhance writing in a course or courses. In concert with the Writing Specialist, these innovators develop a comprehensive approach to improving students' writing skills, the establishment of outcomes for writing, and the assessment of those outcomes. During 2007-08, Owen and Cummings recruited faculty heavily to publicize this new program and to solicit applications. After visiting every college on campus and the library, they received 15 complete applications from faculty in Theatre, Geography, Business Management, Art, Education (2), English (2), University College/College Success, Ecology, History, Philosophy, International Business, African Studies, and Library Studies.

The following faculty were selected:

- **Dr. John Barone** for his proposal to improve the frequency of writing in Ecology through weekly field journals, lab reports, and a capstone project;

- **Dr. Tina Butcher** who sought to establish writing as a tool for learning in College Success, bringing the essential confidence to participate in the academic process to an audience of at-risk students;

- **Dr. Jennifer Pitts**, whose Information Systems Management capstone project sought to give students on the cusp of graduating in to the working world the abilities to interpret, understand, and manage the data produced through information technology;

- **Dr. Amanda Rees** for her comprehensive plan to employ student writing about outcomes in both upper- and lower-division instruction;

- **Dr. Bonita Williams** whose plan involved using technology to train future and current teachers to help students identify and explain how they acquired reading and writing skills through "literacy narratives" to reinforce their enhancement;

- **Dr. Orion Wertz** whose innovative proposal combined writing to learn techniques with the traditional studio art practice of critique, bringing reflective writing practices to an area of academia where they are often absent.

The number of students benefiting from writing-enriched classes taught by the fellows was 261 in academic year 2007-2008.

While these six were selected to become fellows, the fifteen applications represented a rich and diverse pool of faculty talent and thinking toward which the 2006 QEP development process could only portend. In order to maximize the transformative potential of these applications, several faculty with promising Fellows applications who were not selected to participate as Fellows were approached to participate in the two remaining programs: grants and release time.

Grants and Reassignment Time Awardees

A total of $11,400 dollars in QEP grants were awarded for Spring 2008. Under the guidance of the QEP Advisory Committee, a call for proposals was designed and implemented; all faculty were informed through electronic mail. The Advisory Committee formed a subcommittee to rate the proposals with a rubric; the subcommittee majority voice was faculty and staff. The following faculty members were selected

- **Clinton Barineau** from the Department of Chemistry and Geology was awarded $2,400 for his project, "The Story of Quartz." In his Geology 1121 sections in the spring, he offered students to choice to tackle an ongoing weekly writing assignment in place of weekly quizzes.

- **June Goyne**, Chair of the Department of Nursing, was awarded a grant of $2,000 to be divided among three of her faculty members who piloted a shared assessment program with Nursing junior papers. Professor Goyne's department worked closely with Drs. Cummings and Owen in developing a rubric for evaluating a specific assignment that all junior nursing majors are required to write.

- **John Studstill** from the Department of Psychology and Sociology was awarded $1,400 for his project, "The Ultimate Term Paper." Rather than have students in his Anthropology 3125 class write a final paper, he divided up the paper into processed steps in order to offer continuous feedback throughout the writing process.

- **John Theis** from the Department of Finance was awarded $1,000 for his project, "Shared Assessment of Writing in Senior Finance Capstone Classes." He piloted a shared assessment model whereby a random selection of the cases written in the

capstone class would be read by two "outside" readers (professors within the Finance department) in addition to the lead instructor.

- **Florence Wakoko-Studstill**, from the Department of Psychology and Sociology, received a grant of $2,400 for her project, "Mainstreaming Writing in Sociology: Writing to Learn," in which she added various writing assignments such as reflective journals and weekly responses to both her Spring Sociology 1101 class and her Fall Sociology 4108 class.

- **Elizabeth Wurz**, from the Division of Basic Studies, was awarded $2,000 for her project, "Inviting Learning Support Writers into Academic Conversations: A Long-term Evaluation of the Successes and Retention of Learning Support Writers." While Dr. Wurz's grant immediately impacted her English 0098 and 0099 classes in Spring 2008, it also represents an on-going project: she introduced an electronic writers discussion board for her students and incorporated her students into CSU's "World Without Borders" experiences to give them something common to reflect upon. She has developed a database and is tracking the success and retention of these students over a five-year period.

Reassignment Time AY 2007-2008

Reassignment time proved a harder sell than grants. QEP monies were offered to departments willing to lighten a faculty member's course load by one class for a semester; the QEP paid for a part-time faculty member to cover the reassigned faculty member's class. Reassigned faculty members then worked on QEP-related projects.

Few faculty members applied; hence, the QEP Advisory Committee suggested using the funds allotted to support other projects. There were, however, two faculty members reassigned Spring 2008:

- **Dr. Becky Becker**, from the Department of Theatre, agreed to teach a writing intensive theatre class, Theatre 3178. In this class, she required her students to write an extensive dramaturgical analysis of a play. These papers were in the 30-40 page range, certainly difficult for undergraduates unfamiliar with such extensive studies. Dr. Becker designed the assignment as a process, and she provided feedback to her students throughout the class.

- **Dr. Virginia Causey,** from the Department of History, was given reassignment time to work on her project, "Writing to Learn in History." Dr. Causey's project was a curriculum redesign, aimed at bringing more writing projects in both History 2112 and History 3105, with the intention of better preparing history majors at CSU for their senior-level writing class. As Dr. Causey's proposal will affect all history majors at CSU, hundreds of students will benefit from her work in years to come; the average enrollment for Spring 2112 classes is 400.

Total Number of Students Affected Through Writing Enriched Classes From QEP Grants or Reassignment Time, Spring 2008: 378.

Department-level Recruitments: Nursing, History, Art, and Art History

Under the leadership of Dr. June Goyne, the CSU Nursing department has been the vanguard of the enhancement of writing instruction, setting an example for all departments. Their participation in the QEP began early, as they sent a large group of faculty to the first CLAQWA sessions in August of 2006. Driven by the desire to improve the literacy skills of their graduates in occupational health care settings, the Nursing Department has been largely self-directed by its own sense of the urgency of its students' writing needs.

Working with the FCETL Director and the QEP Writing Specialist, they have developed substantial mandatory writing components to three required Nursing courses: NURS 3176, NURS 3275, and NURS 4177. Each course writing component served as a capstone experience for students, integrating various curricular strands within the course and building on knowledge between courses.

The department has also taken writing assessment to a new level: working on its own, it developed an innovative, internal writing rubric to assess student work in these three courses. The terms of the rubric were inspired by the CLAQWA rubric, but also adapted to fit the values of the nursing discipline. The department has also quickly identified sophisticated issues in writing assessment, such as inter-rater reliability, and furthered a team assessment plan which allows faculty to learn from assessment in other courses and provides a more coherent development of writing skills for nursing students. The department later collaborated with the QEP Writing Director to substantially revise and refine to the rubric to better reflect teacher needs, student reactions, and the principles of composition and writing assessment (see exhibit 1). The resulting rubric is truly an artifact of advanced writing instruction in contemporary nursing scholarship and has been the topic of collaboration between Dr. Cummings and scholars in Nursing at other institutions; hopefully this will lead to academic paper in the future with input from the CSU Nursing department, the Nursing Department at the University of Iowa, and Dr. Cummings.

On September 14, 2007, the Nursing department held a planning retreat and invited Drs. Owen and Cummings to participate. Dr. Cummings delivered a presentation to the faculty of the department on writing rubrics and writing assessment to foreground a general discussion on successes and needs of the early version of the rubric (see exhibit 2). After the presentation, an open workshop was held where all nursing faculty participated in the development of the revised writing rubric. Taking the suggestions from the faculty as a whole about the successes and failures of the early version of the rubric, Dr. Cummings returned two weeks later with a revised rubric.

In addition to working with Nursing, Drs. Owen and Cummings dedicated time in 2007-08 to curricular revision within the History Department. Although efforts with History have not yet yielded the comprehensive curricular refocus initially encouraged by the chair of the department

during their CPR process the QEP has worked with History faculty individually to employ the new outcomes-based writing assessment plan.

Similarly, in 2007-08 Drs. Owen and Cummings met with CSU's art department to discuss curricular reform to emphasize writing. In several meetings with then chair, Mara Scrupe, QEP representatives outlined a set of possibilities for addressing writing at multiple levels in art instruction, based in part on the great success of Orion Wertz enjoyed during the summer of 2007 in introducing writing in to studio art courses. Owen and Cummings also learned how art was viewed by students with low confidence in writing skills as a "safe" discipline, or one where little writing was involved. Working with the natural overlap in portfolios – or between electronic portfolios now popular in writing assessment and the rich history of portfolio assessment traditionally associated with art instruction – conversations with the chair formed several options which were then taken to the department as a whole. However, due in part to internal staffing changes within the art department, and devotion of subsequent energy toward replacing departed colleagues, any changes in the teaching of writing for the Art Department will be postponed until staffing levels return to normal, hopefully in 2009-10.

Art History, however, has been able to maintain its focus under the leadership of Dr. Claire McCoy with the assistance of Professors Michele McCrillis and Barbara Johnston. In 2007-08, Art History consulted with Dr. Cummings to develop a comprehensive curricular review to emphasize writing in the teaching of Art History. In fact, the program intends to place writing skills at the heart of its newly revised mission statement, reflecting the emphasis which the discipline of Art History places upon writing as a vehicle for students to research, explore, comprehend and communicate the historical, cultural, and aesthetic significance of art. These discussions culminated in the program's application for QEP grant money, and with the funds from this grant the program will hire a writing consultant and host a retreat at the end of spring semester 2009 to investigate comprehensive curricular changes to writing in Art History.

Outstanding Teaching of Writing Awards

The QEP document called for the development of annual monetary awards for outstanding teaching of writing. As written, the document calls for up to 11 awards to be given annually: two to each college, one to the library. The document specified that the library award be $500 and the rest be $1000.

In discussion with the QEP Advisory Committee, Dr. Owen suggested that the library faculty would be slighted if their award was half of what others received. The committee agreed to change the awards to $1000 per awardee, regardless of college.

Further, it was agreed that the award should be open to any active teacher at CSU, part-time or full-time, regardless of tenure-track status. Hence, the committee felt that the award treated all faculty equally.

Finally, it was agreed that nominations would be accepted from candidates who wished to nominate themselves, from students who wished to nominate their professors, from staff members who wished to recognize the contributions of a teacher, or from other faculty members. The nominations were opened, and advertisements ran in the *Saber*, email messages and reminders targeted all segments of the campus community.

Nominees were then asked to supply a packet containing sample assignments, a statement of their strategies toward teaching effective writing, and other information that would state the case for their candidacy.

Twenty five nominees turned in their packets. A faculty-led subcommittee of the QEP Advisory Committee selected 10 finalists and also requested three honorable mention awards of $300 per.

Awardees:

- **Dr. Joseph McCallus**, English
- **Dr. Tom Dolan**, Political Science
- **Dr. Tom Hackett**, Educational Leadership
- **Dr. James Brewbaker,** Teacher Education
- **Dr. John Barone**, Biology
- **Dr. Rodrigo Obando**, Computer Science
- **Dr. Neal Thomson**, Marketing and Management
- **Professor Erma Banks**, Library
- **Dr. Teresa Irvin**, Basic Studies
- **Dr. Elizabeth Wurz**, Basic Studies

Honorable Mentions:

- **Dr. Kristen Hansen**, Music
- **Dr. Zodiac Webster**, Chemistry/Geology
- **Dr. Noreen Lape**, English

Objective 2: Provide Faculty with Instructional Strategies that Facilitate Improved Student Writing

Celebration of Student Writing

CSU's first Celebration of Student Writing was held on April 15, 2008, in the Elizabeth Bradley Turner Center. The event was constructed as a showcase of student writing to facilitate the connection between the two halves of the QEP: professional writing and competent writing. As such, this science-fair type of event featured the writing of the students in the classes of our writing fellows. The audience for this event was the entire cohort of first-year composition writers who were asked to attend the event and write a summary of what they saw and found particularly illuminating in terms of writing. In addition to providing a showcase for the work of students enrolled in the Fellows' courses, the CSW reinforced another pedagogical purpose – allowing first-year students to understand the role of writing in advanced classes. And perhaps most importantly, it was truly a celebration of our undergraduate's work. Cokes and popcorn were provided, but the atmosphere of students explaining the significance of their writing with expertise and a natural sense of accomplishment controlled the tone of the event.

The QEP was able to produce a short video for the event, which is temporarily stored here:

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=P7UpdSWv1CY

CSU's first Celebration of Student Writing also had the effect of placing the teaching methods of the Fellows on display for other faculty to view. The Fellows were available for this event, and many additional faculty attended. In addition, several Fellows would later present the details of their pedagogy in special public sessions at the library.

Nursing and Art History Interventions

The special departmental and program level interventions with Nursing and Art History, mentioned earlier in document, provide additional evidence of how the QEP has provided CSU faculty with instructional strategies to facilitate improved student writing. Numerous workshops with faculty, departmental retreats, and workshops on the use of rubrics or the creation of assignments, have all assisted in creating opportunities for the improvement of the teaching and learning environment for writing. Both programs sought assistance with revising writing "from the ground up" by interrogating their prior assumptions on the role of student writing and then revising strategies and curricula to improve and emphasize outcomes. Over thirty-one nursing faculty and three Art History faculty have participated in these instructional strategies to improve student writing.

CLAQWA

Although the role of CLAQWA, our writing assessment instrument, will be discussed further under the assessment portion of this document, it is important to acknowledge that the introduction of this writing assessment instrument, and certainly faculty training with the instrument, constitute important instances of providing faculty with significant instructional strategies to facilitate improved student writing. During 2006-08 (names are given here for the two year period to preserve the record and indicate the disciplinary diversity of participants), the following faculty received instruction on writing assessment generally, and the CLAQWA program specifically, as they spent at least four hours assessing student writing samples:

- Sandra Coffey, English

- Hongying Dai, Mathematics

- Josh Eyler, English

- Joyce Hickson, VPAA

- Barbara Hunt, English

- Terry Irvin, Basic Studies

- Patricia Ivey, English

- Tyrone Jones, English

- Jackie Konan, Classical and Modern Languages

- Vicky Langston, DATCOB

- Noreen Lape, English

- Tom Loughman, DATCOB

- Nancy Moore, English

- Gretchen Nevins, English

- Jim Owen, FCETL

- Janice Rholetter, English

- John Summerfield, English

- Daniel Van Kley, Philosophy

- Scott Wilkerson, English

- Bonita Williams, Education

- Rachael Williams, English

- Crystal Woods, English
- Andres Jauregui, Economics
- Pamela Baker, History
- Gail Jones, Nursing
- Andres Evans, Nursing
- Jean Arrighi, Nursing
- Sarah Angermuller, Nursing
- Tammy Condrey, Nursing
- Stephen Levin, English
- Jennifer Moody, Nursing
- Catrina Latimore, English
- Sallie Miller, Reading Education
- Stephen Barber
- Reagan Grimsley, Library Science
- Paula Walker, Health Science
- Beverly Venable, Marketing
- Kelli Whitted, Nursing
- Rodrigo Obando, Computer Science
- Tara Redmond, Health Science
- Gina Sheeks, Communication
- Rhonda Hollis, Nursing
- Bobbie Hunter, Nursing
- Aimee Vael, Nursing
- LaTonya Pringle, Nursing
- Lowanda Johnson, Nursing
- Sheri Noviello, Nursing
- Lisa Frander, Nursing
- Noreen McDonough, Nursing

- Therese M. Lahnstein, Nursing

- June Goyne, Nursing

- Ron Linton, Mathematics

- Tim Howard, Mathematics

- Charlotte Ingram, Nursing

- Roger Fontana, English

- Mark Schmidt, Psychology

- April Phillips, Psychology

- Tina Butcher, Education

- Tommy Delaney, English

- Retha Martin, Communication

- Neal McCrillis, History & CIE

- Amada Rees, Geology

- Cindy Henning, Mathematics

Writing Workshops: Chris Anson

Professor Chris Anson, who directs the Writing and Speaking Program at North Carolina State University, conducted two two-hour workshops for CSU faculty members on 11 April 2008. Professor Anson's program was one of the writing initiatives studied by the designers of the CSU QEP, and he had indicated to Dr. Owen that he would design workshops for our faculty.

Dr. Anson designed two workshops: "Reading, Writing, and Critical Thinking," and "Strategies for Evaluating Student Writing."

Twenty seven faculty members and several students from the Writing Center attended either one or both of the workshops.

Workshops were evaluated by participants and the responses were superb. Dr. Anson has agreed to return.

Objective 3: Establish Resources Related to Promoting Student Success in Improving Writing Abilities

Faculty Forums

In 2007-08, the QEP staff held four faculty forums to develop and promote writing pedagogy strategy with all faculty, promote upcoming programs, and listen to faculty concerns about writing. Our purpose was two-fold: we wished to provide faculty with a clear idea of what the writing program was accomplishing, but more importantly, we wished to recruit participants for the program.

In fact, Drs. Elizabeth Wurz and Clinton Barineau became interested in applying for QEP grant funding through learning about the QEP at our fall forum. Both received grants; Dr. Wurz went on to win an Outstanding Teacher of Writing Award and she currently represents University College on the QEP Advisory Committee.

C. Goal 3: To Establish Writing as a Tool for Enhanced Student Learning in Undergraduate Courses and Programs

Goal 3-A: To Acquire Writing Skills Appropriate for Success at the General Education Level -- The Competent Writer

FYC CompTalk and Other Profession Development

During the 2007-08 period, Robert Cummings introduced new faculty development opportunities for writing to expand on those efforts already underway in FYC which serve to help teachers of writing at the competent phase to enhance their pedagogical skills. Professional development for the First-Year Composition staff at CSU is inherently complex, given the fact that teachers are a so many points in their careers: we have part-time teachers who teach high school during the day and are only available at night, we have part-time teachers who teach for us as well as up to three additional institutions, full-time instructors, and full-time faculty. The main challenge in creating outreach for these groups has been attempting to find a common denominator: what would they all need in terms of pedagogical assistance?

Rather than continuing to divine the common need among these disparate groups, Cummings created a new outreach program which had two major goals: (1) increase the level of appreciation level of discourse in composition and rhetoric theory amongst teachers in the department, and (2) provide more practical advice on teaching writing based on the teachers' self-selection. The result was "Comp Talk," a weekly lunch hour discussion group.

III. Writing Assessment: 2006, 2007, and 2008

A. 2006-08: Establishing a Baseline

1. Cognitive Level And Quality Writing Assessment (CLAQWA)

2. Collection and Survey of Syllabi to Establish Quantitative Data Baseline

B. 2007-08 Measuring The Progress of the Competent Level Writer with CLAQWA: Comparing English 1102 Spring 2007 to English 1102 Spring 2008

Elements	2008 Mean	2007 Mean	Difference	2008 % 3 & Above	2007 % 3 & Above	Difference
Point Of View Is Consistent	3.07	2.95	0.12	62	60	2
Ideas Are Comprehensible	2.98	2.92	0.06	58	55	3
Appropriate Audiences Are Consistently Addressed	2.97	2.95	0.02	57	56	1
Word Choice Is Accurate	2.97	2.83	0.14	56	49	7
A Main Idea Is Presented And Maintained	2.92	2.82	0.10	54	48	6
Coherence Devices Are Present And Appropriate	2.89	2.65	0.24	50	37	13
Opening Supports The Main Idea	2.88	2.73	0.15	50	38	12
Sentence Construction Varies Appropriately	2.86	2.78	0.08	48	46	2
Paragraphs Demonstrate Unity	2.86	2.76	0.10	47	46	1
Closing Supports The Main Idea	2.85	2.63	0.22	47	36	11
Purpose Is Clear And Specific	2.85	2.73	0.12	46	38	8
Reasoning Supports The Main Idea	2.84	2.64	0.20	47	33	14
Grammar And Mechanics	2.76	2.64	0.12	40	35	5
Details Are Sufficient In Quality To Develop Main Idea	2.76	2.58	0.18	35	29	6
All Assignment Requirements Are Fulfilled	2.73	2.65	0.08	36	38	(2)
Details are Sufficient In Quantity to Develop Main Idea	2.68	2.58	0.10	32	30	2

Elements	2008 % Below 2.5	2007 % Below 2.5	Difference	2008 % 2.5 to 2.9	2007 % 2.5 to 2.9	Difference
Point Of View Is Consistent	10	22	(12)	28	18	10
Ideas Are Comprehensible	11	22	(11)	31	23	8
Appropriate Audiences Are Consistently Addressed	10	26	(16)	33	18	15
Word Choice Is Accurate	10	26	(16)	34	25	9
A Main Idea Is Presented And Maintained	20	31	(11)	26	21	5
Coherence Devices Are Present And Appropriate	17	33	(16)	33	30	3
Opening Supports The Main Idea	21	34	(13)	29	28	1
Sentence Construction Varies Appropriately	20	27	(7)	32	27	5
Paragraphs Demonstrate Unity	20	29	(9)	33	25	8
Closing Supports The Main Idea	24	25	(1)	29	39	(10)
Purpose Is Clear And Specific	26	31	(5)	28	31	(3)
Reasoning Supports The Main Idea	22	32	(10)	31	35	(4)
Grammar And Mechanics	26	33	(7)	34	32	2
Details Are Sufficient In Quality To Develop Main Idea	29	33	(4)	36	38	(2)
All Assignment Requirements Are Fulfilled	34	33	1	30	29	1
Details are Sufficient In Quantity to Develop Main Idea	32	30	2	36	40	(4)

Spring 2008 N = 125
Spring 2007 N = 201

C. 2008 Assessment Plan Revision

In our January meeting with Terri Flateby I proposed a revision to the QEP assessment plan. In subsequent QEP meetings we have continued to discuss this new plan. However, before now I have not written it out in any comprehensive fashion. Since our new writing consultant, Michael Neal, will soon be arriving to help us evaluate our assessment strategy, I thought it best to offer a written description of what I see as the best way to mend the QEP strategy to writing assessment.

Summary of our Current Plan

The current assessment plan is based on the experimental model, or measuring "value added" to student achievement by creating a baseline measurement and later comparing control and experimental group measurements to that baseline to infer progress. Baseline measurement was conducted in two major phases: the first used CLAQWA to measure the writing of English 1101 students in the fall of 2006 and English 1102 students in the spring of 2007. Similar CLAQWA measurements were conducted on the same populations, with the same prompts, in the fall of 2007 and the spring of 2008.

The QEP, as summarized on page 28 of 79, calls for a baseline, midpoint, and endpoint collection of writing samples with treatment and control groups of the competent writer phase. The baseline data is to consist of CLAQWA-scored essays taken from 100% of entering freshmen. The data midpoint is to consist of CLAQWA-scored samples from both treatment and control groups, while the data endpoint is to consist of CLAQWA-scored samples from treatment and control group members who have completed 60 hours of instruction at CSU.

For the professional writer phase, as summarized on page 33 of 79, baseline assessment is to be conducted with a "representative sample of rising juniors," followed by endpoint data of "a representative sample of sample of students completing academic coursework and approaching graduation." The baseline data of freshman are to be compared to graduating seniors. It is important to note that while these direct measurements are not the only indications of QEP effectiveness at improving writing (c.f., Daly-Miller tests, quantitative measurements of writing from syllabi, NSSE survey measurements, and qualitative reports from faculty fellows, re-assignment time recipients and grant winners), they are the chief measurement of our effectiveness.

<u>Problems with the Current Plan</u>

As we have discovered during the preliminary CLAQWA baseline measurements and the first full year of QEP operation, there are some problems with how the QEP assessment plan is currently constructed.

1. The current plan offers little motivation for student participation.

Writing assessment in the QEP does not anticipate the specifics of gathering writing samples. If students are asked to write outside of their normal classroom setting, then they will need to be provided some sort of compensation or motivation for their time and true attention to the writing task. If they are to be tested within their classrooms, then the QEP writing prompt will need to be integrated with the course curricula.

2. The current plan is problematic in providing motivation for faculty participation.

The QEP envisions that the experimental groups will be faculty participating in the QEP as faculty fellows, reassignment time recipients, or grant winners. Thus, any classes providing writing samples would change from semester to semester. Additionally, writing samples would be embedded in these courses, and therefore individualized, resisting comparisons between sections. As we learned last year, simply by comparing an English 1101 CLAQWA prompt to an English 1102 CLAQWA prompt, there are inherent difficulties with measuring writing progress between two courses – even if the two courses are closely linked.

If faculty beyond the QEP groups are to participate, then our assessment will need to "compensate" their efforts in terms of increased data about student learning in their courses.

3. The current plan is external to the course curriculum.

As long as the writing assessment remains external to the classroom, creating prompts for measurement will be an extra task for students, requiring extra compensation. Shifting to a course-embedded writing prompt provides motivation for the students in terms of the completing the class curriculum and enhancing learning there. However, this would create the additional burden of creating a writing prompt which makes sense

to all course content, and provides feedback to teachers such that participation in QEP writing assessment is attractive in terms of their teaching goals.

4. The experimental model, as conceived, is complicated by the lack of pure control groups.

A strict experimental model relies on control groups which have not participated in treatment to make judgments about value-added by the QEP. Since our goal is to affect as many students as possible, the idea that we will have pure control groups is fleeting at best.

5. The current portion of the CLAQWA rubric we now use is analytically weighted and difficult to administer.

Our first modification to the CLAQWA rubric was to ignore the cognitive portion, since it both proved overly laborious to administer, and our prompt had not specifically solicited the types of thinking the measured. This has left us measuring sixteen elements in each essay, primarily concerned with style. Additionally, since this rubric is an analytic rubric, it loses sight of the summative judgments associated with holistic rubrics.

Proposal of New Plan

We need an assessment plan which would measure the effectiveness of QEP programs across the institution, in multiple classes of multiple disciplines and levels, yet still offer the ability compare writing between those disparate classes. We need a plan which is course-embedded, so as to provide motivation for student participation – rewarding work through course grades and furthering course learning – and motivation for faculty participation – rewarding participation by providing data about student learning. We need a plan which measures QEP programs by measuring improvements in student writing within QEP-affected classes, and if comparisons to control groups prove problematic, makes comparisons which logically measure progress in writing improvement.

Thus heart of this plan is a common writing prompt, which could be embedded in any class across the curriculum. This "universal" writing prompt would ask students to write about the course outcomes, soliciting different levels of cognition from writers, and inviting students to define the outcomes, interpret the significance of outcomes, measure their success with the outcomes, provide evidence for claims of achievement with outcomes, narrate their story of

learning in the course, and apply the skills learned in that course to other environments.

Even though outcomes would vary from course to course, and increase in difficulty from freshman to senior-level courses (indeed, outcomes are always level appropriate), we would be able to make significant measurements of QEP program effectiveness by comparing writing in the same course, year over year. We would also be able to make some comparisons between different courses, as the fundamental rhetorical stance of the universal prompt would never vary: in every class, students would be asked to write about achieving outcomes, and support those claims with characterization of evidence from the course.

Since this universal prompt would focus on course outcomes, it would be course embedded, and provide real incentives for both faculty and student participation. Faculty would receive data about student writing and learning progress towards curricular outcomes, which could be used to improve teaching, course structure, and content – or both formative and summative assessment. In writing the outcomes essay, students would receive many of the same benefits traditionally associated with portfolio pedagogy: reflecting on learning accomplishments not only boosts student confidence, but also provides them with the meta-cognition to transfer learning from one class to another. And, of course, since the outcomes essay would be part of the course grade as an embedded assignment, student would also receive the traditional recognition of a course grade.

Benefits of New Plan

The new assessment plan would not only provide administrative benefits to the QEP by allowing it to make valid measurements of student progress in writing instruction, but it also provides benefits to students and faculty. Students would accelerate their "ownership" of knowledge sooner through reflection on course outcomes, enabling them to become more conscious, self-aware, and self-directed in their educational careers. Under this plan faculty would receive both formative and summative assessment to improve teaching.

This assessment program can also be shaped so that the prompt specifically solicits levels of cognition, representing a return to the original QEP assessment focus. As we know, once we began implementation of the CLAQWA tool, the cognitive measurements per Bloom's taxonomy were deleted due to time constraints. Under this plan, levels of thinking could be solicited through the prompt and measured in the rubric – both yet to be designed.

Potential Problems with New Plan

Does writing about outcomes reveal the particular effectiveness of individual faculty plans to improve writing?

Will student reflection about outcomes generate authentic writing?

Will the evidence to support student claims be too far removed from the writers to make use of in the essay?

How much will our measures tell us about students' proficiency with our writing prompt, as opposed to proficiency with writing?

List of Exhibits

Exhibit 1: Nursing Dept. Writing Rubric

Exhibit 2: Nursing Dept. Presentation

Exhibit 3: CLAQWA results, Spring 2007 and Spring 2008

Exhibit 4: *Impact* Article

Columbus State University

WRITTEN ASSIGNMENT GRADING RUBRIC

NURS 4177

Name of Topic: **NURS 4177**

Instructor Name: **Spring 2007**

Student Name:

(Overall Grade on 100 Poin

10	6	Below S
Exemplary	Competent	

I. PROFESSIONAL WRITING PARAMETERS

STRUCTURAL INTEGRITY

Meets all the following criteria:

- Introduction clearly communicates topic
- Ideas progress logically
- Closing supports main idea

Meets all the following criteria:

- Introduction communicates topic
- Ideas in sequence, but don't always progress
- Closing relates to main idea

Any of the following

- Introduction fails
- Ideas not in order
- Relationship betw
  idea
  unclear

REASONING & FOCUS CONSISTENCY

Meets all the following criteria:

- Maintains focus on topic throughout
- Develops appropriate, logical, and relevant supporting detail and/or evidence
- Explains how, why, and in what way evidence supports point/claim/thesis

Meets all the following criteria:

- Appropriate focus on topic, but some deviation
- Supporting detail and/or evidence is largely persuasive
- Relationship between evidence and point/claim/thesis is largely explained

Any of the following :

- Insufficient focus o
- Inappropriate, illo or missing, detail a
- Fails to connect evi point/claim/thesis

LANGUAGE & AUDIENCE APPROPRIATENESS

Meets all the following criteria:

- Demonstrates the voice of a professional nurse
- Presents awareness that audience will interpret ideas offered
- Employs word choice appropriate for professional nurse

Meets all the following criteria:

- Voice mostly reflects a professional nurse, but with some gaps
- Lacks appropriate awareness that audience will interpret ideas offered
- Word choice is largely appropriate for a professional nurse

Any of the following :

- Voice lacks profes or part
- Lacks awareness o and thinking audie
- Word choice inapp professional nurse

APA FORMAT

Meets all the following criteria:	Meets all the following criteria:	Any of the following:
•Correct APA document format (title page, running head, headings, etc.) •All APA In-text citations have correct author name(s) and source date •Paraphrasing and/or quotations accurate •List of references titled appropriately and references in correct format	•APA document format (title page, running head, headings, etc.) largely correct •Most APA In-text citations have correct author name(s) and source date •Paraphrasing and/or quotations have few errors •List of references formatted so that readers could find information cited therein	•APA document form running head, headir •Errors in APA in-te incorrect author nan date •Paraphrasing and/o errors •List of references fo prevent or delay rea information cited the

PRESENTATION

•Grammar and mechanics support clear understanding of writer's message, with few errors	•Grammar and mechanics rarely impede writer's message, with some errors present	•Grammar and mech message, with too ma

PROFESSIONAL WRITING PARAMETERS

II. ASSIGNMENT PARAMETERS: Evidence Based Practice (content requirements for this pa...

NURSING TOPIC OF THIS PAPER:

10	6	
Exemplary	Competent	Below S

Identifies a relevant change that needs to be made related to nursing care delivery AND explains the rationale behind the proposed change.	The change that is identified is not relevant OR is not related to nursing care OR the rationale is weak.	The change that is id AND is not related to delivery AND the rat or absent.
Discusses the DRIVING FORCES that are present that would motivate others to implement the change explaining WHY each is a DRIVING FORCE.	Discussion of DRIVING FORCES is incomplete (eg only lists them without explanation of why they are DRIVING FORCES).	Discussion of DRIVI included OR does no present that would m implement the chang
Discusses the RESTRAINING FORCES that are present that would tend to make others RESIST the change, explaining WHY each is a RESTRAINING force.	Discussion of RESTRAINING FORCES is incomplete (eg only lists them without explanation of why they are RESTRAINING FORCES).	Discussion of RESTF not included OR doe present that would te RESIST the change.
Discusses actions to take to change the status quo, minimize restraining forces, and make the change more likely to be accepted.	Discussion of actions to take to change the status quo, minimize restraining forces, and make the change more likely to be accepted is weak.	Discussion of actions status quo, minimize and make the change accepted is not inclu

ASSIGNMENT CONTENT PARAMETER

PROFESSIONAL WRITING PARAMETER

OVERALL GRADE (average of a

JG, LP/jg   Written Assignment Grading Rubric Template Oct 19 06; DRAFT revisions by Robert Cummings Sep 25 2007
NURS 4177 Leadership Change Paper 2/5/07

CSU Nursing
Strategic Planning Retreat
September 14, 2007

Is Our Writing Rubric Doing What We Want and Need?

Dr. Robert Cummings

QEP Program Specialist

What is Wrong with Student Writing?
(And Who is to Blame?)

- My students don't write or think clearly.
- They don't know how to use and document sources.
- They don't know how to read critically and analytically.
- They didn't follow the assignment.
- They don't revise and proofread their papers.
- They haven't learned the basics of grammar and composition.

When does a CSU Student Write?

Freshman Year: English 1101, 1102.

But not necessarily again until:
upper division major courses.

Who am I to Teach Writing?

"Real writing instruction has always occurred in other fields, contexts, and forms, in courses of all sizes and at all levels throughout the curriculum – wherever teachers take active measures to help their students write effectively. In this respect, writing instruction is just a kind of thoughtful attention to uses of language, in your course and field of study and in the kind of written work you assign."

Who am I to Teach Writing?

"Real writing instruction can and should be integral to your own goals for teaching and learning and should utilize your own expertise. [T]his instruction is often simply a matter of making your own knowledge and expectations explicit, in terms of the forms, functions, and methods of writing you assign."

--Gottschalk, Hjortshoj

Current Rubric

Current Rubric, grammar pt 2.

LANGUAGE & AUDIENCE APPROPRIATENESS					
Exhibits skillful use of vocabulary that is precise & purposeful.		Exhibits minimal use of precise & purposeful vocabulary.		Uses vocabulary that is vague and/or is not precise/purposeful.	
Demonstrates skillful sentence fluency (varies length, good flow, rhythm & varied structure).		Demonstrates lapses in sentence fluency.		Demonstrates minimal or lack of sentence fluency.	
Word choice is accurate & appropriate for the intended audience (RNs).		Word choice is sometimes inaccurate &/or inappropriate for intended audience (RNs).		Word choice is inaccurate &/or inappropriate for intended audience (RNs).	
All ideas are comprehensible.		Some ideas are incomprehensible.		Many ideas are incomprehensible.	
Sentence construction varies & is appropriate for assignment.		Sentence construction is sometimes inappropriate or does not vary.		Sentence construction is inappropriate &/or does not vary.	
Point of view is consistent (first, second, third person).		Point of view shifts occasionally (first, second & third person).		Point of view shifts often (first, second & third person).	
SUPPORTING INFORMATION					
Support information is related to & supportive of topic/subject.		Support information has major weaknesses in relatedness to &/or support of the topic.		Support information is lacking, unrelated to topic/subject, &/or does not support ideas/subject.	
GRAMMAR & MECHANICS					
Sentences are grammatically correct.		Many sentences are grammatically incorrect.		Almost all sentences are grammatically incorrect.	
Sentences are mechanically correct (punctuation, spelling, capitalization, etc).		Many sentences have mechanical errors.		Almost all sentences have mechanical errors.	
APA style is used consistently & correctly.		APA style is used with several minor errors &/or an occasional major error.		APA style is not used OR is used but with multiple, often major errors.	
References are current, appropriate & citations reflect APA style.		Some references are not current &/or are inappropriate &/or some citations do not reflect APA style.		Most references are not cited &/OR are inappropriate &/OR most citations do not reflect APA style.	

The Current "Grammar" Element Headings

- Structural Integrity

- Reasoning & Focus Consistency

- Language & Audience Appropriateness

- Supporting Information

- Grammar & Mechanics

The Current "Grammar" Elements

Structural Integrity

- Organization and logical progression of ideas
- Opening and its relationship to the main idea
- Transitions
- Paragraph unity
- Closing, and its relationship to main idea

The Current "Grammar" Elements

Reasoning & Focus Consistency

- Maintains focus on topic throughout
- Reasoning supports main idea
- Details are sufficient in quantity to develop main idea
- Details are sufficient in quality to develop main idea

The Current "Grammar" Elements

Language & Audience Appropriateness

- Purposeful vocabulary
- Sentence "fluency" (varies in length, good flow, rhythm, & varied structure)
- Word choice is accurate and appropriate for RN's
- All ideas are comprehensible
- Sentence construction varies and is appropriate for assignment
- Point of view is consistent (1st, 2nd, 3rd person)

The Current "Grammar" Elements

Supporting Information

- Support information is related to & supportive of topic/subject

The Current "Grammar" Elements

Grammar & Mechanics

- Sentences are grammatically correct
- Sentences are mechanically correct (punctuation, spelling, capitalization, etc.)
- APA style is used consistently & correctly
- References are current, appropriate, and reflect APA Style

The Current "Grammar" Elements

20

Connection between rubric and Assignment?

Nursing 4177: Change Paper Assignment

The Columbus State University Baccalaureate Nursing Program is interested in developing students' critical thinking skills. Think about prior clinical experiences. In a typed paper (no more than 6 pages including title and reference pages) identify a change you would like to make in nursing care delivery. Utilize Lewin's Change Theory to design a plan to implement the change. Be sure to describe restraining forces, driving forces, and how to change the status quo. Use APA format. Remember to give credit where it's due!! Lewin's Change Theory was not your creation; therefore every student should have at least one reference to this theory on a reference page. Submit paper as an **ATTACHMENT** by due date.

Why do I Want a Rubric Again?

- Rubrics should provide timely feedback
- Rubrics should prepare students to use detailed feedback
- Rubrics should encourage critical thinking
- Rubrics should facilitate communication with others
- Rubrics should help us define our teaching methods – give teacher and student greater confidence
- Rubrics should level the playing field

3 Types of Rubrics

- ## Analytic
  (kindergarten)

- ## Staged
  (UGA FYC)

- ## Holistic

The Categories of Rubrics

	Pros	Cons
Analytic	•Articulates exactly what you want to see in the writing •Allows students to understand those qualities, and their worth in the grade	•Loses sight of the overall effect of the paper •Allows "bean counting" and student "lawyering"
Staged	•Balances articulation of elements with vision of overall effect of paper	•Takes slightly longer than holistic •Forces priority on to elements
Holistic	•Very fast to administer •Keeps an emphasis on the overall effect of the writing on the audience	•Poor for feedback or model •Doesn't usually articulate elements well, so there is little to share with students