



2000 - 2006
Assessment of
Student Learning Outcomes

Undergraduate
Written Communication
Information Literacy and
Critical Thinking Skills

Prepared by the
Office of Assessment &
Educational Effectiveness

Halyna Kornuta, Ed.D., Director

With assistance and consultation from

Leanne Neilson, Psy.D., Associate Provost,
Graduate & Adult Programs and Accreditation

Joan Wines, Professor, English Department

Amanda McClendon, Administrative Assistant to the Associate Provost

Cathy Alexander, Institutional Research Officer

Members of the Assessment Committee

November 2006

Contents

Summary	4
Purpose.....	5
Definitions and Discussion of Terms.....	5
Methodology	6
Student Writing Samples.....	6
Scoring Rubrics.....	6
Scoring Sessions.....	6
<i>Spring 2001 – Spring 2003</i>	6
<i>Spring 2005</i>	7
<i>Spring 2006</i>	7
Data Analysis	9
<i>Spring 2001 – Spring 2003</i>	9
Table 1	10
Spring 2001 – 2003 Pilot Study Summary of Criteria and Mean Scores.....	10
<i>Spring 2005</i>	11
Table 2.....	11
Spring 2005 Summary of Criteria and Mean Scores.....	11
<i>Spring 2006</i>	12
Table 3.....	12
Spring 2006 Summary of Criteria and Mean Scores.....	12
Table 4.....	13
Comparison Mean Scores of Course Type by Year	13
Table 5.....	13
Comparison Mean Scores of Course Type by Year	13
Reflection and Goals.....	14
Appendix A: CLU Student Learning Outcomes, Definitions, and Alignment	16
Appendix B: Writing Assessment Rubric.....	17
Appendix C: Critical Thinking Rubric	18
Appendix D: Analytic Grading Rubric for Evaluating Written Compositions.....	19
Appendix E: 2006 Faculty Scoring Invitation	20
Appendix F: 4 th Annual Assessment Scoring Session Agenda.....	21
Appendix G: Project Summary over time.....	22

Summary

California Lutheran University faculty identified and began developing 14 Student Learning Outcomes in 2000. Collecting direct assessment data of student learning will provide evidence to determine if we are achieving our Student Learning Outcomes.

Data collection began via the gathering of undergraduate student writing samples in 2000. Student writing was scored determine levels of achievement attained in three of California Lutheran University's 14 Student Learning Outcomes (Appendix A): Written Communication, Information Literacy, and Critical Thinking skills.

The methodology and data collection have been reviewed yearly and changes are noted in the summary below:

	Spring 2001 – Spring 2003	Spring 2005	Spring 2006
Writing Sample Papers	Eng 111 Writing Intensive courses (sophomore and junior students) final student papers Capstone courses (senior students)		
Papers	Submitted on voluntary basis by instructors		
Student Learning Outcomes scored	Written Communication Critical Thinking		Written Communication Critical Thinking Information Literacy
Scoring Rubrics for assessing writing sample papers	Writing Assessment Rubric (Appendix B) Critical Thinking Rubric (Appendix C)		Analytic Grading Rubric for Evaluating Written Compositions (Appendix D)
Scoring Sessions	Instructors scored papers from own courses using scoring rubrics.	Workshop provided on scoring process. Each paper scored by two instructors using scoring rubrics until consistency of scores reached.	Workshop provided on scoring process. Volunteer instructors scored a sample paper together using the scoring rubric and EduCue to facilitate discussion, calibration, and consensus. Scores reviewed; some papers were second scored.

Note: No data were collected in Spring 2004

Purpose

The purpose of the study is to assess undergraduate student papers to determine the students' levels of achievement attained in three of California Lutheran University's 14 Student Learning Outcomes (Appendix A): Written Communication, Information Literacy, and Critical Thinking skills.

Definitions and Discussion of Terms

The following terms are defined to clarify their meaning and use in the study.

Instructor

The term Instructor in this study refers to all faculty including adjunct faculty at California Lutheran University.

Scoring Rubrics

A scoring rubric is an assessment tool with three dimensions:

1. The first dimension involves identifying a **rating scale** that describes levels of achievement. The rating scale may be numerical (using numbers to define a scale), qualitative (using words to describe levels), or both.
2. The second dimension lists **criteria** for the assignment to be scored.
3. The third dimension provides the **description** for each criteria and level within the rating scale. The criteria descriptions provide the standards defined for each performance level.

It is the combination of these dimensions that assists a scorer to define the level of a student's performance. Rubrics become meaningful when developed by instructors as they assist in clarifying the purpose of an assignment and the levels of expected outcomes. Value is added to the use of rubrics when they are shared with students as the assignment is given. Students then have the opportunity to review their own work in relation to expectations. Samples of student work that illustrate each level of the rating scale are helpful to the learning process.

Rubrics provide the three dimensions in two formats. The Analytic Rubric (Appendix D) displays the description for each criteria and rating scale in matrix format. The Holistic Rubric (Appendix C) combines criteria by each rating scale.

Student Papers

Student papers were submitted by faculty teaching in English 111, Writing Intensive, or Capstone courses. English 111 first and last papers assigned were submitted.

Methodology

The methodology for this study is presented through details in the following three sections: Student Writing Samples, Scoring Rubrics, and Scoring Sessions.

Student Writing Samples

Student writing samples were collected from Fall 2000 through Spring 2003 and from Fall 2004 through Spring 2006 from three types of undergraduate courses:

1. Eng 111
2. Writing Intensive courses (sophomore and junior students) final student papers
3. Capstone courses (senior students)

The writing samples were submitted on a voluntary basis by instructors. The intent of scoring papers from three types of courses was to begin to build a reliable data baseline for evaluating progress in two Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs): Written Communication and Critical Thinking. The scoring session in Spring 2006 expanded to include the Information Literacy Student Learning Outcome.

Scoring Rubrics

Each writing sample was scored by instructors who used both the Writing Assessment Rubric (Appendix B) and the Critical Thinking Rubric (Appendix C) for all scoring occurring from Spring 2000 – Spring 2005. These rubrics were developed by the General Education Subcommittee of the Educational Policies and Planning Committee and adopted as a non-discipline specific scoring rubric for assessing student writing samples. The Writing Assessment Rubric is an analytic scoring rubric where the instructor determines writing proficiency as defined by seven separate criteria using a five point scale and reported the eighth criteria as an overall score. The Critical Thinking Rubric is a holistic rubric where the instructor makes a scoring judgment based on criteria defined at four levels.

The Spring 2006 scoring session began with a review of the rubrics for content and possible combination onto one page. An idea for expansion was also incorporated, as a review of the Student Learning Outcomes resulted in the recognition that the learning outcomes for Information Literacy were very much a part of the Written Communication process. Therefore, the Analytic Grading Rubric for Evaluating Written Compositions (Appendix D) combined the elements of the previous two rubrics, and aligned criteria with Written Communication, Critical Thinking, and Information Literacy Student Learning Outcomes into the scoring criteria.

Scoring Sessions

Spring 2001 – Spring 2003

The Writing Assessment and Critical Thinking Rubrics were distributed to instructors who taught and collected their own student writing samples. Instructors scored papers from their own courses and submitted scores to the Director of Assessment, Julie Kuehnel.

Instructors used the rubrics to score 704 of their own student papers. There were 382 papers scored from English 111, 138 papers from Writing Intensive courses, and 184 papers from Capstone courses.

The process and data collected from Spring 2001 – Spring 2003 contributed to a Pilot Study. During this time, data were collected to begin developing a baseline for evaluating progress in written communication and critical thinking skills of students progressing from English 111 through to a capstone course. No data were collected in the Spring of 2004.

Spring 2005

A revision to the scoring format occurred in Spring 2005. A group of 17 volunteer instructors met in May 2005 to score writing sample papers collected from courses offered in the Fall 2004 and Spring 2005 semesters. Instructors were paid a stipend for the day of scoring.

The scoring session, conducted by Dr. Joan Wines, began with an introduction to issues in scoring writing and an introduction to the rubric. The group then scored two sample capstone course papers predetermined to demonstrate strong and weak writing skills. Dr. Wines also led the group in a discussion of the criteria and scoring consistency. Dr. Jim Bond presented the scoring process to the group. The group then began scoring papers.

Each paper was initially scored by two people. This process contributed to the verification that scores had an inter rater reliability. After consistency of the scores was observed by the Assistant Provost for Assessment and the Institutional Research Officer, papers were only intermittently scored by two scorers. The scoring process differed from past assessments in which instructors scored papers from their own courses.

The instructors scored a total of 339 student papers. There were 88 papers collected from 6 English 111 courses, 152 papers from 12 writing intensive courses, and 99 papers from 10 capstone courses.

Spring 2006

A similar scoring format to the Spring 2005 session was used the following year. At two faculty meetings, faculty were invited to attend the May 22, 2006 scoring session (Appendix E) and adjunct faculty were sent email invitations to participate as scorers. Scorers were paid a stipend for the afternoon of scoring student papers.

A major revision occurred to the previously used two rubrics. Collaboration between Henri Mondschein, Joan Wines, Leanne Neilson, and Halyna Kornuta resulted in the Analytic Grading Rubric (Appendix D). A review of the definitions of the Student Learning Outcomes suggested that the addition of Information Literacy would provide valuable additional data, as Information Literacy is a component of Written

Communication. The Analytic Grading Rubric combined the items of three SLOs into one rubric.

Instructors were provided with a resource package which included the CLU 14 Student Learning Outcomes and the alignment of the three Student Learning Outcomes to be scored (Appendix A), the Analytic Grading Rubric (Appendix D), Grading Template for draft revision with sample revisions, APA, Chicago, and MLA Style Reference Guides.

The agenda for the scoring session (Appendix F) included a welcome and introduction to the scoring session by Dr. Halyna Kornuta, followed by Dr. Wines who presented “Approaches to Writing” and by Dr. Jim Bond who provided instructors with a Calibration of Scoring Exercise. During the exercise, instructors used the analytic Grading Rubric to score the same, pre-selected student paper.

An important component of the scoring process was to provide instructors with the opportunity to practice the application of the rubric. This practice session contributed to inter rater agreement. Dr. Leanne Neilson facilitated this practice session which involved a calibration process and was assisted by the personal response system, EduCue. EduCue facilitates the collection of scores that instructors enter by using a remotely controlled responder. Faculty respond anonymously to items as each score is reported by responder and not identified by faculty name.

EduCue was programmed to receive scores item by item. The results were displayed graphically on a screen for all to see. Once instructors used their own responder to enter their score, a tabulation of all scores by item was projected in graph format. Dr. Neilson reviewed each item with instructors for consistency in scoring and she encouraged discussion. During this calibration process, discussions assisted in clarifying the interpretation of criteria and scoring levels resulting in a greater consistency of scoring. Once consensus on a score was reached, the next item was reviewed. As discussions led to clarifying item descriptions, changes were then made to the Analytic Grading Rubric.

Twelve instructors who attended were asked to self-select one of three groups of papers to score and began scoring papers. A total of 369 papers were submitted; 132 papers from 4 English 111 courses, 171 papers from 10 writing intensive courses, and 66 papers from 6 capstone courses. Of the 369 papers submitted, 180 student papers were scored at the Scoring Session. Of these 180 papers, there were 56 English 111, 37 Capstone papers, and 88 Writing Intensive papers.

A review of scores indicated that even with the calibration process, it was evident that there was variation and inconsistency within course types. As a result, two instructors were invited to provide a second scoring for some of the initially scored papers so that rater agreement might occur. Results are reported in the Data Analysis Section.

In summary, the methodology and data collections have developed over time:

	Spring 2001 – Spring 2003	Spring 2005	Spring 2006
Writing Sample Papers	English 111 Writing Intensive courses (sophomore and junior students) final student papers Capstone courses (senior students)		
Papers	Submitted on voluntary basis by instructors		
Student Learning Outcomes scored	Written Communication Critical Thinking		Written Communication Critical Thinking Information Literacy
Scoring Rubrics for assessing writing sample papers	Writing Assessment Rubric (Appendix B) Critical Thinking Rubric (Appendix C)		Analytic Grading Rubric for Evaluating Written Compositions (Appendix D)
Scoring Sessions	Instructors scored papers from own courses using scoring rubrics.	Workshop provided on scoring process. Each paper scored by two instructors using scoring rubrics until consistency of scores reached.	Workshop provided on scoring process. Volunteer instructors scored a sample paper together using the scoring rubric and EduCue to facilitate discussion, calibration, and consensus. Scores reviewed; some papers were second scored.
Note: No data were collected in Spring 2004			

Data Analysis

Data reported were gathered beginning the 2000 academic year until Spring 2006. This section presents the Data Analysis for three scoring sessions: Spring 2001 – Spring 2003; Spring 2005; Spring 2006. Note that data for Spring 2004 was not collected.

Spring 2001 – Spring 2003

Results for Spring 2000 – Spring 2003 include the analysis of papers scored from the 2000-01, 2002-02, and 2002-03 academic years. The data are combined into one data set which includes three years of English 111 student papers, two years (2000-2001 and 2002-2003) of Writing Intensive student papers, and two years (2000-2001 and 2002-2003) of Capstone student papers.

Table 1
Spring 2001 – 2003 Pilot Study Summary of Criteria and Mean Scores

Criteria	Course Type Mean Scores			Overall Mean Score N=704
	English 111 N = 382	Writing Intensive N = 138	Capstone N = 184	
Written Communication Score (5 point analytic rubric)				
1. Clear thesis/purpose/topic	3.3	3.9	4.2	3.7
2. Paper organized/unified	3.2	3.7	4.1	3.5
3. Free of errors—grammar, punctuation, spelling	3.1	3.4	3.9	3.3
4. Purpose/thesis addressed throughout	3.2	3.7	4.0	3.5
5. Supporting argument, evidence, examples	3.0	3.4	3.7	3.3
6. Language and Vocabulary	3.3	3.6	4.2	3.6
7. Conclusion (synthesis & addresses thesis/purpose)	3.0	3.3	3.7	3.2
8. Maintains level of excellence throughout	3.2	3.6	4.0	3.5
Critical Thinking Score and Mean (4 point holistic rubric)	3.0	3.5	4.0	3.4

The data for Table 1 were collected from instructors who scored their own student papers using the rubrics found in Appendix B and C. The “Summary Score” was calculated by using the raw scores from each of the three course types.

The data illustrate:

- Consistent increases. Course Type Mean Scores increased from English 111, through Writing Intensive and finally Capstone Courses for both Written Communication and Critical Thinking Mean Scores.
- A congruence of scoring. A summative score for Written Communication provided in Criterion 8: *Maintains level of excellence throughout*. The calculation of the Written Communication Mean Score also provides a summative score that is congruent to the scores in Criterion 8.

Changes were made for the Spring 2005 scoring session as a result of lessons learned from this pilot. Most notably, student papers were coded to remove their identity and the papers were scored by a team of instructors.

Spring 2005

The data in Table 2 were collected from the 2004-05 academic year and include student papers from English 111, Writing Intensive, and Capstone courses. The format for scoring changed from the Spring 2004 scoring when instructors scored their own student papers. In the Spring 2005 scoring session, papers were coded by number and instructors did not have knowledge of the identity of the student or the course.

Papers were scored using rubrics found in Appendix B and C. The “Summary Score” and the “Written Communication Mean” in Table 2 were calculated by using the raw scores from each of the three course types.

Table 2
Spring 2005 Summary of Criteria and Mean Scores

Criteria	Course Type Mean Scores			Overall Mean Score N = 339
	English 111 N = 88	Writing Intensive N = 152	Capstone N = 99	
Written Communication Score (5 point analytic rubric)				
1. Clear thesis/purpose/topic	3.0	3.2	3.3	3.2
2. Paper organized/unified	2.9	3.3	3.2	3.1
3. Free of errors—grammar, punctuation, spelling	3.3	3.3	2.9	3.2
4. Purpose/thesis addressed throughout	3.0	3.4	3.4	3.3
5. Supporting argument, evidence, examples	2.9	3.4	3.3	3.2
6. Language and Vocabulary	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.5
7. Conclusion (synthesis & addresses thesis/purpose)	2.7	2.9	3.1	2.9
8. Maintains level of excellence throughout	2.9	3.2	3.1	3.1
Written Communication Mean (Items 1-7)	3.0	3.3	3.3	3.2
Critical Thinking Score and Mean (4 point holistic rubric)	2.5	2.8	2.7	2.7

The data illustrate:

- Improvement from the English 111 courses to the Writing Intensive Courses. In some instances, the scores improved from Writing Intensive to Capstone courses, but there were a larger number of decreases in the scores of the Capstone papers. The largest decrease, 0.4, occurred in item 3 regarding errors of grammar, punctuation, spelling.
- A consistent increase of scores when compared with data from Table 1 between the English 111 courses to the Writing Intensive Courses. The overall change from English 111 to Capstone in 2000-2003 is an average of 0.8. This average includes all nine items in the scoring criteria.

Spring 2006

The data in Table 3 were collected from the 2005-06 academic year and include student papers from English 111, Writing Intensive, and Capstone courses. In the scoring session, papers were coded by number and instructors did not have knowledge of the identity of the student or the course. Papers were scored using rubric found in Appendix D. The Summary Score and the Written Communication Mean in Table 3 were calculated by using the raw scores from each of the three course types.

Table 3
Spring 2006 Summary of Criteria and Mean Scores

Criteria	Course Type Mean Scores			Overall Mean Score N = 181
	English 111 N = 56	Writing Intensive N = 88	Capstone N = 37	
Written Communication, Critical Thinking, and Information Literacy (4 point analytic rubric)				
1. Articulates focus	3.1	2.8	3.6	3.0
2. Finds sources	2.1	2.9	3.2	2.7
3. Analyzes and evaluates sources	2.7	2.7	3.3	2.8
4. Synthesizes information to support arguments	2.7	2.6	3.1	2.7
5. Presents arguments	2.6	2.5	3.2	2.7
6. Uses conventions of standard U.S. English	3.0	3.1	2.9	3.0
7. Creates conclusion	2.6	2.5	3.4	2.7
<i>Written Communication, Critical Thinking, and Information Literacy Mean</i>	2.7	2.7	3.3	2.8

The data illustrate:

- Freshmen English courses to Writing Intensive scores showed improvement in two criteria, declined in four and stayed the same in one
- Improvement from the Writing Intensive Courses to Capstone courses except for a slight decline in Criteria 6: Uses conventions of standard U.S. English.
- The highest summary scores occur Capstone Criteria 1: Articulates focus.
- The course type mean scores are identical in English 111 and Writing Intensive and show an increase in the Capstone courses.

Table 4 provides an overall summary comparison of the mean scores for the Spring 2000 – 2003 pilot study, Spring 2005 and Spring 2006 scoring sessions.

Table 4
Comparison Mean Scores of Course Type by Year

Criteria	Spring 2000-2003 (Pilot Study)			Spring 2005			Spring 2006 (4 pt rubric)		
	Freshman English	Writing Intensive	Capstone	Freshman English	Writing Intensive	Capstone	Freshman English	Writing Intensive	Capstone
N	382	138	184	88	152	99	56	88	37
* Written Communication Summary Mean (5 point rubric)	3.1	3.5	3.9	3.0	3.3	3.3	2.7	2.7	3.3
Critical Thinking Summary Mean (4 point rubric)	3.0	3.5	4.0	2.5	2.8	2.7			

The data illustrate:

- A variation in scores between the pilot study and Spring 2005. A difference in scoring methods where instructors participated in a scoring calibration exercise and also scored blind papers may have contributed to the change in results.
- A score for three learning outcomes in Spring 2006 as one 4-point rubric was used for scoring. Instructors also participated in a scoring calibration exercise and also scored blind papers.
- A reporting of scores

Table 5
Comparison Mean Scores of Course Type by Year

Criteria	Spring 2000-2003 (Pilot Study)			Spring 2005			Spring 2006 (4 pt rubric)		
	Freshman English	Writing Intensive	Capstone	Freshman English	Writing Intensive	Capstone	Freshman English	Writing Intensive	Capstone
N	382	138	184	88	152	99	56	88	37
* Written Communication Summary Mean (collapsed 4 point rubric)	3.1	3.5	3.9	2.1	2.3	2.3	2.7	2.7	3.3
Critical Thinking Summary Mean (4 point rubric)	3.0	3.5	4.0	2.5	2.8	2.7			

Table 5 provides an overall summary comparison of the mean scores for the Spring 2000 – 2003 pilot study, Spring 2005 and Spring 2006 scoring sessions using a collapsed 4 point rubric for Written Communication.

An analysis of the Spring 2005 results for each criterion by each 5 point level is available in Appendix G. The analysis revealed that the lowest percentage was awarded to Level 1 in all but seven of the eight criteria. This analysis was completed for the purposes of providing a comparison between scored papers in Spring 2005 and Spring 2006 for the Written Communication and Critical Thinking items only, as the Information Literacy items were not scored in Spring 2005.

Reflection and Goals

This section of the report summarizes discussions of members of the Assessment Committee. The most significant data from the 2004-05 scores is the information from Table 6 regarding critical thinking and Table 7 regarding mechanics. There is almost no change (0.1) from English 111 to Capstone in the area of mechanics. The scores start low and stay low. This information reveals that students may need more instruction in the area of grammar. This data provide an opportunity for faculty discussion about ways in which CLU students develop skills to write using proper mechanics.

Steps also need to be taken to improve critical thinking skills by CLU students. Scores from the 2004-05 data show that an increase of 0.2 was achieved from English 111 to Capstone courses, as opposed to an increase of 0.9 in the 2000-03 data.

As was noted above Table 2, the scoring method was different in 2004-05. A group of 17 instructors randomly graded papers from all areas in 2004-05 as compared to faculty members scoring their own students' papers in 2000-03. This change in the scoring method is part of what may have caused the scores from the previous assessment to the current assessment to show very little change. It can also be noted that the number of papers that are included in each group differ drastically because the papers from the first three years of the rubrics use versus just one year of use in the 2004-05 administration.

In general, the scores in all of the data collected from 2001 to 2006 showed an increase each year from English 111, through Writing Intensive, and finally Capstone Courses. Also consistent throughout all of the data is that the score related to writing a conclusion is lowest each year, and with only one exception, it received the lowest score in every category (English 111, Writing Intensive, Capstone). The two highest areas generally found each year, and in each category, are: "Language and Vocabulary" and "Clear Thesis" (or "Articulates Focus"). These results were shared at the 2006 faculty retreat as part of a session entitled "Educational Effectiveness."

This study indicates that students at CLU are improving in Written Communication, Information Literacy, and Critical Thinking from their English 111 course to their Senior Capstone course. The study also indicates a need for faculty to work with students to develop better writing skills specifically related to synthesizing their information into a conclusion.

While positive changes in students' writing and critical thinking skills were achieved, greater improvement would be desirable over the course of students' four years at CLU. Two changes might contribute to greater improvement. First, faculty need to reach a consensus about the purpose and goals for English 111. Currently there are diverse opinions as to the degree of emphasis that should be given to writing mechanics (grammar, spelling, sentence construction) and critical thinking (evidence, synthesis, organization around a thesis) vs. the expression of ideas and fluency. Second, the assumption of many faculty is that they should not have to "teach writing" in non-writing intensive courses. Faculty who assign writing (i.e., papers, essays) in non writing related courses may need to provide more feedback and grading on writing elements rather than only on content. Further, students need to be disabused of the idea that their essays etc. in non writing intensive courses should only be graded on the accuracy of the content. Encouraging faculty to use the WAR as part of grading writing assignments across all types of courses would provide consistent feedback to students and set consistent expectations for student writing across the curriculum

The means on the WAR items for assessing the elements of writing and critical thinking were reasonably consistent for the two years. Combined, the two years represent the assessment of 168 papers in 8 sections of English 111. The WAR will be used again in Fall 02 and Spring 03 to complete a baseline for making comparisons with evaluations of students' final papers in their second writing intensive courses and Capstone Courses.

Suggestions to improve this process are noted below:

- Calibration process: lengthen time and provide two opportunities
- Rubric:
 - Review rubric with faculty (English, Information Literacy, Critical Thinking) for additional clarification and to ensure alignment with SLO
 - Request that faculty share the rubric with students as part of the assignment
- Study results: Share with faculty
- Process: Review the process of collecting papers. Is the sample size enough?
- Invite report response from Joan Wines and Jim Bond for the writing data, Doug Thiel for critical thinking, and Henri Mondschein for Information Literacy.

Appendix A: CLU Student Learning Outcomes, Definitions, and Alignment

Professional Preparation	Liberal Learning	Character & Leadership Development
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Field-specific knowledge and experience Ethical & professional judgment Interpersonal & teamwork skills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Critical thinking</i> <i>Information literacy</i> <i>Written communication</i> Oral communication Ability to comprehend issues from disciplinary and interdisciplinary perspectives Understanding of cultural and global diversity Integration of knowledge with ethical reflection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Growth in identity & values Appreciation of diversity Service to the community Principled leadership

Definitions:

Written Communication Skills (WCS)

Students will:

1. Articulate an explicit focus
2. Find, analyze, and evaluate sources
3. Synthesize information to support their arguments
4. Present arguments in an engaging and coherent style, appropriate to the conventions of standard US English and of the discipline, and to the nature of the work

Critical Thinking (CT)

Students will:

1. Generate relevant and probing questions
2. Identify, interpret, assess and evaluate relevant information
3. Recognize premises, assumptions, and point(s) of view underlying an argument, theory, or selection of information
4. Reach fair-minded conclusions that are well-reasoned or well-supported
5. Apply those conclusions to new issues and problems

Information Literacy (IL)

Students will:

1. Determine the extent of the information needed
2. Access the needed information effectively and efficiently
3. Evaluate sources and information critically
4. Use information to accomplish a specific purpose
5. Understand economic, legal, and social issues surrounding the use of information in order to use information ethically and legally

Aligning Written Communication Skills with Critical Thinking and Information Literacy

Written Communication Skills (WCS)

Students will:

1. Articulate an explicit focus
2. Find, analyze, and evaluate sources
3. Synthesize information to support their arguments
4. Present arguments in an engaging and coherent style, appropriate to the conventions of standard US English and of the discipline, and to the nature of the work

Critical Thinking (CT)

Students will:

1. Generate relevant and probing questions
2. Identify, interpret, assess and evaluate relevant information
3. Recognize premises, assumptions, and point(s) of view underlying an argument, theory, or selection of information
4. Reach fair-minded conclusions that are well-reasoned or well-supported
5. Apply those conclusions to new issues and problems

Information Literacy (IL)

Students will:

1. Determine the extent of the information needed
2. Access the needed information effectively and efficiently
3. Evaluate sources and information critically
4. Use information to accomplish a specific purpose
5. Understand economic, legal, and social issues surrounding the use of information in order to use information ethically and legally

Appendix B: Writing Assessment Rubric

Student Name _____

Circle type of course:
Capstone, Writing Intensive,
English 111, English 101

Course _____

California Lutheran University

Outcome Assessment: Writing Evaluation Grid

	<u>Poor</u> 1	2	<u>Average</u> 3	4	<u>Excellent</u> 5
1. The thesis/topic/purpose is clearly expressed.					
2. The paper is well organized and unified.					
3. The paper is free of errors in grammar, punctuation, word choice, and spelling.					
4. The paper has a perspective/thesis that is consistently addressed.					
5. The paper provides adequate supporting arguments, evidence, examples, details and/or evaluation.					
6. The writer uses language and vocabulary that is appropriately formal.					
7. The conclusion synthesizes the arguments and evidence and addresses the thesis/purpose/topic.					
8. The paper maintains a level of excellence throughout.					

Holistic Critical Thinking SCORE (see attached) 1 2 3 4

Evaluator _____

Outcomes Assess. in Writing/#46

Appendix C: Critical Thinking Rubric

Teaching for Thinking Evaluation Forms Holistic Critical Thinking Scoring Rubric

Facione and Facione

- 4** Consistently does all or almost all of the following:
- Accurately interprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc.
 - Identifies the salient arguments (reasons and claims) pro and con.
 - Thoughtfully analyzes and evaluates major alternative points of view.
 - Draws warranted, judicious, non-fallacious conclusions.
 - Justifies key results and procedures, explains assumptions and reasons.
 - Fair-mindedly follows where evidence and reasons lead.
- 3** Does most or many of the following:
- Accurately interprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc.
 - Identifies relevant arguments (reasons and claims) pro and con.
 - Offers analyses and evaluations of obvious alternative points of view.
 - Draws warranted, non-fallacious conclusions.
 - Justifies some results or procedures, explains reasons.
 - Fair-mindedly follows where evidence and reasons lead.
- 2** Does most or many of the following:
- Misinterprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc.
 - Fails to identify strong, relevant counter-arguments.
 - Ignores or superficially evaluates obvious alternative points of view.
 - Draws unwarranted or fallacious conclusions.
 - Justifies few results or procedures, seldom explains reasons.
 - Regardless of the evidence or reasons, maintains or defends views based on self-interest or preconceptions.
- 1** Consistently does all or almost all of the following:
- Offers biased interpretations of evidence, statements, graphics, questions, information, or the points of view of others.
 - Fails to identify or hastily dismisses strong, relevant counter-arguments.
 - Ignores or superficially evaluates obvious alternative points of view.
 - Argues using fallacious or irrelevant reasons, and unwarranted claims.
 - Does not justify results or procedures, nor explain reasons.
 - Regardless of the evidence or reasons, maintains or defends views based on self-interest or preconceptions.
 - Exhibits close-mindedness or hostility to reason.

Appendix D: Analytic Grading Rubric for Evaluating Written Compositions

Scorer's Name _____ ANALYTIC GRADING RUBRIC FOR EVALUATING WRITTEN COMPOSITIONS Paper # _____ For Critical Thinking, Information Literacy, and Writing Development				
Level of Achievement Category	Weak 1	Developing 2	Proficient 3	Excellent 4
Articulates Focus (Thesis statement)	<i>Focus</i> for writing is not stated.	<i>Focus</i> for writing is stated yet is imprecise and unclear.	<i>Focus</i> for writing is stated, but lacks some precision.	Explicit <i>focus</i> for writing is articulated clearly and precisely.
Finds Sources	Few or no <i>sources</i> are accurately cited in body and reference section using current APA/MLA/Chicago style.	Some <i>sources</i> are accurately cited in body and reference section using current APA/MLA/Chicago style.	Most <i>sources</i> are accurately cited, in the body and reference section using current APA/MLA/Chicago style.	All <i>sources</i> are accurately cited in the body and reference section using current APA/MLA/Chicago style.
Analyzes and Evaluates Sources	Seldom or fails to <i>identify, analyze, and evaluate</i> or hastily dismisses strong, relevant counter-arguments.	Sometimes <i>identifies</i> relevant arguments, <i>analysis</i> , and <i>evaluates</i> obvious points of view.	Frequently <i>identifies, analyzes, and evaluates</i> obvious points of view.	Consistently <i>identifies, analyzes, and evaluates</i> major points of view.
Synthesizes Information to Support Arguments	Little information or no <i>arguments</i> are <i>synthesized</i> , critiqued, combined, or supported.	Some information and <i>arguments</i> are <i>synthesized</i> , critiqued, and combined with supporting evidence, examples, details, and/or evaluation.	Most information and <i>arguments</i> are <i>synthesized</i> , critiqued, and combined with supporting evidence, examples, details, and/or evaluation.	All information and <i>arguments</i> are <i>synthesized</i> , critiqued, and combined with supporting evidence, examples, details, and/or evaluation.
Presents Arguments (Organization)	Fails to develop <i>supporting arguments</i> clearly, coherently, or in an engaging style; offers biased interpretation; fails to justify results. Major problems in sentence and/or paragraph construction.	Sometimes <i>arguments</i> are developed clearly, coherently, or in an engaging style; sometimes justifies results, seldom explains reasons. Occasional sentence and/or paragraph structure is awkward.	Frequently develops <i>arguments</i> clearly, coherently, and in an engaging style; justifies results, explains reasons. Minor problems in sentence and/or paragraph construction.	Presents <i>arguments</i> clearly, coherently, and in an engaging style. Justifies results, explains assumptions and reasons. Sentences and paragraphs are well crafted and contribute to a smooth flow of thought.
Uses Conventions of Standard U.S. English (Spelling and Grammar)	<i>Frequent errors: Spelling and grammar</i> ; incorrect <i>word usage</i> ; awkward syntax; expression of thought is obscured by mechanics.	Errors are sometimes distracting: <i>Spelling and grammar</i> ; occasional incorrect <i>word usage</i> ; expression of thought is sometimes obscured by mechanics.	Minor errors in <i>spelling and grammar</i> . Expression of thought is rarely obscured by mechanics. Minor problems in choice of precise <i>word usage</i> .	<i>Spelling and grammar</i> are exemplary. Expression of thought is not obscured by mechanics. <i>Word usage</i> gives consistently clear and precise meaning.
Creates Conclusion	<i>Conclusion</i> is missing. Argues using fallacious or irrelevant reasons and unwarranted claims, or fails to argue. Topic is not addressed.	<i>Conclusion</i> lacks synthesis of arguments and evidence. Sometimes draws unwarranted or fallacious conclusions. Topic is somewhat addressed.	<i>Conclusion</i> synthesizes arguments and/or evidence. Conclusion is frequently warranted, judicious, non-fallacious. Topic is addressed.	<i>Conclusion</i> clearly synthesizes arguments and evidence. Topic is addressed. Conclusion is warranted, judicious, non-fallacious.

Appendix E: 2006 Faculty Scoring Invitation

You are Invited!

What: The 4th Annual Assessment Scoring Session of student papers

When: Monday, May 22 beginning at 12:00 noon until 5:00pm.
Lunch is included.

Where: Nelson Room

Who: Any / all faculty members at CLU

Why: To collect data about student competency in three Learning Outcomes: Written communication, Critical Thinking, and Information Literacy.

We have collected papers from English 111, Writing Intensive Courses, and Capstone Courses that need to be scored. We will be using an assessment rubric to score these papers. We will begin by scoring a paper together with the rubric and then will score the remainder of the student papers.

Bonus: There is a \$150 stipend for participating in this session.

Please print your name below if you would like to participate.

Appendix F: 4th Annual Assessment Scoring Session Agenda



CALIFORNIA LUTHERAN UNIVERSITY

4TH ANNUAL ASSESSMENT SCORING SESSION – MAY 22, 2006

AGENDA

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| Noon – 1:00 p.m. | Lunch at the Pavilion |
| 1:00 p.m. | Welcome
Purpose of Scoring Session
→ To collect data about student competency in Learning Outcomes: Writing, Critical Thinking, and Information Literacy. <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Data Source: Writing papers from English 111, Writing Intensive, and Capstone courses○ Scoring Rubric: 7 Categories, 4 Level of Achievement → To grow professionally
→ To contribute to “How do we know?” |
| 1:15 – 2:00 p.m. | Approaches to Writing: Joan Wines
Calibration of Scoring Exercise: Jim Bond |
| 2:00 –4:45 p.m. | Scoring of Papers: Procedures and Strategies |
| 4:45 p.m. | In Review
→ Complete “Learning Together” |

Appendix G: Project Summary over time

Continuum of Development

Demonstrating competency in Written Communication, Information Literacy, Critical Thinking (WIC)

	2001 - 2003	2005	2006	2007
Learning Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Written Communication Critical Thinking 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Written Communication Critical Thinking 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Written Communication Critical Thinking Information Literacy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Written Communication Critical Thinking Information Literacy
Scoring Instrument(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Written Communication Rubric (4 point scale) Critical Thinking Rubric (5 point scale) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Written Communication Rubric (4 point scale) Critical Thinking Rubric (5 point scale) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Written Communication, Information Literacy, and Critical Thinking and Rubric (4 point scale) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Written Communication, Information Literacy, and Critical Thinking and Rubric (4 point scale)
Scorers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty self-scored 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty scorers calibrated Scored papers “blind” (w/o names) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty scorers calibrated Scored papers “blind” (w/o names) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty scorers calibrated Scored papers “blind” (w/o names and courses)
Student Writing Samples Scored	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> English 111 (382) Writing Intensive (138) Capstone courses (184) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> English 111 (88) Writing Intensive (152) Capstone courses (99) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> English 111 (56) Writing Intensive (88) Capstone courses (37) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Graduate courses
Results				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Available for Program Reviews Summary report in Data Warehouse

2006 / 2007 WIC Development Plan

Fall 2006	Spring 2007
<p>Rubric Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open to all faculty Scoring completed using papers with WC, IF, and CT SLO embedded in the assignment Students receive rubric prior to assignment Rubric used by faculty to score papers Rubric summary of scores profile prepared Rubric summary to Cathy Alexander by mid-November Rubric reviewed and revised by participating faculty and Assessment Committee 	<p>Assessment Scoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open to all faculty (continued emphasis on English 111, Writing Intensive, Capstone, and Graduate courses) Scoring completed using papers with WC, IF, and CT SLO embedded in the assignment Students receive revised rubric prior to assignment Revised rubric used to score first and last papers Papers (copies) submitted with rubric summary by mid-May 5th Annual assessment Scoring Session mid-May <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty scorers are calibrated Submitted papers are scored “blind” using revised rubric Results compared