

**JOHN JAY COLLEGE ENGLISH DEPARTMENT
FRESHMEN-YEAR COMPOSITION PROGRAM
OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT REPORT**

Academic Years 2010-2012

**Submitted by:
Tim McCormack
Composition Program OA Chair**

Report Submitted July 15, 2012

The Freshmen-year Composition Outcomes Assessment Committee consists of the following faculty members: Tim McCormack (chair), Mark McBeth, Sanjana Nair, and Les Hansen.

REPORT SUMMARY

The Freshmen-year Composition Outcomes Assessment Committee has completed two full years of OA work. We have established learning objectives for all courses in the sequence, developed an assessment plan, piloted assessment methodologies (syllabus review, student focus groups and portfolio evaluation), completed a first round of assessments, uncovered key findings, and made changes to curriculum based on those findings.

Our OA design includes steps of data collection and analysis, but also the development of curricular guidelines in the form of a curriculum memo to faculty teaching the courses that will be generated from each year's work. In addition, faculty development workshops and faculty mentoring programs have been set up to introduce the desired changes to the curriculum and to encourage faculty to share methods and strategies that focus on the desired outcomes as determined by the OA process. Finally, at the start of each academic year, the Outcomes Assessment committee meets to design a specific OA agenda for the coming year.

We have developed a process that actively engages the faculty in OA, and therefore acts as focused faculty development for the courses under study. This connection between data and practice is crucial to the success of the Composition program.

Our OA process has initiated a positive and demonstrable improvement in the composition courses at John Jay.

REPORT SUMMARY CONT.

SPECIFIC FINDINGS AND ACTION ITEMS

The majority of work in the past two years has been centered on the courses with the largest student population, ENG 101 and ENG 201. From the data we have collected and analyzed, we concluded the following:

- 1) Some of the basic tenets of the composition sequence courses (such as the portfolio requirement) were not being followed by faculty.
- 2) There is a need for more consistency in curriculum in ENG 101 and a greater need for consistency in ENG 201.
- 3) There is a need for more coherence in assignments, curriculum and pedagogy between the different levels of courses from EAP 121 to ENG 201, so that the students perceive a relationship between the courses.
- 4) More faculty need to make the Writing Center a required part of their curriculum.
- 5) There is a need for more focus on Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) and rhetorical analysis in the ENG 201 course.
- 6) There is some confusion over the amount of reading that is assigned in composition courses and the purposes for which reading is assigned (aka how reading is related to writing).
- 7) There is inconsistency in the approaches to sentence-level and grammar work in all courses.

Based on OA findings, curricular, pedagogical or programmatic changes were made and improvements were seen in the following areas.

101 Course

1. 89 percent of faculty had the prescribed assignments listed on their syllabus, an increase of 9 percent from the previous year.
2. 94 percent of faculty required a portfolio for the course, a specific requirement for ENG 101, an increase of 14 percent from the previous year.

201 Course

1. 90 percent of faculty assigned some writing in the disciplines and 71 percent assigned students to read in the disciplines. These are more than 50 percent increases from the previous year.
2. 85 percent assigned a portfolio, a more than 45 percent increase from the previous year.
3. There was a marked increase in the number of syllabi that mentioned grammar or sentence-level work, with more than 80 percent explicitly mentioning this kind of work, up from 18 percent the previous year.
4. 70 percent of faculty assign the rhetorical analysis essay assignment, up from 25 percent the previous year.

In the coming academic year, the OA committee will continue this same process of work begun here, focusing on number 6 and 7 above, as well as other specific areas of concern to student

learning that the committee identifies. In addition, we will continue to monitor progress on the issues raised in numbers 1-5, to continue improvement.

As all OA committees come to realize, OA work is extremely time consuming and can be a drain on committee members' time needed for teaching and research. In these first two years, we have already dramatically scaled back our intended OA plans, to a more viable level that can be accomplished each year. Still, we feel that the OA committee for composition is understaffed. Given the large number of students impacted by the composition sequence, and the importance of these core courses to student success overall, we believe more time and money needs to be devoted to OA of the Composition sequence. Specifically, it is recommended that this committee be expanded next year to include two of the new lecturers in writing, Victoria Bond and Christen Madrazo, who will be teaching extensively in the composition sequence. In addition, because the majority of our faculty are adjunct faculty, and that our OA model relies heavily on faculty engagement, we believe paying adjunct faculty for four non-teaching hours per semester would go along way toward improving both the quality and the speed of the work we do. We will make a formal proposal regarding this latter request early next academic year.

Freshmen Year Composition Program Description

The John Jay Freshmen Year Writing Program consists of a three-course composition sequence ENGW 100, ENG 101 and ENG 201 and a two-course sequence for English as a Second Language (ESL) students, EAP 121 and EAP 131. The program also runs EAP versions of ENGW 100, ENG 101 and ENG 201.

Course Descriptions

ENGW 100: Literacy Inquiries. This course introduces students to the literacy skills, habits, and conventions necessary to succeed at college-level work. While offering students techniques and practices of invention, composition and revision, the course also teaches the students the historical and educational aspects of *literacy as a scholarly topic*. In addition, the course provides a rhetorical analysis of the CATW writing exam, develops a workable writing process for the exam, and provides many opportunities for students to practice taking and receiving feedback on the exam. Note that since fall of 2011, this course is offered only to SEEK students and EAP students.

ENG 101: Exploration and Authorship: An Inquiry-based Writing Course. This course introduces students to the skills, habits, and conventions necessary to prepare inquiry-based research for college. While offering students techniques and practices of invention and revision, this theme-based composition course teaches students the expectations of college-level research, academic devices for exploring ideas, and rhetorical strategies for completing investigative writing. Students prepare a sequence of prescribed assignments that culminate in a final research paper. These assignments provide small manageable task that explore the process of the normally overwhelming research paper. The course grade is based on the quality of revised writing in a final portfolio.

ENG 201: Disciplinary Investigations: Exploring Writing across the Disciplines. This course introduces students to the rhetorical characteristics and writing styles from across the disciplines. Instructors choose a single theme and provide students with reading and writing assignments which address the differing literacy conventions and processes of diverse fields. Students learn how to apply their accumulated repertoire of aptitudes and abilities to the writing situations presented to them from across the disciplines.

EAP 121: English for Academic Purposes. This high intermediate "content-based" ESOL course reviews sentence structure and works towards perfecting English paragraph composition. Students learn to draft simple narratives. Journals are required in response to all readings, which are carefully selected literary pieces on sociological topics. The course stresses grammar, reading, and writing skills development, using readings that emphasize sociological themes, situations, and terminology.

EAP 131: Advanced English for Academic Purposes. This course is the second and last in the English Department's ESOL sequence. It prepares students for ENG 100 and ENG 101 by

offering intensive instruction in grammar, reading, and writing skills development. The course incorporates readings with criminal justice themes and asks students to analyze them both orally and in writing. Students will progress from simple to more sophisticated narratives and ultimately write an argumentative essay.

Scheduling, Staffing, Enrollment and Placement

The writing program runs approximately 110 sections of writing each semester with 70-80 sections of ENG 101 and 20 – 30 sections of ENG 201 offered each fall. In the spring, the department offers 20-30 sections of ENG 101 and 60-70 sections of ENG 201. In addition, we run 8 sections of ENGW 100 and 7 sections of EAP 121 and 131 each academic year.

Approximately 80 percent of the courses in the writing program are taught by adjunct professors, with the remaining 20 percent taught by tenured, tenure track and full-time lecturer faculty.

Student enrollment for ENG 101 and ENG 201 is limited to 26 with a secondary cap of 27 students. In any given semester, 75 percent of these ENG courses run within 2 students of the cap. The sections with lower enrollment are often on off hours, such as Friday evening and Saturday morning. EAP and ENGW course enrollment is capped at 22, and fluctuates significantly from semester to semester.

The overwhelming majority of students begin the composition sequence with ENG 101. The only way to place directly into ENG 201 is with ENG 101 transfer credit. Placement into EAP courses is done by the Center for English Language Support (CELS). The director of CELS reviews the CUNY CATW exam of any designated ESL student and places students according to a review of this piece of writing.

Background History: Composition Course Sequence

In the fall of 2006, the English Department launched a new writing curriculum, which created a new sequence of composition courses at the college. As stated in the materials that detailed the new curriculum, there was a strong rationale for revising the existing courses. The new curriculum attempted to build a course sequence that:

- ❖ Serves a writing community largely comprised of English-as-second-language and English-as-second-dialect students who need extended periods of instruction and practice to master composition skills.
- ❖ Addresses the writing needs of a primarily sociologically and scientifically oriented (mission-related) curriculum, while still providing the rhetorical sensibilities for a well-rounded liberal arts undergraduate.
- ❖ Approaches writing as a means of analytical and organizational thinking rather than mere tabulation of information.
- ❖ Presents a scaffolded sequence of manageable, interrelated tasks.
- ❖ Emphasizes (and consistently reinforces) the habits, techniques, and strategies necessary to compose a college-level piece of writing.
- ❖ Introduces students to the cross-disciplinary aspects of writing, which teaches them how to apply their writing skills in a variety of academic and rhetorical writing situations.

In short, the new curriculum emphasized writing process, rhetoric, writing across the curriculum, scaffolded writing assignments that broke complex writing tasks into manageable pieces for the students, and inquiry-based writing. The new curriculum offered a stark alternative to the essay-based, literature focused, end-product oriented previous curriculum.

Prior to and during the first year of implementation, guidelines for the new curriculum were distributed to faculty and faculty development workshops were held to foster the development of the curriculum. The new curriculum was minimally assessed after the first year with the collection and analysis of a small sample of student portfolios and a review of portfolio cover letters by the writing program director. Faculty development workshops continued to be held each semester, so faculty could “grow into” the new curriculum and develop their own creative stamp on the “prescribed” but not dictated assignments. In these workshops faculty shared assignments, activities and classroom practices that fostered the goals of the new curriculum.

Background History: EAP Course Sequence

Designed by English department faculty member and nationally known ESL scholar Effie Cochran, the ESL course sequence features an ESL reading and writing curriculum based within academically themed courses (sociology and criminal justice). The theme-based approach provides these courses with college-level rigor and an academic context for the writing and reading work the students needed to accomplish. However, the courses were not designed as part of a cohesive writing program that helped students rehearse the specific assignments and skills they would need in their subsequent ENGW 100, ENG 101 and ENG 201. In addition, the current curriculum has been in place for more than 10 years, and has never been evaluated.

Three years ago the Writing Program Director worked with Kim Helmer, and other full-time and part-time EAP English faculty to revise certain aspects of the EAP curriculum to improve consistency within the courses and increase coherence between the EAP courses and the composition sequence that the EAP students would take after they finished EAP 131. Thus, the EAP 121 and 131 became portfolio driven courses with some common assignments and with an increased amount of assigned reflective writing, to prepare students for the meta-cognitive work of the ENG sequence.

Two years ago Kim Helmer undertook the first step of the EAP OA process by conducting a full-scale evaluation of the EAP program using a variety of methodologies. Her lengthy report was filed in the spring of 2011, and certainly represents the launch of a strong OA process for the EAP courses. The recommendations in the report are the ones that have been followed during the 2011-2012 academic year.

For Outcomes Assessment for EAP courses, please see Addendum A.

Freshmen Year Composition Program Outcomes Assessment Philosophy

It is imperative for a college-level writing program to have a stable, consistent curriculum for each course in the sequence, so that all students have a similar learning experience, regardless of the sections in which they are enrolled. Perhaps more importantly, a writing program should offer students coherence as they move from one course to another in the sequence, and as they face writing situations in courses outside of the writing program. We envision the OA process as a key component in achieving these two important objectives. OA work, when done well, should have a profound and ongoing classroom impact on student learning.

The overriding goals of the outcomes assessment plan for the writing program has been two-fold: to assess the success of the composition curriculum and to develop an ongoing OA protocol that directly influences classroom practice. We wanted the work we do in assessment to follow a process that facilitates curricular, pedagogic and programmatic evolution, rather than stifle such changes in favor of maintaining the status quo. Therefore, the OA committee believes that the assessment plan should be flexible, creative, open ended and responsive to faculty's goals and desire for information about particular classroom issues, structures or possibilities.

Since we view OA as intricately involved with curriculum development, it is imperative that as many writing faculty as possible be involved in the OA process. By including a large number of full and part-time faculty, the OA process has intrinsic benefits beyond the analysis of whether the program is meeting its learning objectives. When OA directly involves the faculty who teach the courses that are being assessed, their close work with the curriculum transfers directly to their work in the classroom.

The necessities of budget limit the volume of OA work that can be completed in a given year. Therefore, OA work should be focused on pressing concerns as determined by the faculty teaching the courses.

OA work should follow the standard practices in the field of writing program assessment, but it should also take into account the specific curriculum context of the program under study. Outcomes Assessment should not be a one-size fits all endeavor.

With these philosophical point sin mind, the OA committee agreed on the following general practice. Each academic year, the committee will stipulate target goals for the OA process, consider various research methods for each target, collect and evaluate data, institute changes to curriculum, pedagogy or programmatic practice based on the assessment, conduct faculty development to encourage the change in practice and assess the change to see if improvement has been made. Each year we will repeat this OA cycle, confirming the changes we have implemented and looking for additional ways to improve.

Foundations for Outcomes Assessment

For a number of reasons, we decided to focus our initial OA work on the ENG 101 and ENG 201 courses.

ENGW 100 was left out of our initial work because the college no longer admits a large group of students who need to take this course, which was designed for students who did not score high enough on the CUNY Assessment Test in Writing (CATW). The 100W course is offered for SEEK students and ESL students only. In the coming years, the course will undergo a curriculum revision aimed at reconfiguring it for the two disparate and overlapping groups that now take it. The faculty members who redesign this course will undertake Outcomes Assessment of the existing course as they develop ideas for the new course.

Initial OA work was done on EAP 121 and EAP 131 courses through the program evaluation completed by Professor Kim Helmer in 2010 and 2011. A separate OA committee chaired by Professor Helmer will develop a plan for EAP Outcomes Assessment in the 2012-2013 academic year. In the interim, as described below, limited OA work has been completed on the EAP curriculum. However, this OA committee decided that it was more imperative to focus on the ENG 101 and ENG 201 courses, where the overwhelming majority of students reside, and especially since the curriculum for these courses is only five years old and has never been fully evaluated. OA work on EAP courses

Initial OA Steps for ENG 101 and ENG 201.

In the spring of 2010, an outcomes assessment committee for the composition sequence was formed. The committee worked with full and part-time writing faculty to clarify the emphasis points of the ENGW100, ENG 101 and ENG 201 course sequence. The following eight concepts were culled and clarified from the original course materials and they represent the initial stage of developing learning outcomes for the composition sequence.

- ***Inquiry***, where students are asked to explore ideas rather than report information.
- ***Research*** focused projects, where students learn to find, evaluate, incorporate and cite sources in their written work.
- ***Writing processes***, where students learn and practice the writing process steps of low stakes writing, drafting, revision, editing and proofreading.
- ***Rhetoric***, where students learn how writing works and what writing moves to make in particular situations and contexts.
- ***Meta-Cognition***, where students learn to reflect on their own writing and the writing moves they make.
- ***Writing Across the Curriculum***, where students learn to write in a variety of contexts, situations, genres and disciplines.
- ***Sentence coherence and grammatical conventions***, where writers develop sentence level clarity and variety and understand and use the style and grammatical conventions of academic English.

It should be pointed out that all of the courses in the sequence emphasize these core concepts, but different courses accentuate particular ones.

Beginning in the fall semester of 2010, the Director of Writing Programs facilitated faculty development workshops for all writing faculty to design an outcome assessment program for ENG 101 and ENG 201. Five to seven workshops were used to study the curriculum, identify

and clearly state its specific learning objectives, and evaluate sample student writing from the ENG 101 and 201 courses using these objectives. The workshop participants then discussed possible target objectives for assessment and methodologies for assessing those targets.

The following writing program learning objectives were established from this work.

writing.

Writing Program Learning Objectives

Invention and Inquiry: Students learn to explore and develop their ideas and the ideas of others in a meaningful and complex way.

Awareness and Reflection: Students learn to metacognitively analyze their writing, to plan their writing tasks, to monitor their progress, and to adapt their writing methods as needed.

Writing Process: Students learn methods of composing, drafting, revising, editing and proofreading.

Sentence Fluency: Students learn to write clear, complete and correct sentences and use a variety of independent and dependent clause forms.

Conventions: Students learn to control language, grammatical structures, and punctuation necessary for academic

Rhetoric and Style: Students learn rhetorical and stylistic choices that are appropriate and advantageous to a variety of genres, audiences and contexts.

Claims and Evidence Students learn to develop logical and substantial claims, provide valid and coherent evidence for their claims and show why and how their evidence supports their claims.

Research: Students learn to conduct research (primary and secondary), evaluate research sources, integrate research to support their ideas, and cite sources appropriately.

After developing learning objectives, the OA committee then devised an ongoing OA plan as follows.

Writing Program Outcomes Assessment Plan

The John Jay College Writing Program will undertake the following three-pronged OA assessments for ENG 101 and ENG 201 each academic year.

Syllabus Review: This standard Outcomes Assessment methodology can be used to confirm basic consistency between sections of the same course. In addition, course tendencies can be determined, such as the amount and kinds of writing assignments and readings can be confirmed. Syllabus review can also be used to determine the amount of course coherence between different levels of the course sequence.

Syllabus Review Process: A sampling of sections of course syllabi, representing at least 20 percent of the faculty teaching the particular course in a given semester will be collected and evaluated using criteria-based coding. Criteria will change according to the target data a particular assessment is looking for, but an initial syllabus review should contain the following basic items for ENG 101.

- Learning Objectives Listed
- Learning Objectives Match Writing Program Objectives
- Prescribed Assignments listed
- Portfolio Midterm required
- Portfolio Final required
- Handbook required
- Amount of Reading Assigned (in pages)
- Explicit Grammar Instruction Listed

An initial syllabus review for ENG 201 should contain the following items

- Learning Objectives Listed
- Learning Objectives Match Writing Program Objectives
- Reading and Writing Assigned in the Disciplines
- Amount of Reading Assigned (in pages)
- Types of Writing Assignments
- Research Project Assigned
- Rhetorical Analysis Essay Assigned
- Portfolio Midterm required
- Portfolio Final required
- Handbook required
- Explicit Grammar Instruction Listed

Student Focus groups. The OA committee felt that it was crucial that student voices should be part of the OA process. Focus groups allow for extended commentary from students, more than survey responses could allow. Of course, the limitation of focus groups is the small sample size. Still, the committee felt it was worth trying out this methodology as student comments, even from a small sample size, could substantiate the conclusions from the other pilot studies. But most importantly, student focus groups would offer the opportunity for student voices to contribute to the direction of the writing program.

Student Focus Groups Process. At the end of each semester, students will be selected randomly from classes to participate in 4-6 student focus groups. The groups will be filmed and analyzed. Questions will be open ended and students will have a chance to provide feedback outside of the asked questions. The protocol will change based on the target of the assessment. However, some initial focused questions are presented below.

Fall semester, focus groups of ENG 101 students will be conducted using the following protocol.

How has this class helped your writing?

What have you learned about writing a college-level research paper?

What did you learn from building and writing about a portfolio?

How did this class prepare you for the reading and writing you have to do in other classes?

What could your class have done to help you more?

(targeted questions)

Spring semester focus groups of ENG 201 students will be conducted using the following protocol.

How has this class helped your writing?

What have you learned about writing a college-level research paper?

What did you learn from building and writing about a portfolio?

How did this class prepare you for the reading and writing you have to do in other classes?

What could your class have done to help you more?

(targeted questions)

Portfolio Evaluation. This is a standard evaluation tool for writing programs. Portfolios are evaluated using a rubric, which produces numerical scores in particular learning categories. Since our Composition courses require the students to produce a portfolio, it is natural that we should conduct a portfolio evaluation, rather than an evaluation of a single student paper. Portfolio evaluation offers a more comprehensive display of the learning objectives of the course. Portfolios can contain a variety of student writing, including low-stakes and in-process work. In addition, portfolios allow the evaluators to see the students' reflections on their own learning, thus revealing more about the courses than a single end product could show. However, the downside of portfolio evaluation is the increased time it takes to review a students' whole semester's work, rather than a single paper.

Portfolio Evaluation Process. Each semester, a portfolio evaluation will be completed by writing faculty using standard portfolio assessment practices. The rubric to be used for portfolio evaluation will be developed from the writing program learning objectives. At the end of each fall semester, portfolios will be randomly collected from ENG 101 courses totaling either 20 percent of student enrollment for the semester, or at least one portfolio from 20 percent of courses offered. In the spring semester, the same procedures will be followed for collection of portfolios from ENG 201 courses.

After the completion of all evaluations, and the submission of the annual OA report to the department, the composition committee, consisting of the writing program director and members of the OA committee will make curricular recommendations to all writing faculty for the coming academic year. These recommendations will be distributed in the form of a curriculum memo prior to the start of the semester. Fall semester faculty development workshops will be held to support and develop classroom practices that respond to the recommendations made in the curriculum memo.

After agreeing on a process, pilot work on outcomes assessment began in the fall of 2010.

Outcomes Assessment 2010-2011

Fall 2010 Pilot Syllabus Review of ENG 101.

In the fall of 2011, 18 syllabi were collected from faculty members teaching ENG 101, representing 41 percent of the sections taught in the semester.

Table 1 on the next page shows the objectives of the syllabus review in the left hand column and the results in the columns to the right.

Among the notable findings of the Fall 2010 ENG 101 syllabus review.

1. More than 90 percent of syllabi had learning objectives listed matched or somewhat matched the department objectives.
2. Only 80 percent of faculty had the prescribed assignments listed on their syllabus.
3. Only 80 percent of faculty required a portfolio for the course, a specific requirement for ENG 101.
4. About half of the syllabi had explicit grammar assignments or instruction listed.

Analysis of the findings.

There is a high percent of faculty meeting the curriculum objectives and assignment practices for the ENG 101 course; however, given that stated learning objectives and inclusion of eight prescribed assignments and a portfolio requirement are a pretty minimal standard of consistency, these percentages should be closer to 100 percent.

TABLE 1: SYLLABUS REVIEW FALL 2010

	Yes	No	Somewhat	Unclear/Not indicated
18				
Learning Objectives Listed	18	2		
Learning Objectives Match Writing Program Objectives	15	2	3	
Prescribed Assignments on Schedule	13	2	4	1
Portfolio Midterm Required	5	13		2
Portfolio Final Required	14	4		2
Handbook Required	18	2		
Amount of Reading Assigned (in pages)	0-50 [2]	51-100	100+ [3]	15
Explicit Grammar Instruction Listed	8	9	2	1

Spring 2011 Pilot Syllabus Review of ENG 201.

In the spring of 2011, 37 syllabi were collected from faculty members teaching ENG 201, representing 85 percent of the sections offered that semester.

Table 2 below shows the objectives of the syllabus review in the left hand column and the results in the columns to the right.

210 Syllabus Review Summary				
	Yes	No	Somewhat	Unclear/ Not indicated
Learning Objectives Listed	70%	30%		
Learning Objectives Matching Writing Program Objectives	32%	41%	27%	
Reading and Writing Assigned in the Disciplines	49%	30%	16%	5%
Research Project Assigned	67%	19%	3%	11%
Rhetorical Analysis Essay Assigned	22%	41%	3%	34%
Midterm Portfolio Submission Assigned	5%	89%	3%	3%
Final Portfolio Submission Assigned	38%	62%		
Handbook Required	65%	22%	8%	5%
Explicit Grammar or Sentence Work Assigned	18%	76%	3%	3%
Amount of Reading Assigned (in pages)	0-50	51-100	100+: 89%	11%
Types of Writing Assignments	"paper": 41%; journal: 30%; response paper: 30%; annot. biblio.: 14%; definition: 11%; field report: 11%; news article: 5%	Essays: comparative: 32%; analytical: 32%; narrative: 22%; diagnostic: 18%; argumentative: 16%; expository: 11%; descriptive: 5%	textual analysis, lit. review, interview, policy paper, poem, abstract, close reading, case study, film critique: 3% each	Unclear/ not indicated: 5%
Isabel Cuervo & Amanda Springs, Writing Fellows, 5/2011	37 TOTAL in this review	Missing from Spring 2011 faculty list: Warren, Purvis, Leamy & Schneider		

Among the notable findings of the Spring 2011 ENG 201 Syllabus Review.

1. Less than 60 percent of faculty listed learning objectives that matched or matched somewhat the writing program objectives.
2. 30 percent of faculty were not doing any reading and writing across the disciplines, a key learning objective for this course.
3. Only 38 percent of faculty were assigning a portfolio in ENG 201, though portfolio was a requirement for the course.

4. Few of the assignments listed in “types of assignments” replicate the kinds of assignments completed by the students in ENG 101. The sole exception is the requirement by 30 percent of the faculty to do an annotated bibliography, one of the prescribed assignments in ENG 101.
5. There is a wide range of “types of assignments” required by faculty in this course, varying from the generic “paper” to the specific film analysis.
6. Only 18 percent of syllabi mentioned sentence level or grammar level work as a formal or informal assignment.

Analysis of the findings.

These findings indicate that there are still some ENG 201 faculty that are not designing courses that meet the learning objectives and practices of the 201 course. In addition, there is a tremendous lack of consistency in the various sections of ENG 201 and a failure of faculty to make pedagogical and curricular connections between ENG 101 and ENG 201.

Pilot Student Focus Groups for ENG 201.

At the end of the spring semester, ENG 201 student focus groups were conducted by writing fellows Isabel Cuervo and Amanda Springs. There were 16 participants in three separate groups. The students were asked open-ended questions about their experience in ENG 201, and how their experience compared to ENG 101. Students were also asked specific questions about the relationship between ENG 101 and ENG 201.

A list of summarized responses is included as Addendum B. Below we list some of the comments made by more than one of the students in the focus groups.

Among the notable findings.

1) Amount of writing/kind of writing.

- Not much writing – emphasis is on reading & analyzing; want more writing in 101; want more writing intensive.
- Overall: learned a lot more about writing in 101 than in 201
- Learned formal academic writing
- Learned referencing & citation

2) Comparison of 101 and 201.

- “101 and 201 are building blocks for other classes”; “101 is like crawling”
- No relationship between 101 and 201.
- Professor variation (students noted how their courses were different from each other)

3) Writing Across the Curriculum focus.

- Learned about WID

- Applied writing structures in other classes

4) Suggestions.

- Improve development of ideas
- More creative control of content
- More grammar
- We learn more from peers' – more peer review wanted

Analysis.

1. The facilitators were amazed at the reflective abilities of these student responders. They were able to talk about writing in a serious and focused way. Of course the participants were volunteers, so these students were a self-selected group of “reflectors.”
2. The fact that students understood and learned from the WAC/WID focus of the course is a positive result that supports the focus of the course on writing and reading outside the Literature discipline.
3. The indication by the students that they learned more about writing in 101 than in 201, and that they felt 201 was perhaps too heavy on reading needs serious consideration by the committee. The concern expressed a number of different ways that the 201 course needs more writing and more learning about writing is troublesome. This finding seems to be supported by the syllabus review, which indicates that close to 90 percent of the courses assign more than 100 pages of reading, which may or may not be too much. In future syllabus reviews, we need to list more specific higher categories (100-200 pages; 200-300 pages) and beyond, to determine how much reading is the norm in ENG 201. Consideration of how to balance reading across the curriculum with writing across the curriculum in this course seems to be a primary concern.
4. The recognition by the participants that there was a lot of variation in their 201 courses is indicative of the inconsistency between course sections, and matches a finding from the syllabus review above. Finally, the fact that at least two respondents stated the strongly worded “no relationship” when asked about the connections between 101 and 201, and that other participants expressed a similar concern reinforces the committee’s concerns that faculty are not emphasizing course structures, assignments and learning objectives from one level of class to another.

Pilot Portfolio Evaluation of ENG 101 Fall 2010.

In the fall of 2010 we collected high medium and low sample portfolios from 12 ENG 101 courses (approximately 15 percent of sections offered). These portfolios were “digitized” and stripped of student and instructor identity. A pilot portfolio evaluation session was completed, using the Learning Objectives developed the previous year, which were placed in a rubric form with a five point open-ended scale. Goals for the pilot session included:

- To refine the logistics for portfolio evaluation sessions.

- To revise the wording of the learning objectives based on application to the portfolios.
- To norm faculty on how to do portfolio evaluation. These faculty will be the eventual readers for the ongoing portfolio assessment.
- To come to agreement on model low, medium and high portfolios to be used as benchmark portfolios in future sessions.
- To corroborate findings from the ENG 101 syllabus review.
- To begin to develop the curriculum map for ENG 101.

In a series of sessions, groups of faculty met to read and evaluate portfolios and to discuss what they learned from the process. Faculty read in groups of two or three. They read separately and then compared scores. When scores for a particular portfolio were in strong agreement (defined as no more than one point apart in any one category and no more than three points apart total on a rubric) that portfolio was set aside as benchmark portfolio. After completing the reading all faculty met for a focus group led by the writing program director who took notes on faculty commentary. From the notes of these sessions, the following points were made.

1. Learning objectives need to be revised to better indicate distinction in certain categories and definition in certain categories. Faculty readers were able to provide these changes.
2. Faculty repeatedly stated how they were surprised by how many of the portfolios were missing the prescribed assignments, and how many of the portfolios lacked a serious commitment to having the students do the metacognitive writing and process writing work that are two main components of the writing program curriculum. This finding seemed to contradict the results of the syllabus review that indicated that 90 percent of writing faculty listed the writing program learning objectives and 80 percent of syllabi had prescribed assignments listed.
3. In this short reading session, faculty members were unable to come to agreement on specific criteria for evaluation, making the development of a curriculum map not possible. Though there was plenty of discussion of what good research is, for example, there was plenty of disagreement as to how to delineate specific criteria for each rubric level.
4. Faculty were surprised by the variety of assignments, types of writing and difference between portfolios. While this was partly viewed as a good thing, a sign that faculty had a creative investment in the 101 course, some expressed concern that students were not learning the same things.

In addition to these faculty comments, the writing program director noted these things about the sessions.

1. The benchmark portfolios were established for high, medium and low portfolios in ENG 101. These portfolios are available on line, and so can be used for training new faculty and for faculty development.
2. Norming of faculty was ultimately successful, but proved very time consuming. More than half of the time allotted to evaluation was spent on norming.
3. The discussions between faculty after reading the portfolios were energetic and full of the sharing of teacher knowledge. There was an exchange of ideas about the course and how to teach it. In this way, these sessions acted as meaningful faculty development.

OA Conclusions 2010-2011.

From the results of all three pilot studies, it is apparent that there is a good degree of curriculum consistency among the sections of ENG 101 but much less consistency in ENG 201. In addition, too often the course curriculum fails to emphasize the learning objectives of the writing program. An example of this is the lack of reflective writing assignments in the 101 portfolios that were reviewed and the number of faculty who have failed to include reading and writing across the curriculum in the ENG 201 course. Though these and other findings are preliminary, curricular recommendations for ENG 101 and ENG 201 were made prior to the start of the 2011-2012 academic year to facilitate improvement in these areas. See Addendum C for the 2011-2012 Curriculum Memo.

Outcomes Assessment 2011-2012

With our processes established, the OA committee in composition was ready to take on a full-scale OA commitment in the academic year 2011-2012.

ENG 101 Syllabus Review Fall 2011. During the fall semester, a syllabus review was completed by writing fellow Alec Magnet. The review included syllabi from 75 percent of the sections offered. Table 3 below represents the findings.

TABLE 3

ENGLISH 101 SYLLABUS REVIEW FALL 2011				
Ratios	Yes	No	Somewhat	Unclear/Not indicated
Learning Objectives Listed	94%	4%	2%	
Learning Objectives Match Writing Program Objectives	27%	20%	53%	
Prescribed Assignments on Schedule	75%	6%	14%	6%
Portfolio Midterm Required	16%	84%		
Portfolio Final Required	94%	6%		
Handbook Required	88%	12%		
Library Training Scheduled	55%	45%		
Explicit Grammar Instruction Listed	31%	69%		
Writing Center workshops or tutoring explicitly required for all students	22%	78%		
	<i>5-10?</i>	<i>10-20?</i>	<i>20+</i>	unclear/not indicated
Amount of Writing Assigned (in pages)			2%	98%
	<i>0-75</i>	<i>76-150</i>	<i>150-250</i>	unclear/not indicated
Amount of Reading Assigned (in pages)	2%	4%	16%	78%
Indication of low stakes writing	69%			31%
				Explicitly mention journals: 35% Explicitly mention blog/Blackboard discussion: 20%

Among the notable findings of the Fall 2010 ENG 101 syllabus review.

1. 80 percent of syllabi had learning objectives listed that matched or somewhat matched the department objectives, a decrease of 10 percent from the previous year.
2. 89 percent of faculty had the prescribed assignments listed on their syllabus, an increase of 9 percent from the previous year.
3. 94 percent of faculty required a portfolio for the course, a specific requirement for ENG 101, an increase of 14 percent from the previous year.

4. Only 31 percent had explicit grammar assignments or instruction listed, a decrease of 19 percent from the previous year.
5. 22 percent of faculty require writing center visits by their students.

Analysis.

Despite the start of the semester curriculum memo and other reminders to faculty, the percent of faculty listing the program learning objectives decreased. This will be addressed in the coming academic year via email communication with faculty, as well as through the observation process.

The increased number of faculty assigning the portfolio and requiring the prescribed assignments is a positive outcome of this process that suggests that the 101 course is offering a consistent learning experience for students.

Just because faculty are not listing explicit sentence-level and grammar instruction, does not mean they are not doing any. However, as expressed by some members of the department it is imperative that composition faculty address these issues with clear and progressive instruction. Locating how sentence fluency and grammar is taught in our courses will require a different methodology. But, encouraging faculty members to explicitly state grammar instruction on their syllabi indicates its importance to students and to the development of the college-level writer. This issue will be addressed in the curriculum memo for this year.

Spring 2012 ENG 201 Syllabus Review. During the spring semester, a syllabus review was completed by writing fellow Alec Magnet. The review included randomly selected syllabi from 30 percent of 201 sections taught in Spring 2012. Table 4 below represents the findings.

TABLE 4

ENGLISH 201 SYLLABUS REVIEW SPRING 2012				
Ratios	Yes	No	Somewhat	Unclear/ Not indicated
Learning Objectives Listed	100%			
Learning Objectives Matching Writing Program Objectives	58%	23%	19%	
WRITING Assigned in the Disciplines	50%	8%	42%	
READING Assigned in the Disciplines	42%	27%	31%	
Research Project Assigned	73%	11%	8%	8%
Rhetorical Analysis Essay Assigned	70%	15%		15%
Midterm Portfolio Submission Assigned	8%	69%	23%	
Final Portfolio Submission Assigned	85%	15%		
Handbook Required	46%	54%		
	Exercises Assigned	Instruction Listed	Neither	
Explicit Grammar or Sentence Work	27%	31%	54%	
	All students	For revisions	If referred	mentioned
Writing Center Required?	23%	8%	23%	50%
	0-75	76-150	151+	unclear
Amount of Reading Assigned (in pages)	8%	35%	42%	15%
Types of Writing Assignments				

Among the notable findings of the Spring 2012 ENG 201 Syllabus Review.

1. 77 percent of faculty listed learning objectives that matched or matched somewhat the writing program objectives, an increase of 18 percent from the previous year.

2. 90 percent of faculty were doing some writing in the disciplines and 71 percent were doing asking students to read in the disciplines. These are more than 50 percent increases from the previous year.
3. 85 percent assigned a portfolio, a more than 45 percent increase from the previous year.
4. There was a marked increase in the number of syllabi that mentioned grammar or sentence-level work, with more than 80 percent explicitly mentioning this kind of work, up from 18 percent the previous year.
5. 70 percent of faculty assign the rhetorical analysis essay assignment, up from 25 percent the previous year.
6. 23 percent of faculty require visits to the writing center, and 50 percent at least mention the writing center on the syllabus.

Analysis.

The marked increase in the number of faculty listing the learning objectives, focusing on WAC/WID reading and writing and assigning the portfolio is a clear indication of increased attention to the course curriculum and an increased consistency in the 201 course, ensuring that students have a more common experience. The improvement can be traced to the curriculum memo, fall faculty workshops on 201 topics, and one-on-one mentoring of a select group of 201 faculty.

The OA committee was surprised at the tremendous increase in the number of faculty explicitly mentioning grammar and sentence level work on their syllabus (up from 21 percent to 51 percent). While the pre-academic year curriculum memo emphasized that grammar and sentence level work should not be ignored, mostly this stark uptick in the attention to grammar and sentence level work may be attributable to the excellent workshop offered by Les Hansen and Mark McBeth to writing and literature faculty. The workshop was offered once in the fall and again in the spring.

The increase in the number of faculty assigning the rhetorical analysis essay 70 percent, up 45 percent from the previous year) can be traced to a fall workshop offered on this assignment where faculty shared the different ways they assign rhetorical analysis. The ability of students to develop an understanding of rhetoric and apply their rhetorical analysis skills to a variety of genre and disciplines forms is a key component of the class. The rhetorical analysis essay assignment formalizes what had been an understated goal of the course. In the coming year, this assignment will be turned into the second prescribed assignment for ENG 201.

Both here in ENG 201, and in ENG 101 above, more faculty need to integrate a writing center presence into their syllabi.

ENG 101 Student Focus Groups. At the end of the fall semester, writing fellow Alec Magnet conducted three focus groups with a total of 14 students. This number is admittedly smaller than we would like. We consider this part of the OA process to still be in the pilot stage, as this was the first attempt to do these focus groups with 101 students. Even with the small sample size, we do believe the student voices provided valuable insight and critique of the 101 course. A full analysis of the three ½-hour videos tapes has yet to be completed. (When it is completed a full

analysis will be added to next year's report.) However, the tapes were scanned for answers to two particular issues of concern in ENG 101. As described in the rationale for student focus groups, above, one of the great advantages of this methodology so that it can be used to confirm issues and data points that show up in other evaluations, and it can also confirm from the students' own voices what the OA evaluators and Composition faculty report. The two points below derive from concerns raised in other OA data collection.

- 1) As has been mentioned throughout this report, one of the goals of this work is to increase the cohesion between courses in the composition sequence. Students should see 101 and 201, and their previous writing courses (ENGW100, EAP 121 and 131) if they took any, as part of a learning continuum. Concepts and even assignments should carry over from one level of learning to the next. Therefore, we wanted to see if, at the very end of the 101 course (the focus groups were conducted just prior to or after the last day of class) what the students knew about their upcoming 201 course. The tapes reveal that the students know very little about the 201 course. They were not aware, for example, they would be doing a portfolio again in 201, or that 201 would have a WAC focus. In this year's curriculum memo, ENG 101 faculty will be asked to explicitly talk with the students about ENG 201, and perhaps complete an activity or assignment that introduces the 201 course to them.
- 2) Another area of special interest to the committee was the research paper focus of ENG 101. From the ENG 101 portfolio evaluation, faculty evaluators were concerned that too many of the final assignments featured an information delivery focus of mainly scholarly articles, as opposed to the stated goal of the research project, an inquiry-based exploration of a research question using a variety of sources. The student focus group tapes were scanned for students' understanding of and feelings about the research project assignment. Students' respondents did feel that the scaffolded assignments helped them explore their research question. However, many reported that the emphasis on scholarly journal articles caused them to lose interest in the project as they neared the end of the semester. Two students felt that they had spent too much time looking for scholarly articles that supported their topic, and not enough time writing their paper. In subsequent focus groups, we will ask this question more directly to confirm the over-emphasis on the finding and using of scholarly journal articles in the research project.

ENG 201 Student Focus Groups. Due to lack of money and faculty to complete and evaluate the tapes, the student focus groups were not completed in the spring.

ENG 101 Portfolio Review.

Objectives of the Portfolio Review.

1. To determine the level of proficiency of ENG 101 students using the eight learning objective categories.
2. To compare the proficiency of traditional ENG 101 students to students in ENG 101 Learning Communities.
3. To corroborate findings from the ENG 101 syllabus review and student focus groups.
4. To begin to develop the curriculum map for ENG 101.

Sampling Method. At the end of the fall semester, 132 ENG 101 portfolios were randomly selected from ENG 101 courses. Portfolios were randomly taken from 55 out of 73 sections of ENG 101, or 75 percent. In order to create an equal student sample to complete the second objective above, five portfolios were taken from Learning Community courses and 2 portfolios from traditional ENG 101 courses, creating a sample of 51 Learning Community Portfolios and 81 from traditional ENG 101 courses. Portfolios were chosen at random and neither the faculty member nor the student knew that they would be chosen.

Evaluation Method. Portfolios were collected and numbered. Portfolios were randomly mixed to avoid more than all LC portfolios being read together, or all from the same course being read together. Faculty evaluators from the English Department were normed using low, medium and high benchmark portfolios, and completed the reading over three, 4-hour days. Many of these faculty had participated in the pilot portfolio reading the previous semester, where they had also undergone a norming process.

Faculty read and evaluated the portfolios using the learning objectives for the writing program, which had been reformatted into a rubric with a five-point scale of no proficiency; little proficiency; some proficiency; full proficiency, exceeds proficiency. Rubric is attached as Addendum D. If student work was missing from any portfolio, making it impossible to rate the portfolio in a particular category, faculty evaluators were asked to enter a “0” or “could not be evaluated” in that category. Faculty members were not allowed to evaluate their own student portfolios.

After initial scoring, three portfolios from each pile of 10 were read by a second reader to confirm the reliability of that pile. A pile was determined to be reliable as long as each category score was within one point of the initial score, and there were no more than a 3-point difference in the total score. If all three second-readings passed this test of inter-rater reliability, then the pile of 10 was certified as accurate. If, the second reading of the three portfolios fell outside the reliability criterion, the whole pile was read a second time and then a third reader (table leader) reviewed the entire pile. Any portfolio whose two readings fell outside of the acceptable range of difference was excluded from the study. In all 31 portfolios were excluded.

Statistical analysis of the resulting rubric scores was conducted by Christine Burbank of the Freshmen Year programs office. Her preliminary evaluation is charted below.

Table 5 below shows scores in all categories for all portfolios. There are 92 portfolios in the chart below because these figures do not include any portfolio that contained a “0” category, as described above.

TABLE 5: ENG 101 FALL 2011 PORTFOLIO EVALUATION

Invention and Inquiry	Awareness and Reflection	Writing Process	Claims and Evidence	Research	Rhetoric and Style	Sentence Fluency	Conventions
2.86	2.87	2.96	2.67	2.66	2.79	2.90	2.86

Analysis.

The scores range from a low of 2.66 to 2.96, meaning that in all categories, scores were just below “3” on the five-point scale. It should be noted that the rubric had been presented to faculty as a writing program rubric, not an ENG 101 rubric and faculty were normed to evaluate the student portfolios based on their overall quality, not purely as samples from ENG 101. In other words, the goal would be to have students reach full proficiency or scores of 4.0 or higher as they finish ENG 201. Viewed in this light, the scores do not seem as low as one might first assume.

Certainly, it is important that students are achieving at close to equivalent rates in all categories. If there was a large disparity in scores between categories, there would certainly be things to focus on. The two lowest scores, in research and claims and evidence, reflect anecdotal evidence from faculty commentary after they completed the evaluation session. Many mentioned how disappointed they were in the students’ ability to produce final research projects that made successful arguments using research. Though the standard error of mean is high enough in both of these categories (.73 in research and .85 in claims and evidence) to provide doubt that these category scores are indeed the lowest, there was a communal sense among the faculty evaluators that these were the weakest categories.

The final thing to take from these numbers is a close look at the sentence fluency (2.90) and conventions (2.86) categories. It is often assumed that John Jay students score very low in these areas. While these numbers may be skewed by the fact that the evaluators were John Jay faculty who are used to reading the work of John Jay students, it remains somewhat reassuring that these portfolios offer evidence that the almighty “grammar” issue is not as overriding a concern as some would predict.

Without comparative numbers from a similar evaluation of student work done prior to these students entrance into ENG 101, it is impossible to say what the “value added” of the ENG 101 learning experience for these students. Certainly, as we move forward and complete portfolio evaluations of ENG 201 students using the same rubric, we should be able to show value there. Once we have a second year of data for ENG 101 students, we will be able to say more about whether the curricular changes we are enacting are benefitting the students.

COMPARISON OF LC AND TRADITIONAL ENG 101

Table 6A and Table 6B on the following page provide a comparison of portfolios from traditional ENG 101 courses with those from Learning Communities. The hypothesis was that we would see the LC scores rate higher, as the students in the LCs have the benefit of smaller class size, increased faculty presence, extra-curricular activities such as the Student Showcase etc. We especially thought we would see LC students score higher in the Claims and Evidence and Research categories.

Analysis.

Though these tables indicate that LC students' mean scores were higher than the traditional 101 course students in all categories, the independent t-test, which is conducted to determine the significance of the results, showed that the difference was only significant in the category of Conventions (.015) and approaching significance in the Research category (.142). Therefore, the indicated benefits of LC courses in all of the other categories were deemed insignificant. For Conventions, faculty and program administrators cannot think of any reason why LC students would have scored higher than non-LC students. In future assessments, we will look to corroborate these findings to determine their importance. Regarding the Research category, though the LC score approaches significance, further study needs to be done to confirm its significance.

Though this statistical analysis reveals only slight significant and insignificant differences between measured outcomes of the two courses, this result may have been obtained because of a poorly designed study, rather than a true absence of difference. Standard assessment practice was not followed in two specific ways: the evaluation rubric did not have criteria listed for each gradient score. Such criteria would come from the development of the curriculum map that we do not have in place yet. In addition, for reasons of practicality and budget, we did not use a standard inter-rater reliability model, where each portfolio would have been read by two readers. This casts some doubt on these assessment results. As part of next year's OA plan for ENG 101, a more focused assessment will be developed to determine if participation in Learning Community courses offer students an academic/literacy benefit.

TABLE 6A Fall 2011 Portfolio Evaluation **Traditional 101 Courses**

		Statistics								
		Invention&Inquiry	Awareness&Refle ction	WritingProcess	Claims&Evidence	Research	Rhetoric&Style	SentenceFluency	Conventions	
N	Valid	57	57	57	57	57	57	57	57	
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Mean		2.81	2.82	2.95	2.63	2.58	2.75	2.84	2.70	
Std. Error of Mean		.092	.109	.110	.105	.087	.104	.103	.090	
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	
Std. Deviation		.693	.826	.833	.794	.653	.786	.774	.680	
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Maximum		4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	
Sum		160	161	168	150	147	157	162	154	

TABLE 6B: Fall 2011 ENG 101 Portfolio Evaluation **Learning Community Courses**

		Statistics								
		Invention& Inquiry	Awareness& Reflection	WritingProcess	Claims& Evidence	Research	Rhetoric& Style	Sentence Fluency	Conventions	
N	Valid	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Mean		2.94	2.94	2.97	2.74	2.80	2.86	3.00	3.11	
Std. Error of Mean		.158	.158	.171	.144	.128	.131	.153	.152	
Median		3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	
Std. Deviation		.938	.938	1.014	.852	.759	.772	.907	.900	
Minimum		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	
Maximum		5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	
Sum		103	103	104	96	98	100	105	109	

2011-2012 Conclusions

From the findings of the 2011-2012 OA findings, a curriculum memo will be developed and provided to ENG 101 and ENG 201 faculty that will clearly state major findings of our OA work this year and provide faculty with concrete curricular, pedagogical and programmatic changes related to the findings. In addition, as was done last year, faculty development workshops will be held to reinforce these practices.

ADDENDUM A

EAP Program Outcomes Assessment Report Academic Year 2011-2012

Four workshops were held with EAP faculty in the spring of 2012, totaling 24 hours. The goal of the workshops was to begin the implementation of recommendations made in the Spring 2011 EAP Program review submitted by English Department faculty member Kim Helmer.

- 1) Adjunct and full-time faculty met to work out new learning objectives. After rejecting the use of the learning objectives from the portfolio rubric as being too reductive and too writing focused, faculty agreed to design objectives according to the four learning domains of speaking, listening, reading and writing. It was pointed out by the faculty that focus on these four areas was standard practice in the ESL field and better represented the needs of John Jay ESL students. It was also pointed out that all teachers in EAP 121/131 and ENGW 100 NNES were already focused on these four domains.

Various sets of learning objectives were consulted, including TESOL, the American Association of Intensive English Programs, NCTE and the LaGuardia Community College ESL Program. A new set of learning objectives were developed and accepted by faculty attending the workshop sections. It was agreed that these objectives would be reviewed and modified at the end of academic year 2012-13. The new learning objectives are attached as to this report.

- 2) Another finding of the EAP program evaluation report suggested that currently EAP courses were just that, separate courses with little programmatic support linked to class content and little extra-curricular supports for this vulnerable population of students. The report recommended a better more integrated relationship with the Freshmen Year Experience (FYE) office. During the four workshops with faculty, FYE staff presented learning outcomes and possible co-curricular programs related to academic and personal development. The initiatives would include field trips, faculty-student lunches, peer mentors, and participation in the student showcase. Faculty agreed to develop these program initiatives and to include additional learning objectives related to these programs, thus all EAP courses and ENG 100W courses will now have the Freshmen Year Seminar designation. The FYS Learning Objectives are included on the course learning objectives (Addendum E).
- 3) A third recommendation of the EAP program review suggested that the curriculum and instructional relationship between the Center for English Language Support and the EAP faculty needed to be strengthened. CELS director Christopher Davis

attended all of the EAP workshop sessions and was able to integrate the CELS perspective on all of the discussions. In addition, CELS instructors were invited to the last of the four EAP workshops. This face-to-face meeting created an opportunity for the crossover of instructional ideas and the development of better communication lines between EAP faculty and CELS instructors. A number of initiatives were put forth, including the redesigning of how the required CELS tutoring sessions would be used, and the establishment of course folders for all EAP class sections in CELS, so that instructors would have access to all course materials.

In the fall of 2012, the EAP OA Committee (separate from the Composition Committee) will devise an OA plan for academic year 2011-2012.

**ENGLISH FOR ACADEMIC PURPOSES (EAP)
LEARNING OBJECTIVES FOR EAP 121, EAP131 AND ENGW 100**

A) READING

Students understand, respond to, and interrelate college-level readings in a variety of genres.

1. Students learn pre-reading strategies to predict content
2. Students learn academic vocabulary
3. Students learn to locate, summarize and discuss main ideas and themes in readings
4. Students can identify, locate and discuss the rhetorical moves (such as organization, tone etc.)
5. Students learn to engage with ideas presented within readings and relate these ideas to their own experience, other readings and academic contexts

B) WRITING

Students compose a variety of writing projects in various contexts for particular audiences and purposes.

1. Students learn to generate ideas that express thematic course content and advance logical arguments.
2. Students learn to compose, draft, revise, and proofread over a number of drafts.
3. Students learn to illustrate claims with specific and concrete evidence, including the productive use and synthesis of outside texts and/or personal experience. Explains how and why evidence supports ideas.
4. Students learn to follow a clear structure and demonstrates an ability to organize ideas into a cohesive, progressive argument.
5. Students learn to write using clear syntax, appropriate vocabulary and using stable sentences with a variety of sentence structures.
6. Students learn to use grammatical forms accurately and for appropriate contexts.

C) LISTENING AND SPEAKING

Students comprehend and participate in aural discourse in a variety of social and academic settings for a variety of purposes.

1. Students learn the situational context of a speech act
2. Students learn to use academic vocabulary in discussion and group work
3. Students learn to discuss the academic work of the class in group work and responding to the whole class
4. Students learn to communicate effectively with classmates and teachers;
5. Students learn to conduct presentations and speeches in class;
6. Engaging with ideas presented in lectures and through discussion by responding in writing, speech, or projects.

D) METACOGNITIVE UNDERSTANDING AND PRACTICE

Students demonstrate self-awareness and strategies for improving reading, writing, listening and speaking.

E) ACADEMIC AND PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT

Students demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to understand their own academic context, to enact clear goals for learning and personal growth and to seek out and utilize the John Jay services and peer interaction to fulfill these goals.

1. **Academic planning:** Students will articulate academic goals for the first year, identify appropriate resources and formulate/ monitor a plan to work toward those goals.
2. **Self-awareness:** Students will identify areas of academic/social/personal interest/development and pursue appropriate John Jay resources/support.
3. **Collaboration:** Students will learn to successfully collaborate with peers from diverse backgrounds inside and outside the classroom.

ADDENDUM B

ENG 201 Focus group summary
Amanda Springs & Isabel Cuervo
5.20.11

Key: Items in **bold** were indicated by more than one student.

- How has 201 helped your writing?
 - High school writing incorrect (college level writing is distinct from high school level writing)
 - Different kinds of outlines
 - They Say I Say book good (organizing writing – templates help to focus content)
 - Professor feedback (good)
 - **Referencing & citation**
 - **Not much writing – emphasis is on reading & analyzing (more writing in 101; want more writing intensive)**
 - Grammar helped
 - **Learned about WID**
 - Theme was informative

- How did 201 relate to 101?
 - **No relation (101 was better due to overall theme)**
 - 101 was not challenging & 201 taught scholarly writing
 - In 101 had control over content
 - Didn't like overall theme in 201
 - Had control over content in 201
 - Learned to structure writing
 - Both classes – control over content
 - ISP & LC's were more writing intensive
 - Too easy (too much like high school)
 - **Professor variation**
 - Improved upon skills learned in 101
 - **Overall: learned a lot more about writing in 101 than in 201**

- 201 preparation for reading & writing in other classes
 - **Like WID writing (applied writing structures in other classes)**
 - Did not learn how to apply writing skills
 - **Learned formal academic writing**
 - **“101 and 201 are building blocks for other classes”; “101 is like crawling”**
 - Other lower level classes are not research or writing based; will take those kinds of classes later
 - Helps increase “reading stamina”
 - **Referencing & citation**

- Learned about audience & thesis
- What have you learned about writing a college-level research paper?
 - **Nothing (not assigned) - Focused on different disciplinary writing**
 - Research papers can be based on student's primary research
 - Have to conduct research prior to beginning of writing
 - Importance of avoiding plagiarism
 - Different citation styles
 - **References have to be scholarly**
 - "Patience & Fortitude" required to write a research paper
 - Integration of sources to support student's idea(s)
 - **Boring, long**
 - Thoroughness, specificity, definition of terms
- What did you learn from creating a portfolio?
 - Not much ("throw them in a folder")
 - **Yes - allows student to see his/ her growth (guided revision, reflection letter & peer review); [Note: this did not excite them]**
 - A way to be able to challenge grades if necessary
- Any other suggestions?
 - Theme: 'superheroes & ethics'
 - **Improve development of ideas**
 - **More creative control of content**
 - **More grammar**, vocabulary, rhetorical structures in a separate course
 - English placement test so that students can be at similar levels
 - Want more student-centered learning
 - **'We learn more from peers' - more peer review wanted**
 - Should be allowed to bring work from other classes (esp. in 201)
 - More extracurricular academic experiences such as lectures.
 - Guest speakers in 201 because interested in alternate perspectives
- Other – Writing Center
 - Criticized Writing Center; didn't like that some professors required a visit
 - Extend Writing Center hours

ADDENDUM C

ENG 101 and 201 Curriculum Changes for Academic Year 2011-2012

As you all know, in fall 2010 and spring 2011, we conducted outcomes assessment measures on the courses in the writing sequence. Many of you participated in this work via the faculty development workshops. Though the results from this work are preliminary, the data clearly indicates that certain changes to the curriculum and program are needed for the coming academic year.

Please see the attached recommendations/requirements for English 101 and 201, and take the time to read them and incorporate the changes into your courses. I realize that these requirements and recommendations are arriving a little later in the summer than I promised. However, I ask that you make every effort to incorporate them for the fall semester 2011 courses and continue thereafter. Requirements are just that—required. Recommendations are strongly advised, and will be required in the spring 2012 semester.

Our outcomes assessment work will continue this academic year, and we hope that you will continue to be involved. Changes to the writing program will be ongoing as each year's OA work shows us where improvements and refinements are needed. Please continue to talk with me directly or via email should you have any comments, concerns or happy news to report about these changes, the writing program in general, the curriculum and/or your students.

As always, thank you for your smart, professional and challenging work with our students, and for your contribution to John Jay College overall.

FINDING: STUDENTS DO NOT SEE A CONNECTION BETWEEN 101 AND 201 COURSES

1. REQUIREMENT. ***Learning Objectives should be listed on every course syllabus.*** Learning Objectives for ENG 101 and ENG 201 should mimic or directly relate to the John Jay Writing Program objectives. See attached for these objectives. (Additional objectives may be added to the program objectives if you wish.)
2. REQUIREMENT/RECOMMENDATION. ***101 portfolios must be returned to the students at the end of the semester.*** We realize this may force you to collect the portfolios earlier than you have in the past. However, it is essential that students receive their portfolios back from you with your comment and recommendations for improvement. **It is recommended that you use the program rubric (see attached) to evaluate the final portfolio.** This recommendation may soon become a requirement. The rubric is merely a chart version of the program learning objectives. See attached.
3. REQUIREMENT. **Beginning in spring 201, there will be one prescribed assignment for ENG 201: a rhetorical analysis of student portfolios from ENG 101.** This curriculum change will be discussed during fall faculty workshops and model assignments will be developed and shared.
4. REQUIREMENT. ***All faculty that teach ENG 201 are required to submit themed course descriptions to the department by October 1.*** If you want to be considered for a 201 course in the spring, you must submit a one-paragraph description of your course theme, so that we can make students aware of the themed courses prior to registration. Be sure that your course theme emphasizes that your 201 course is a writing and rhetoric course not just a topics course on the theme.

FINDING: LACK OF COHESIVENESS WITHIN THE SAME COURSE TAUGHT BY DIFFERENT FACULTY

FINDING: LACK OF ATTENTION TO WRITING PROGRAM CURRICULAR OBJECTIVES

1. REQUIREMENT. ***ENG 201 students must complete a writing portfolio as part of the course requirements.*** As with ENG 101, ENG 201 portfolios must be returned to students with evaluation and commentary before the end of the semester.
2. REQUIREMENT. ***All ENG 101 prescribed assignments must be included in the portfolios.*** Every 101 course must include all prescribed assignments. We realize that many of you have developed fabulously creative and effective versions of these assignments. These instructor-enhanced versions are exactly what we wanted to happen. However, each version of a prescribed assignment should fulfill the basic idea of the prescribed assignment and should use the prescribed assignment terminology. For example, your version of the scripted interview should still be called a scripted interview.
3. RECOMMENDATION. ***Increase the number and variety of low stakes and assignments in the portfolio.*** Portfolios need to include samples of student writing that show the drafting stages of the prescribed assignments. In addition, portfolios should include informal assignments that are not part of the prescribed

assignments. Inclusion of these assignments fulfills the “process writing’ learning objective of the course. Faculty workshops in the fall will focus on how to develop these kinds of assignments.

4. RECOMMENDATION. **Increase the number and variety of reflective writing assignments in the portfolio.** Students should be asked to reflect on their writing and learning through a number of assignments during the semester, not just in the prescribed end-of-semester reflective letter. Faculty workshops in the fall will focus on developing these kinds of assignments.
5. RECOMMENDATION. **All ENG 101 and 201 curriculum needs to include demonstrated attention to sentence-level instruction.** This attention should be revealed through specific assignments or editing work on student drafts in the portfolio. Developing instructional methods, classroom activities, and writing assignments that work on sentence-level issues will be the subject of future faculty development workshops.
6. REQUIREMENT/RECOMMENDATION. **Your final exam period is a required meeting time for you and your students.** We understand that you may not be offering a traditional final exam in these courses. But the minimum requirement is that you are available during the final exam period for consultation with students. More effective ways to use the final exam period: return your portfolios; have students write their final reflection as a final exam; meet with each student for five minutes or particular students for a longer period of time; have a “read-around” where students read from their work; or administer a final exam where students have to demonstrate their writing and rhetoric knowledge.

FINDING: WEAK AND STRUGGLING WRITERS ARE NOT IDENTIFIED EARLY ENOUGH IN THE SEMESTER AND THEY DO NOT MAKE ENOUGH USE OF OUTSIDE THE CLASSROOM SERVICES

REQUIREMENT. All ENG 101 and 201 faculty are required to complete an in-class 30-minute writing diagnostic assignment within the first two class-meetings of a course. Using the diagnostic and other early writing assignments identify 1-3 students as your weakest writers in each course you are teaching. Please list the names, email addresses, and last 4 digits of the SS# for each identified student on a single sheet of paper with your name and course /section. (Do separate sheets for each course you are teaching.) Submit these to Tim McCormack’s mailbox no later than the last day of the second week of class (Thursday Sept. 8, 2011 5 P.M.) These students will be contacted by the Writing Center and asked to come in for an appointment. The writing center will notify you of those students who fulfill their appointment. As always, you may require additional appointments for these or any of your students. Note: One good way good to incorporate the diagnostic is to spend some time introducing your course theme through dialogue, short readings or group work. Then give the students a single open-ended prompt. The kind and length of writing they do is entirely up to you, but they should have at least 30 minutes to write.

ADDENDUM D

Portfolio number _____

Revised 06/01/11

**John Jay College Writing Program
Portfolio Evaluation**

	5 Exceeds Proficiency	4 Full Proficiency	3 Some Proficiency	1 Little Proficiency	1 No Proficiency	0 No Evidence of Proficiency
Invention and Inquiry Students learn to explore and develop their ideas and the ideas of others in a thorough, meaningful and complex way.						
Awareness and Reflection Students learn to reflect on their own writing and learning and increase their understanding of who they are as writers and learners.						
Writing Process Students learn methods of composing, drafting, revising, editing and proofreading.						
Sentence Fluency Students learn to write clear, complete and correct sentences and use a variety of complex and compound sentence types.						

	5 Exceeds Proficiency	4 Full Proficiency	3 Some Proficiency	1 Little Proficiency	0 No Evidence of Proficiency
Conventions Students learn to control language, linguistic structures, and punctuation necessary for diverse literary and academic writing contexts.					
Rhetoric and Style Students learn rhetorical and stylistic choices that are appropriate and advantageous to a variety of genres, audiences and contexts.					
Claims and Evidence Students learn to develop logical and substantial claims, provide valid and coherent evidence for their claims and show why and how their evidence supports their claims.					
Research Students learn to conduct research (primary and secondary), evaluate research sources, integrate research to support their ideas, and cite sources appropriately.					

