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Staff

- 65% (70% in 2005-2006) teaching traditional, Honors, Enhanced and PACE were full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty with terminal degrees.
- 22% (22% in 2005-2006) were contractual faculty without terminal degrees.
- 14% (8% in 2005-2006) were part-time faculty without terminal degrees.
- Total faculty teaching in the program 2006-2007 decreased by 2-3 faculty per semester, due to lower enrollment and a full-time faculty sabbatical in Spring 2007.
- Our dedication to full-time faculty teaching is outstanding.
Types and Numbers of Courses Taught

- From 2006-2007 CWRR faculty taught 58 sections of Critical Writing, Reading and Research I & II
  - 29 sections of CWRR I
  - 29 sections of CWRR II.
- The number of courses offered dropped from 62 total in 2005-2006 to 58 total, dropping 1 section of Honors per semester, 1-4 sections of Traditional, and 1-2 sections of PACE offerings.
Syllabi Review

• In Fall 2006, 90% (up 10% from 2005-2006) of IN150 & IN151 faculty syllabi reflected our learning outcome goals.

• In Spring 2007, 93% (up 13% from 2005-2006) of IN150 & IN151 faculty syllabi reflected our learning outcome goals.
CWRR Program Review

**Class Size**

- The average class size for any one section during the 2006-2007 academic year was 18.6, compared to 19.51 in 2005-2006.
- The average class size for the Enhanced sections of CWRR I for 2006-2007 was 15.5 students (compared to 16 students in 2005-2006).
CWRR Program Review

Class Size

Average Number of CWRRI & CWRR II Students Per Section Per Semester Compared to Recommendations set forth by ADE and MLA

Number of Students

Semester

FA '02  SP '03  FA '03  SP '04  FA '04  SP '05  FA '05  SP '06  FA '06  SP '07

Average Per Semester  ADE & MLA Recommendations
 Facilities

• 60% of CWRR courses were offered in a learning space equipped with technology
• 7% were offered in electronic lab classrooms, with computers for every student.
• 22% were offered in a traditional/lab split configuration
• 31% were offered in a room with an instructor station
• There was a significant increase in the number of sections taught using technology in the classroom, with a trend toward the use of computer labs for holding class at least part of the semester
Assessment Data and Analysis

- Library Entrance and Exit Surveys
- Student Survey administered through Millikin Office of Institutional Research
- Student Artifacts
  - Reading Response
  - Research Paper
  - Reflection Piece
Assessment Data and Analysis

Performance Indicators

• **Green**: A high level indicating clear movement in the right direction, not requiring any immediate change in course of action. Continuing support should be provided.

• **Yellow**: An average, acceptable level indicating either some improvement, but not as quickly as desired, or indicating a slight decline in performance. Strategies and approaches should be reviewed and appropriate adjustments made to reach an acceptable level or desired rate of improvement.

• **Red**: An unacceptable status or direction of change. Immediate, high priority actions should be taken to address this area.

• **Blank**: Insufficient information available (or governance decision pending).
Library Entrance and Exit Survey

• In Joe Hardenbrook’s 2005-2006 Self-Study Report on Library Instruction, he assigned a Green indicator for this point of data collection. This year, he reports another Green indicator.

• The average score on the pre-test was 9.8/15 points or 65% (312 participants). The average score on the post-test was 11.4/15 points (265 participants) or 76%. There were very high increases from last year on the individual questions.

• See Joe Hardenbrook’s 2006-2007 annual CWRR library instruction report for a full assessment and initiatives for improvement.
Assessment Data and Analysis

Student Survey

• 422 first-time students were in IN151 courses. 228 surveys were completed (54% response rate).

• Of those students who took the YFCY Survey, the majority agreed that they successfully completed the goals of the two courses.
Student Survey

- 85.3% of students either agreed or strongly agreed that they learned how to read and critique texts actively, deliberately and carefully. Last year only 71.1% agreed or strongly agreed.
- 83% (compared to last year’s 73%) agreed or strongly agreed that they learned how to write polished, informed essays for varied audiences,
- 84% (compared to last year’s 72%) agreed or strongly agreed that they learned how to conduct research to participate in academic inquiry
- 75.6% (compared to 60% last year) agreed or strongly agreed that they learned how to reflect on the uses of reading and writing in their public and personal lives to better understand themselves, their communities and the world.
Student Survey

- All three areas of evaluation show a significant increase, from 9-16 percentage points, in the “strongly agree” frequency. The increase can either be attributed to the fluctuation in this year’s and last year’s response rate (a decrease from 68% to 54%) or the students’ increased awareness of the learning goals for the two-course sequence.

- The CWRR Program’s Self-Study Team assigns a Green indicator for this point of data collection.
Assessment Data and Analysis

Student Artifacts

• The student artifact **Reading Response** is used to evaluate CWRR goals 1 & 2: “read and critique texts actively, deliberately and carefully” and “write . . . polished essays for personal, public and/or specialized audiences.”

• The student artifact **Research Essay** is used to evaluate CWRR goals 3 & 2: “conduct research to participate in academic inquiry” and “write polished, informed essays for personal, public and/or specialized audiences”

• The student artifact **Reflection Piece** is used to evaluate CWRR goals 4 & 2: “reflect on the uses of reading and writing in their public and personal lives to better understand themselves, their communities and the world” and “write . . . for personal, public and/or specialized audiences”
Average Scores for Each Artifact

• Reading Response Performance Indication: 74% at adequate or excellent levels — **Green**
• Research Essay Performance Indication: 82% at adequate or excellent levels — **Green**
• Reflection Artifact Performance Indication: 68% at adequate or excellent levels — **Yellow**
• Overall Artifact Performance Indication: 74.66% at adequate or excellent levels — **Green**
Performance Indications for Each Artifact

Performance Indications of Randomly Selected CWRR Artifacts
2006-2007 Annual Assessment Report

- **Reading Response**: 33% Excellent, 41% Adequate, 26% Nominal
- **Research Essay**: 40% Excellent, 42% Adequate, 18% Nominal
- **Reflection Artifact**: 3% Excellent, 32% Adequate, 65% Nominal
- **All Artifacts**: 25% Excellent, 50% Adequate, 25% Nominal

Legend:
- Green: Excellent
- Yellow: Adequate
- Red: Nominal
Artifact Criterion

• Each artifact is broken into criteria for evaluation:
  • **Reading Response**—Reading, Critiquing & Writing
  • **Research Essay**—Research, Informed Use of Sources, Audience & Polish
  • **Reflection Piece**—Interpersonal and Intrapersonal Understanding & Inquiry
Average Percent Scores for Each Artifact Criterion
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Final Performance Indications for Each Goal

• Goal 1—Students will be able to read and critique texts actively, deliberately and carefully.
  – Student Survey—Advanced Green
  – Artifact Collection—Advanced Yellow
  – Final Rating—Green

• Goal 2—Students will be able to write polished, informed essays for personal, public and/or specialized audiences.
  – Student Survey—Advanced Green
  – Artifact Collection—Advanced Yellow
  – Final Rating—Green
Final Performance Indications for Each Goal

• Goal 3—Students will be able to conduct research to participate in academic inquiry.
  – Library Assessment—Green
  – Student Survey—Advanced Green
  – Artifact Collection—Advanced Yellow
  – Final Rating—Green

• Goal 4—Students will be able to reflect on the uses of reading and writing in their public and personal lives to better understand themselves, their communities and the world.
  – Student Survey—Low Green
  – Artifact Collection—Low Yellow/Borderline Red
  – Final Rating—Yellow
CWRR Reading Response Two-Year Trend Comparison

CWRR Reading Response Student Artifact: Average Scores
Two-Year Trend Comparison (2006 & 2007)
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CWRR Research Essay Two-Year Trend Comparison

CWRR Research Essay Artifact Assessment: Average Scores
Two-Year Trend Comparison (2006 & 2007)
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CWRR Reflection Artifact Two-Year Trend Comparison

CWRR Reflection Student Artifact: Average Scores
Two-Year Trend Comparison (2006 & 2007)
Two-Year Trends in CWRR Artifact Assessment

- Reading Response
- Research Essay
- Reflection Piece

Improvement Plans

• Enhancing the delivery of our four student learning outcome goals, with special attention to audience and reflection
• Continuing to support faculty development opportunities, as well as the structures that uphold the program and
• Contributing strategies and methods that promote and support writing in a computer classroom.
• Continuing to adjust faculty teaching load