

**STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT**  
**General Education Goal: Writing Effectiveness in the Core Curriculum**

**August 10, 2005**

*Subcommittee Members:*

**Bill Downs, Chair (Political Science)**

**Mike Binford (Political Science)**

**Rashid Naim (Political Science)**

**Larry Youngs (History)**

**Layli Phillips (Women's Studies)**

**I. Description of the Outcomes that Define the Goal.**

As approved by the Georgia State University Undergraduate Council (1/30/04) and the University Senate (2/13/04), Goal I.1 of the University's General Education Goals states, "Students communicate effectively using appropriate writing conventions and formats."

The Assessment Team began in 2004 by recognizing the inherent complexity of writing assessment. There is an impressive multidisciplinary literature that testifies to the enormity and vulnerabilities of any assessment program (cf., Cooper and Odell, 1977; Jones et al., 1995; Godshalk 1966). Indeed, we were confronted at the outset by an initial concern—How, if at all, is it possible to assess written work in a meaningful fashion across diverse disciplines?

Mindful of the special difficulties associated with evaluating written communication, the Assessment Team agreed that writing effectiveness is amenable to some form of measurement and that the University is ultimately accountable for undergraduate student achievement in this area. As such, the Team implemented a Summer 2004 pilot assessment plan and then built upon that plan by collecting and analyzing data during the Fall 2004 and Spring 2005 semesters. The subcommittee met in Summer 2005 to review progress to date and to make recommendations for future iterations of the assessment.

Upon completion of the work done to this point, the Assessment Team finds inherent value, first, in the self-conscious introspection that comes with any assessment exercise. Generating faculty awareness of—and discussion about—the goal of student communication through effective writing is productive (albeit not always easy) in and of itself. The Team finds value, second, in identifying the methodological possibilities and impediments to the assessment of student writing at Georgia State University, the existence of which became apparent through the efforts in 2004-05. Third, the Assessment Team is hopeful that ongoing assessment will provide findings that can and will form the basis for suggested changes to procedures, resource allocation, and/or curriculum.

*What is Writing Effectiveness?*

For purposes of establishing a baseline, we adopted the following broad definition of writing effectiveness:

*Effectiveness* is defined as the ability to write with a clear purpose, appropriate organization, sufficient detail or evidence, appropriate tone, and the proper use of mechanics. Effective communication through writing also entails the ability to summarize and document sources, to write intelligently about topics without quoting sources extensively, and to construct concise statements, arguments, or theories.

This working definition of goal-related outcomes is generally consistent with the “measurable outcomes” for Goal I identified by the University Senate on 3/22/01 <http://www.gsu.edu/~wwwapa/goalsassessmentofgeneraleducation.html>

According to the Senate-approved guidelines, to demonstrate writing as a tool for effective communication we can look for and assess:

- statements of purpose
- integration of ideas into a larger body of knowledge
- clarity of organization
- quality of argument
- proper use of documentation
- coherence
- subject mastery
- levels of formality
- learning through sequential drafts

The Assessment Team recognized also that writing is a context-driven activity. Students write for particular audiences and for particular purposes. As such, writing assessment has to be discipline-sensitive. While broad performance categories may be identified, successful writing in one discipline may be distinct in some facets from that in another discipline. The task of identifying outcomes that define the goal of effective writing is, by necessity, a search for least common denominators—broad elements that should be observable at satisfactory levels in all writing. Among these are:

*Content*—inclusion of ideas, facts, and arguments relevant to the assignment;

*Organization*—ordering and connection of ideas, facts, and arguments;

*Reasoning*—logical development of ideas and arguments;

*Rhetoric*—expression of ideas, facts, and arguments in a manner appropriate for the situation;

*Disciplinarity*—expression of ideas, facts, and arguments in a manner appropriate for the discipline;

*Conventions*—presentation of ideas, facts, and arguments according to the conventions of standard written English.

Constructing reliable and valid measures of these goal-related outcomes constituted one of the challenges of the assessment process. Disciplinarity, in particular, confounded several members of the assessment team—how effectively can a faculty member, graduate student or other evaluator in Women’s Studies gauge disciplinary appropriateness of student writing in Political Science courses, and vice versa?

## II. Description of the ways in which courses to be assessed contribute to this goal.

Across the University's core curriculum, there are at least 30 courses from 13 departments that are self-identified by those respective departments as contributing directly to Goal I.1. These include:

### *Area A (Essential Skills)*

Engl 1101, 1102

Math 1101, 1220, 2212, 2215, 2211, 2420

### *Area B (Institutional Options)*

Phil 1010

### *Area C (Humanities and Fine Arts)*

Engl 2210, 2120, 2130

Phil 2010

Spch 2050

Film 2700

Thea 2040

ForL 1002, 2001, 2002

### *Area D (Science, Mathematics, and Technology)*

Geol 1121, 2001

CSc 1010

Math 1070, 1220, 2420

### *Area E (Social Sciences)*

Hist 1111, 1112, 2110

Pols 1101, 2401

Econ 2100

WSt 2010

For purposes of our assessment project, we selected a sample of four courses from three of the above named departments. We were aware that research on writing effectiveness focuses disproportionately on how students learn to write in first-year writing and composition classes. Much less effort has, however, been devoted to writing performance outside of English departments in what are traditionally deemed "content" courses. With this deficiency in mind, we sampled from courses in Political Science, History, and Women's Studies. The courses were deliberately chosen to sample from both high-enrollment and low-enrollment courses in the core's Area E (Social Sciences). The frequency, length, and quality of writing in high-enrollment/large section courses (120-200 students) are likely to be considerably different than what would be found in low-enrollment/small section courses (< 45 students) and any such differences should ultimately be documented. In selecting the courses to be sampled, we limited the sample to courses in a single area (Social Sciences); clearly, the challenge of assessing across all the respective areas of the core remains.

The following courses constituted the sample for our assessment efforts:

#### **POLS 1101 American Government**

This introduction to American politics and government is a high-enrollment course, capturing an effective snapshot of undergraduates from across the University's fields of study. During the period 2002-2004, this course ranked second among all core courses in terms of total enrollment (10,224). More than half of the students in POLS 1101 are

Freshmen. In Fall and Spring semesters the course has multiple sections of up to 200 students, making this course representative of the challenges faced by instructors (many of whom are untenured junior faculty or graduate student instructors) attempting to achieve General Education goals in large classes. Assessing the class size-learning outcomes relationship in courses such as this could provide some indication of the need for additional graduate student assistance.

### **POLS 2401 Global Issues**

Like POLS 1101, POLS 2401 Global Issues attracts a multidisciplinary student audience. Like POLS 1101 the class sections can be large (120 students), but unlike its counterparts Global Issues is a mid-range enrollment course (4,630 students in fiscal 2002-2004). POLS 2401 also distinguishes itself by having participated actively in the University's Writing Across the Curriculum program. Instructors often require students to write for a range of purposes—e.g., issue background papers, advisory policy memos, and argumentative opinion/editorial type essays. WebCT has been used frequently as a means of peer review and incorporation of instructor feedback on sequential drafts.

### **WST 2010 Introduction to Women's Studies**

WST 2010 is the entry-level women's studies course at Georgia State University and can be used to fulfill the General Education Requirement in Section E of the Arts and Sciences core curriculum. Students who take this course may proceed with a Women's Studies major or minor or they may proceed with other disciplinary courses of study with enhanced knowledge of women, gender, and feminism. WST 2010 seeks to meet General Education Goal I.1 in the following ways:

- Fostering written communication through the use of essay exams and multimedia group presentations;
- Fostering collaborative writing through multimedia group presentations
- Encouraging peer review of written assignments
- Fostering critical thinking in written expression through exposure to critical theory (feminism), interdisciplinary content and methods, and real-world social problem-solving situations
- Incorporation in writing of salient contemporary issues, particularly as they pertain to women, gender, sex and sexuality, feminism/womanism, race, and class.

To assess the degree to which these learning outcomes have been achieved, instructors who teach WST 2010 already use the following methods:

- Course-embedded assessment, including, but not limited to, homework assignments, individual and group projects (written, creative, and technology-based).
- Essay tests, quizzes, and other examinations.
- Portfolio evaluation (such as scrapbooks or research portfolios).
- Students' self-assessment of learning in the course.

### **HIST 2110 Survey of U.S. History**

During the period 2002-2004, this thematic survey of US history from the country's origins to the present ranked first among all core courses in terms of total enrollment (10,716). This made it an ideal—and perhaps indispensable—candidate for us to use in capturing a cross-section of the undergraduate student population and its abilities in the

area of writing effectiveness. In accordance with the Department of History's own articulated core skills required of all students (Historical Mindedness, Multidimensional Analysis, Historical Context, Textual Interpretation, and Presentation), HIST 2110 encourages students to "demonstrate the ability to create, organize, and support in written form an historical thesis or argument" ([http://education.gsu.edu/ctl/outcomes/A&S/History\\_Assessment\\_Plan.htm](http://education.gsu.edu/ctl/outcomes/A&S/History_Assessment_Plan.htm)) This goal is facilitated by the relatively small sections taught.

### **III. Description of the assessment methods.**

The Assessment Team recognized that there are multiple methods available to evaluate the effectiveness of student writing across multiple disciplines, although none is deemed uniquely or universally accurate. Written work can be assessed (1) by sampling evidence of actual performance, (2) by accumulating evidence of skills self-reported by students, and (3) by relying on evidence of skill-building reported by instructors. Our assessment efforts focused predominantly on the first and third methods; we avoided, at least at this stage of the project, the pursuit of evidence of skills self-reported by students themselves.

We also recognized that writing in the general education core comes in multiple varieties: research papers, essay exams, laboratory reports, online discussion postings, collaborative group reports, book reviews, journals and others. The wide variety of writing types confounds the effort to provide meaningful, comparable assessments across disciplines.

Methodologically, the value of these efforts was to (1) help determine the ease/difficulty with which faculty members are willing to construct comparable writing assignments that facilitate assessment across sections of the same course, (2) develop valid and reliable scoring criteria, (3) evaluate the time needed to evaluate student writing across the core curriculum.

*Sampling Evidence of Actual Performance.* Efforts to collect student writing samples entailed requests to all faculty and graduate students teaching the selected courses to submit random papers (selected by choosing papers from the first five students listed alphabetically on their class rolls). Student writing samples were then assessed according to the scheme detailed in Appendix 1.

*Evidence of Skill-Building Reported by Instructors.* The Assessment Team attempted to collect and evaluate syllabi from every section of the selected courses taught since the Fall 2003 semester. This meant the gathering and inspection of approximately 150 syllabi. Here the objectives were to determine:

1. Is any requirement of student written work stipulated in the course syllabus?
2. What type(s) of writing is/are incorporated into the course requirements?
3. What paper lengths are required?
4. Are instructor feedback and/or peer review as part of a process of sequential drafts indicated?
5. What portion of a student's grade weight is determined by effective written communication?

In addition to the collection of course syllabi, the Assessment Team collected assignment details from participating instructors. We recognized that written work is more effectively assessed if the assignment (as worded when given to the student) is provided.

#### **IV. Description of the data collection and analysis procedures.**

##### *Syllabi Collection.*

Our scrutiny of 152 course syllabi from Fall 2003–Summer 2005 produced some important nuggets of discovery [See Table 1]. First, we find that approximately two-thirds of all sections of these Gen Ed courses actually did formalize a writing requirement in the course syllabus. Whether the remaining one-third that make no reference to student writing represent a significant concern is open for debate; what is quite clear, however, is that there are real discrepancies across courses. Whereas 87% of all HIST 2110 sections specify student writing in the syllabus, only 35% of POLS 1101 syllabi do the same. This would seem to beg the real question as to the effects of large class size (120 and 200 in POLS 1101) on the instructor’s decision about whether to assign any written work. Follow-up discussion with faculty instructors reveals a significant apprehension about the costs of trying to achieve the goal of effective written communication—here the mentality is often one of avoiding writing assignments and resorting to fill-in-the-bubble multiple choice exams because of inadequate graduate teaching assistance and the distraction such an investment would give to the publication-driven pressures of promotion and tenure. It is instructive to note here that instructors in POLS 2401 Global Issues have more frequently made use of Writing Across the Curriculum resources (e.g., the addition of an additional graduate student to the classroom as a Writing Consultant) and therefore demonstrated some effectiveness at juggling large class size with the demands of meeting Gen. Ed. Goal I.1.

Also emerging out of our study of these syllabi are concerns about multiple writing assignments. Ideally, student writing improves with faculty and even peer feedback. If students are writing only a single paper in a semester (and we know from experience that many papers are due at the end of the semester, only to find the vast majority of students never pick up their papers and their professor’s comments), then a significant opportunity to advance writing effectiveness is missed. With this in mind, our Assessment Team notes that less than one-third of the syllabi surveyed provide for more than one writing assignment.

We also found that expectations of student writing take many different forms and lengths—from 5-8 sentences at one end of the spectrum to 15 pages at the other. We further note that the importance attached to writing—at least as measured by grade weight—ranges significantly from 3% of the final course grade to 75%. Finally, we observe that less than half of the syllabi examined indicate the existence of an essay component in the course exam.

If the goal is to have 100% of the classes in these Gen Ed core courses formally contributing to student achievement in the area of writing effectiveness, then these data suggest that the goal has not yet been met...at least in the area of writing frequency. The Assessment Team recognizes the need to further investigate these data for their relationship with class size, instructor status, WAC support, previous teaching experience, and the use of WebCT.

##### *Assessment of Writing Quality.*

Building upon an established system developed at Kansas State University in that institution’s own assessment of writing effectiveness in the General Education core (Smit et al., 2000), the Assessment Team employed a six-point scoring scale, in which a “6” is the highest score and “1” is the lowest (with a score of “0” indicating that the paper could not be

evaluated). This scale avoids both a middle score and association with a five-point scale that might be seen as analogous to the A-B-C-D-F grading system.

*Summer 2004 Pilot.* The Assessment Team's first evaluation took place in a Summer 2004 pilot. Evaluations of samples of student writing revealed important elements of both the process and the product of assessment. As Table 2 indicates, four members of the Assessment Team reviewed 32 papers. All team members reviewed an additional five papers. A fifth assessor failed to submit evaluations on the full set of papers, a fact that highlights some of the difficulties of coordinating assessment across multiple departments and during the summer session, when some faculty members become less accessible.

In its pilot the assessment group was able to read and score enough student writing samples to effectively gauge the merits of the evaluation rubric and to draw attention to additional methodological issues for future assessment. On five papers, the entire committee assigned the exact same score. On an additional 14 papers, all scores were within one point of each other. In the case of only one paper did all the evaluators assign different scores. While the Assessment Team wished to continue refining the scoring rubric, the summer pilot gave us reasonable confidence that approach had some merit.

While not aspiring to statistical significance with this small, exploratory assessment of writing samples, the subcommittee took note that the average score for these papers was a rather modest 3.7. This meant that the writing evaluated lay somewhere between "fair" and "good." Perhaps it lies beyond the remit of this subcommittee to derive targets from the data, but it was our belief coming out of the Summer 2004 pilot that the average score for our students should be *at least* 4.0 "good."

*Spring 2005 Assessment.* The Assessment Team collected 125 samples of student writing in the Fall 2004 and Spring 2005 semesters. The Department of English and the Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) program generously provided six paid graduate student writing consultants to assemble on a Saturday in April 2005 to score each paper. Two of the evaluators were from the Department of English, two were from History, one was from Communications, and the sixth came from Women's Studies/Sociology. The results (Table 3) reinforce the methodological challenges of assessing student writing. The first problem that leaps out from the data is that of "evaluator fatigue" – two evaluators failed to get past the 89<sup>th</sup> sample paper. The second problem is that of variation across assessments of the same paper – Paper 1, for example, received three 4s ("Good") but also two 1s ("Poor"). Similarly, on Paper 19 Evaluator 1 assigned a 6 ("Excellent") while Evaluator 5 deemed the paper a 1 ("Poor"). Overall, the evaluators assigned an average score of 4.066, which just crosses the "Good" threshold; however, concerns about inter-coder consistency suggest caution in drawing inferences about the score.

## **VI. Recommendations and Future Assessments.**

The subcommittee met in Summer 2005 to review its mission and to reflect upon assessment efforts to date. Among the concerns discussed were the validity of the scoring rubric, procedures for sampling student papers, ability of readers to judge the disciplinary of student written work outside their own fields of expertise, and the difficulties of getting faculty in multiple departments to buy into the assessment process.

The sense of the committee is that assessment is a useful exercise, especially when it prompts self-conscious introspection and thus leads to heightened sensitivity to learning goals. In short, the

more we raise awareness that certain courses profess to achieve certain learning outcomes the more likely it is that faculty and department chairs will explicitly seek out ways to accomplish those goals. We hope that our work can spawn departmental conversations about learning goals, as decentralizing achievement is likely the best route to take. The committee is more dubious, however, about the setting of some numerical threshold to indicate where students *should* be to demonstrate effective written communication. There appears to be an element of arbitrariness that we should avoid.

The committee recommends that the sampling of student writing be narrowed to fewer course sections wherein students write on a common assignment. This, it is hoped, may help reduce some of the variability of scores by evaluators. For Fall 2005 the goal is to ideally collect work from three sections in each of the selected courses – one taught by a graduate instructor, one by a tenure-track faculty member, and one by a tenured faculty member. Faculty representatives in each department will work with instructors to design a common assignment to be administered to all students in these course sections. Papers from the first ten students appearing alphabetically on the class rolls will be forwarded to the committee for assessment.

The committee also strongly recommends that WAC writing consultants be used in future iterations of the assessment of student papers. Without such assistance, the committee doubts that large-scale assessment can take place. That being said, we find it necessary that all departments (POLS, HIST, WST) be represented among those doing the evaluating (noting that there were no POLS readers among the April 2005 evaluators).

The committee finds the collection of syllabi to be an instructive tool and strongly encourages its continuation. Importantly, the word must get out to faculty teaching in the Gen Ed core that scrutiny of their syllabi will in no way reflect upon them individually and that anonymity will be maintained.

The committee recommends that departmental assessment reports on undergraduate learning outcomes be collected, reviewed, and incorporated into this project. While such reports typically focus on learning outcomes by majors, they also provide important clues about alternative assessment mechanisms and even data collected from the core.

Among the continuing issues to be addressed at future meetings:

- sample size and breadth of classes sampled for writing effectiveness
- increasing breadth of courses targeted for syllabi collection
- increasing diversity of types of writing assessed, to include not only take-home writing assignments but also essay exams and WebCT postings
- consider ways to gauge differences in writing effectiveness
- maintaining incentives for faculty serving on sub-subcommittee
- provide training for team of assessors
- discuss adoption of electronic portfolio-type mechanisms for better systematic collection of writing samples

## REFERENCES

Cooper, Charles R. and Lee Odell, eds. *Evaluating Writing: Describing, Measuring, Judging*. Buffalo, NY.: State University of New York at Buffalo, 1977.

Jones, Elizabeth et al. *National Assessment of College Learning: Identifying College Graduates' Essential Skills in Writing, Speech and Listening, and Critical Thinking*. US. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, 1995.

Godshalk, Fred I., Francis Swineford, and William E. Coffman. *The Measurement of Writing Ability*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1966.

David Smit et al. "Assessing the Writing of Students in General Education at Kansas State University." Report of the General Education Portfolio Assessment Subcommittee (June 30, 2000).

**APPENDIX 1.**  
**ASSESSING WRITING EFFECTIVENESS IN GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES**  
**GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

**Scoring Guide for Writing Samples**

When rating the writing sample, the following six different criteria should be considered: purpose, content, organization, details/evidence, tone and mechanics.

**Explanation of criteria:**

*Purpose:* The purpose of the writing is stated directly in the first few paragraphs of the writing, or the purpose can be easily inferred from the opening paragraphs.

*Content:* The content of the writing is substantial. The information presented is new and interesting, and it is what is asked for in the assignment. The arguments show a command of the issues and present relevant evidence and clearly thought out reasoning.

*Organization:* The organization, form, or structure of the writing is clear, easy to follow and appropriate to the genre of writing. Generally, the beginning of the writing sets up expectations that the rest of the writing meets. Transitions from idea to idea and leaps of thought are clearly indicated.

*Details/Evidence:* The writing is well developed and shows a solid grasp of the type of evidence and level of detail needed for the assignment. The information is accurate and appropriate. The arguments are complete, logical and convincing.

*Tone:* The language is appropriate for the intended audience or type of discourse.

*Mechanics:* The mechanics should be appropriate for the writer's purpose and the audience. Mechanics often include:

Diction: Appropriate choice of words for the purpose, audience and genre.

Sentence Structure: Sentences should be grammatical unless there is a reasonable stylistic reason for using an alternative structure.

Punctuation: Punctuation should follow the general rules for the genre or writing style of the piece.

Usage: The writer should use the tense that is appropriate for the genre and context. First person may be used in some types of writing while third person may be more appropriate in others. Whether the active or passive style is used depends on the document.

**6 The writing is excellent overall.**

Purpose: the purpose of the writing is stated directly in the first few paragraphs of the writing, or the purpose can be easily inferred from the opening paragraphs.

Content: The content of the writing is substantial. The information presented is new and interesting, and it is what is asked for in the assignment. The arguments show a command of the issues and present relevant evidence and clearly thought out reasoning.

Organization: The organization, form, or structure of the writing is clear and very easy to follow. The beginning of the writing sets up expectations that the rest of the writing meets. Transitions from idea to idea and leaps of thought are clearly indicated.

Details/Evidence: The writing is well developed and shows a solid grasp of the type of evidence and level of detail needed for the assignment. The information is accurate and appropriate. The arguments are convincing.

Tone: The language is appropriate for the intended audience or type of discourse.

**5 The writing is very good overall.**

It is similar to writing rated "6." The purpose of the writing is fairly easy to determine but may not be explicitly stated or found in the first couple paragraphs. Writing demonstrates the author's ability to present clear information and fully developed arguments. However, the writing may occasionally lack sufficient detail or evidence. There is some form of organization or structure but at times it may be somewhat difficult to follow. The writing is generally appropriate for the type of assignment and intended audience but may occasionally be slightly off target.

**4 The writing is good overall.**

The writing is competent and has more strengths than weaknesses. However, quality may be uneven and may consistently have one or two problems. The purpose of writing may be fuzzy. The content should generally provide adequate information but this may be presented in a conventional or uninteresting way. Some level of organization is attempted but the writing occasionally goes off track or becomes difficult to follow. Sufficient details and evidence for an argument should be present but irrelevant information may be included or the argument may be unconvincing as a whole. The writing may at times call into question the writer's command of the material or understanding of the audience or genre.

**3 The writing is fair overall.**

It is similar to writing rated "4." However, several problems may consistently occur. The purpose of the piece may be unclear. Although the writing provides some appropriate information, there is also a substantial amount of irrelevant or uninteresting content. The writing may be underdeveloped and not follow a clearly defined structure. An argument may be presented, with some supporting evidence, but the level of detail is insufficient or the reasoning appears flawed. The writing raises consistent questions about the writer's command of the material or understanding of the audience or genre.

**2 The writing is weak overall.**

The writing clearly has more weaknesses than strengths. The writing may indicate some purpose or demonstrate a minimal level of organization. However, overall the writing seems pointless and simply a mechanical response to an assignment. Any arguments are unconvincing and the writing does not appear to know how to use evidence or reasoning

to support the arguments. The writing seriously calls into question the writer's command of the material or understanding of the audience or genre.

**1 The writing is poor overall.**

This writing lacks the occasional good points of a "2." The writing seems completely pointless or unrelated to the assignment. The content appears to be a random collection of facts or ideas without any clear connections or organization. Arguments that are presented lack any evidence or reasoning and seem unrelated to any purpose or audience. The writing demonstrates no sense that the writer understands the material, the audience, or the genre. The writing is so formulaic and undeveloped that it seems as if the writer put it together with little thought or effort.

**0 The writing does not fit the requirements and cannot be assessed.**

It may, for example, be plagiarized or contain a kind of writing not called for in the project description.

Paper Number \_\_\_\_\_

<b>6</b> <b>Excellent</b>	<b>5</b> <b>Very Good</b>	<b>4</b> <b>Good</b>	<b>3</b> <b>Fair</b>	<b>2</b> <b>Weak</b>	<b>1</b> <b>Poor</b>	<b>0</b> <b>Cannot be assessed</b>

- *Please base evaluations on criteria established in the scoring guide.*

**TABLE 1.**  
**PROMINENCE OF STUDENT WRITING IN SYLLABI FROM SELECT GEN ED CORE**  
**CURRICULUM COURSES**  
**FALL 2003-SUMMER 2005**  
**(% INDICATING)**

<b>COURSE</b>	<b>FORMAL WRITING REQUIREMENT</b>	<b>OPTIONAL WRITING REQUIREMENT</b>	<b>MULTIPLE WRITING REQUIREMENTS</b>	<b>ESSAY EXAMS</b>	<b>N</b>
POLS 1101	35	29	14	18	54
POLS 2401	76	6	24	49	33
HIST 2110	87	5	36	54	55
WST 2010	100	0	100	100	10
<i>Overall Avg.</i>	<b>66</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>37</b>	152



**TABLE 2. EVALUATION OF WRITING SAMPLES  
SUMMER PILOT, 2004**

	Assessor A	Assessor B	Assessor C	Assessor D	Assessor E	Avg.
Sample 1	6	5	5	6	5	5.40
Sample 2	5	5	3	5	5	4.60
Sample 3	4	4	4	4	4	4.00
Sample 4	3	4	2	3	3	3.00
Sample 5	2	2	3	3	2	2.40
Sample 6	3	4	5	3		3.75
Sample 7	5	5	4	4		4.50
Sample 8	5	5	3	4		4.25
Sample 9	2	3	4	2		2.75
Sample 10	3	4	2	2		2.75
Sample 11	4	5	2	3		3.50
Sample 12	3	4	3	3		3.25
Sample 13	2	3	3	2		2.50
Sample 14	2	4	4	2		3.00
Sample 15	4	4	4	4		4.00
Sample 16	3	5	4	3		3.75
Sample 17	6	6	5	5		5.50
Sample 18	4	5	4	4		4.25
Sample 19	3	4	3	3		3.25
Sample 20	4	5	6	3		4.50
Sample 21	3	4	5	3		3.75
Sample 22	4	3	2	3		3.00
Sample 23	3	3	5	3		3.50
Sample 24	2	3	4	2		2.75
Sample 25	6	6	5	5		5.50
Sample 26	3	5	5	4		4.25
Sample 27	5	4	5	4		4.50
Sample 28	4	4	4	4		4.00
Sample 29	4	3	4	3		3.50
Sample 30	5	4	3	4		4.00
Sample 31	6	6	3	5		5.00
Sample 32	3	3	3	3		3.00
Sample 33	3	3	3	3		3.00
Sample 34	4	3	3	3		3.25
Sample 35	5	4	4	4		4.25
Sample 36	4	3	3	3		3.25
Sample 37	5	4	4	4		4.25

**Overall average score: 3.77** [i.e., less than "good" and somewhat better than "fair"]

**4.00 (Good):** Writing is competent and has more strengths than weaknesses; however, quality may be uneven and may consistently have one or two problems. The purpose of writing may be fuzzy. The content generally provides adequate information but this may be presented in a conventional or uninteresting way. Some level of organization is attempted but the writing occasionally goes off track or becomes difficult to follow. Sufficient details and evidence for an argument are present but irrelevant information may be included or the argument may be unconvincing as a whole. The writing may at times call into question the writer's command of the material or understanding of the audience or genre.

**3.00 (Fair):** It is similar to writing rated "4." However, more problems consistently occur. The purpose of the writing is often unclear. Although the writing provides some appropriate information, there is also a substantial amount of irrelevant or uninteresting content. The writing may be underdeveloped and not follow a clearly defined structure. Arguments are presented with some supporting evidence, but the level of detail is insufficient or the reasoning appears flawed. The writing raises consistent questions about the writer's command of the material or understanding of the audience or genre.

**TABLE 3.**  
**WRITING ASSESSMENTS, SPRING 2005**

Paper	E-1	E-2	E-3	E-4	E-5	E-6	Average
1	4	4	4	1	1	2	2.667
2	6	6	4	4	3	5	4.667
3	6	3	5	4	3	3	4.000
4	3	4	3	3	1	2	2.667
5	2	3	4	5	2	2	3.000
6	6	5	4	6	4	3	4.667
7	4	0	3	2	1	2	2.000
8	2	2	3	3	1	2	2.167
9	4	N/A	3	5	2	3	3.400
10	4	5	6	N/A	3	6	4.800
11	5	6	5	6	4	5	5.167
12	6	6	6	6	3	6	5.500
13	4	5	4	5	3	6	4.500
14	3	4	4	2	2	3	3.000
15	5	4	5	4	2	5	4.167
16	6	4	5	3	3	5	4.333
17	6	N/A	5	5	2	6	4.800
18	5	3	4	3	2	5	3.667
19	6	4	3	2	1	4	3.333
20	6	5	6	6	4	6	5.500
21	5	4	5	3	2	6	4.167
22	5	5	4	5	4	5	4.667
23	6	5	6	5	4	6	5.333
24	4	5	2	4	2	4	3.500
25	6	5	5	2	1	5	4.000
26	6	5	6	5	4	6	5.333
27	2	2	1	0	0	2	1.167
28	6	4	5	6	0	6	4.500
29	4	2	3	2	2	3	2.667
30	6	5	4	6	5	6	5.333
31	6	4	5	4	3	5	4.500
32	6	4	4	5	4	6	4.833
33	4	5	4	0	0	6	3.167
34	6	6	6	4	4	6	5.333
35	5	5	5	4	5	6	5.000
36	5	5	6	3	3	5	4.500
37	5	6	4	2	2	5	4.000
38	5	4	4	2	3	5	3.833
39	6	5	6	3	2	6	4.667
40	6	5	6	3	2	5	4.500
41	6	5	6	6	5	6	5.667
42	2	4	2	3	2	4	2.833
43	3	4	2	2	2	3	2.667
44	5	4	6	5	3	4	4.500
45	4	5	4	4	5	4	4.333
46	5	4	4	2	3	4	3.667

47	6	5	3	2	3	4	3.833
48	6	5	5	4	4	5	4.833
49	3	4	3	2	2	3	2.833
50	6	5	5	4	3	5	4.667
51	5	4	4	3	3	4	3.833
52	4	4	3	2	2	3	3.000
53	4	4	4	4	4	4	4.000
54	4	5	4	0	0	2	2.500
55	4	4	4	0	0	4	2.667
56	6	5	6	3	3	5	4.667
57	5	4	5	3	3	6	4.333
58	6	4	4	4	3	4	4.167
59	6	4	6	4	3	5	4.667
60	5	4	4	3	4	4	4.000
61	4	4	4	4	3	4	3.833
62	5	4	4	5	4	4	4.333
63	6	5	5	5	5	6	5.333
64	3	2	3	4	4	4	3.333
65	6	6	6	6	6	6	6.000
66	3	3	4	3	3	3	3.167
67	3	3	3	4	4	2	3.167
68	5	3	5	3	3	4	3.833
69	6	5	4	4	3	5	4.500
70	5	3	4	3	2	4	3.500
71	4	4	4	3	3	3	3.500
72	6	5	6	5	4	5	5.167
73	6	5	6	3	4	5	4.833
74	6	6	6	5	5	6	5.667
75	5	6	4	4	1	5	4.167
76	5	5	4	5	2	5	4.333
77	0	3	4	3	2	4	2.667
78	5	6	5	5	5	5	5.167
79	4	5	6	5	4	5	4.833
80	5	5	5	4	2	4	4.167
81	6	4	5	3	4	4	4.333
82	6	5	5	3	4	3	4.333
83	5	4	4	3	2	3	3.500
84	6	5	5	5	3	3	4.500
85	4	4	3	3	1	2	2.833
86	4		5	0	1	2	2.400
87	5		5	5	3	3	4.200
88	5		5	2	2	4	3.600
89	4		5	3	2	3	3.400
90			5	3	3	4	3.750
91			6	6	3	5	5.000
92			5	4	3	5	4.250
93			6	4	3	6	4.750
94			6	3	3	6	4.500
95			5	4	3	4	4.000
96			6	5	2	4	4.250
97			0	0	3	6	2.250
98			3	3	2	4	3.000

99	3	5	2	3	3.250
100	6	4	2	5	4.250
101	6	5	5	6	5.500
102	6	4	4	6	5.000
103	6	4	4	5	4.750
104	5	3	3	4	3.750
105	5	4	4	5	4.500
106	4	N/A	N/A	3	3.500
107	4	4	4	3	3.750
108	6	3	2	5	4.000
109	3	3	3	4	3.250
110	4	5	4	4	4.250
111	5	4	5	4	4.500
112	6	4	4	6	5.000
113	5	5	5	4	4.750
114	5	5	5	4	4.750
115	6	4	5	5	5.000
116	2	2	2	2	2.000
117	6	3	3	4	4.000
118	6	5	5	6	5.500
119	6	5	5	4	5.000
120	4	4	4	4	4.000
121	5	4	4	4	4.250
122	3	4	4	3	3.500
123	3	4	4	3	3.500
124	3	4	4	2	3.250
125	6	4	4	4	4.500

TOTAL AVERAGE: 4.066

E - # => Evaluator # (1-6)

Scale:

0 = Cannot be assessed

1 = Poor

2 = Weak

3 = Fair

4 = Good

5 = Very Good

6 = Excellent