

# Report of The Task-Force on First-Year Composition at Baruch College 2007-2008

## *Preface*

We would like to extend our appreciation to Myrna Chase, former Dean of the Weissman School of Arts and Sciences; Dennis Slavin, Associate Provost of Baruch College; and Judith Summerfield, University Dean for Undergraduate Education—all of whose support of Baruch's College's proposal for funding from CUNY's CUE (Coordinated Undergraduate Education) Grant has made our work possible. Under Dean Summerfield's sponsorship, CUE has been linked to General Education, and we set about our charge in the belief that English composition courses be viewed as General Education, rather than as basic skills. In this report, we will reaffirm that belief. Our suggestions seek to ratify it.

## *Overview*

Because the goals of first-year writing programs have evolved from teaching literary criticism and interpretation to preparing students for multifarious writing tasks across the curriculum and in their professional lives, we began our work by surveying some of the major programs across the country. We discovered several different models. Some colleges choose to separate entirely a Writing Program from the English Department, staffing freshman writing with adjunct, often graduate-student teachers; some link freshman writing classes, generally taught by adjunct teachers, with specially conceived content courses taught by full-time faculty; some fold writing instruction into content courses taught by faculty in the disciplines. (See Appendix 1 for a more thorough overview of these models.)

To enhance student writing ability, we suggest that Baruch pursue a twofold strategy: increase the amount of writing required in both regular course offerings and (especially) in communication-intensive courses and raise the prestige of writing as an academic subject and practice. Toward both ends, we need to modify somewhat the content and form of ENG 2100 and 2150.

Rather than pursuing radical changes, the Task Force is urging a number of smaller—but nonetheless significant—restructurings of Baruch's freshman composition program. Continuing as unchanged will be the program's position in the English Department and its structure of two four-hour courses that are intended to be taken in consecutive semesters. Furthermore, we acknowledge that the writing sections will, for the foreseeable future, be taught by both full-time and adjunct faculty, though we actively are striving to diminish the percentage of teaching done by part-time adjunct professors.

The changes we propose, which are outlined below, attempt to do the following:

- redistribute certain tasks from Writing I to Writing II
- encourage more full-time faculty to teach freshman composition on a regular basis
- introduce greater coherence in content, grading, and mastery of skills

The body of this report suggests ways of re-organizing Writing I and Writing II. While we do not urge lockstep uniformity or a shared syllabus, we recommend that the many writing course sections offered share grading standards, educational methods, and learning goals. This report also defines first-year composition as a component of General Education courses with serious intellectual content.

***Tracking and Assessment: informing the changes recommended below***

Baruch students are required to take two writing classes (ENG 2100 and 2150). Some students, particularly those whose first language is not English, lack the background to succeed in these courses. In the past several semesters, the English Department has developed two intensive parallel courses (2100T and 2150T) designed to strengthen the writing ability and reading comprehension of those students. Taught by experienced ESL instructors, T sections provide two additional hours per week of class contact time with students, and as students proceed through the sequence, the support provided tapers so as to promote increasing independence and competence. Students are placed in ENG 2100T based on ACT scores and a short writing sample; ENG 2150T placement is through teacher recommendation and student choice. We recognize that the learning goals and overall level of the T sections are and should be congruent to the non-T sections; accordingly, we refer to 2100 and 2150 with the understanding that we are also describing the T sections. A preliminary assessment of these courses has been conducted to provide base line data to enhance the development of coordinated standards and curriculum. (See Appendix 2)

In revising course content for ENG 2100 and 2150, we have considered the results of pilot assessments of these courses undertaken in Spring and Fall 2007. These assessments, the first of which has been presented to the Weissman School Curriculum Committee, suggest that students make good progress in organizing arguments and providing evidence for those arguments in the course of each semester of instruction. Difficulties with grammar and idiom prove, not surprisingly, to be less amenable to short-term improvement. The members of the Task Force hope that the revisions it recommends will strengthen student performance in these areas as well. (See Appendix 3)

***Recommended revision of course content and descriptions: Writing I and Writing II***

- I. Nature of Required Reading
- II. Writing Assignments and the Assignment of Research Paper
- III. Possibilities for thematic focus through Learning Community pairs and individual courses

The Task Force recommends that the range of reading be broadened, allowing for the use of imaginative literature in both Writing I and Writing II; and that the “research paper” be scaled back to one or more papers requiring the use and proper documentation of external sources.

To increase coherence in the readings selected for individual classes, the Task Force encourages the English department to announce—well in advance of the semester

—the thematic content of Writing I and Writing II courses. Students with interest in a particular theme will therefore be able to choose a writing course centered on it. In selecting their themes, we encourage faculty to collaborate with their teaching partners in Learning Community units.

## I. Nature of Required Reading

- A. Required reading in English 2100 and English 2150, in keeping with the philosophy informing General Education, should allow for student engagement with ideas and issues that present opportunities for argument and evaluation.
- B. For English 2100, reading assignments should be of a moderate length (averaging approximately 20 pages per week). Readings should cover more than one genre and should include but not be limited to essays, articles, poetry, and short fiction.
- C. For English 2150, reading assignments can be slightly more extensive than for English 2100, but should still take into account the centrality to the course of writing, rather than reading (suggested average: approximately 30 pages per week). Readings should cover at least three genres, including fiction, essays, articles, poetry, and drama.
- D. Readings for both English 2100 and English 2150 should be selected with an eye towards accessibility and relation to students' interest. Theoretical texts should be used judiciously, with a clear pedagogical purpose in mind.

## II. Writing Assignments/Research Paper

- A. A range of writing assignments, most of which build on or relate to one another, should be assigned to students in both English 2100 and English 2150. These include formal writing assignments, pre-draft assignments, informal writing assignments, and freewriting assignments.
  - i. Formal writing assignments ask students to write an essay that presents an original and persuasive argument; is well organized both in sentence and paragraph structure; uses effectively evidence from other text to corroborate points; and adheres to standard grammatical principles. Formal writing assignments are letter graded with a written, and often oral, response from the instructor. Revision will be taught as crucial in the process of writing a formal essay.

The parameters of formal writing are as follows:

- a) Formal writing assignments should account for between twelve and seventeen pages of writing (3,500-5,000 words), distributed among three and five papers, every semester.
  - b) Some of the formal writing assignments in ENG 2100 and at least half of the writing assignments in ENG 2150 should involve more than one source.
- ii. Informal or low-stakes writing assignments involve a diverse range of writing styles. These include, but are not limited to, creative writing, personal essay, diary or journal entries, letters, personal responses to reading assignments and/or class discussion. Informal writing assignments require some response from the instructor, but these responses are less normative and detailed than those provided on formal writing assignments.

The parameters of informal writing:

Informal writing assignments should account for between twelve and seventeen pages of writing (3,500-5,000 words), spread out over six to eight assignments, every semester.

- iii. Freewriting assignments are short, timed, unevaluated exercises in writing. Students should be encouraged to practice freewriting as a means to generate thinking for more formal writing assignments. These are typically shared, orally, in class, and hence provide an opportunity for developing students' presentation skills. Freewriting exercises should be introduced at least one to three times as an in-class exercise and can be used effectively in the vast majority of class meetings.

B. Grammar instruction should be issue-or problem-oriented. Instructors should teach grammar in the classroom when multiple students struggle with the same problem. Individuals who need extra help correcting grammar mistakes should meet for a conference with the instructor of the course, who may prescribe further work with a writing center consultant or a SACC peer tutor. Students can also be encouraged to take advantage of online writing and grammar sites, such as the ones associated with the writing handbook (see Appendix 4). Tutorials for using these sites effectively, both for students and instructors, are available. Instructors are advised to require students who have difficulties with fundamental issues of grammar and usage to re-submit a paragraph or portion of an essay that reflects correct grammar usage. The ESL or "T" sections of these courses will focus on language-learner-specific grammatical, idiomatic, and vocabulary difficulties, with the aim of introducing students to more sophisticated levels in each area. Students should learn how to identify their principal problems and how to research for themselves some methods to revise. Teachers should flag and identify ESL-specific areas but should not "give" the right answers.

- III. Possibilities for thematic focus through Learning Community pairs and in theme-centered courses
- A. Because courses with a specific theme provide a deeper and wider context for a subject, they help students achieve greater complexity and nuance in their papers.
  - B. Courses with a thematic focus teach students a subject area while covering the principles of academic writing.
  - C. By picking themes that they are familiar with and interested in, a greater range of faculty are likely to participate in first-year composition program instruction.
  - D. Themes should be published in advance, enabling students to sign up for a section that interests them. Doing so alleviates some of the sense of restriction associated with a required course by granting the student a sense of agency and generating a genuine sense of interest.

### *Revised Learning Goals*

The Task Force wants to emphasize continuity in the ENG 2100-2150 sequence: both are writing courses, and both will teach many of the same skills, skills that need to be worked on and practiced consistently before improvement can take place. Accordingly, we recommend a revision of the existing learning goals (see Appendix 5). All the goals we mention here, then, are appropriate on a continuum, which is to say that all goals should be striven for in both classes, but in the second course, 2150, we expect a greater complexity of thought from students and a firmer mastery of fundamentals.

#### Proposed Unified Learning Goals for English 2100 and 2150

- **Reading:** Ability to read a variety of articles and essays, identify their key points, and subject them to logical analysis.
- **Process:** Ability to understand writing as a process requiring the outlining of ideas, multiple drafting, and revision of complete essays.
- **Argument:** Ability to create an original and cogent thesis and to develop an imaginative argument in unified and coherent paragraphs.
- **Mechanics, usage, and style:** Ability to observe sentence boundaries, to use correct punctuation, to use a variety of sentence structures, and ultimately to observe the conventions of standard English grammar and usage.
- **Understanding:** Ability to recognize different genres of writing and to comprehend and use appropriate vocabulary in interpreting what one has read by paying close attention to language and style.
- **Research and Plagiarism:** Ability to identify, analyze, and synthesize multiple sources as support for written arguments and to understand what constitutes plagiarism and why that is unacceptable in the research process.

- **Audience:** Ability to imagine the needs of one's reader when writing in different rhetorical modes and social contexts and to take audience and occasion into account when writing.

### ***Recommended assignments to advance Learning Goals***

Each instructor of ENG 2100 and 2150 will receive a looseleaf notebook in which are compiled a series of documents to enhance, enrich, and inform classroom practice. Sample syllabi, model assignments to advance learning goals, and advice about helping first-year students acclimate themselves to college will be included. A required faculty development session will be held before the start of each semester to review and discuss these materials. A series of faculty development meetings devoted to topics like creating a course, establishing a rubric, teaching the argument, leading discussion about poetry, or explaining a difficult grammatical issue will provide further opportunities for instructors to learn from each other and achieve greater coherence in the conduct of the many sections of ENG 2100 and 2150.

In addition, since both writing courses are freshman level, we need to work in a concerted manner to teach students how to succeed at being college students. Since many Baruch students live at home and commute, just as they had done for many years prior to attending college, many fail to make a distinction between high school and college. Part of our job in teaching the freshman composition sequence, then, will be to educate students about that difference.

By the time students have finished ENG 2100, they should be able to write an essay and be familiar with research methods. By the conclusion of ENG 2150, they should be able to deal with more complex issues and write a research-based argument using multiple sources and employing a more sophisticated critical model.

### ***After the First-Year Composition Sequence***

- I. Writing Beyond English 2100 and English 2150
- II. Faculty Development

- I. Writing Beyond English 2100 and English 2150

Ensuring continuity of writing throughout an undergraduate's career is necessary in order to reinforce the message regarding the importance of effective writing. To ensure this continuity, the Task Force recommends that all Baruch faculty members be aware of the goals of the Freshman English sequence so that all teachers are in a position to reinforce writing instruction as students move beyond the freshman year.

- II. Faculty Development

In order to integrate writing within and beyond the writing program, a degree of consistency needs to be agreed upon and maintained by all Baruch faculty.

### A. English Faculty Workshops

Eight workshops will be offered in the fall, one every other week. The first four could be on Wednesdays, and the second four (which would repeat the topics/foci of the first four), on Saturdays, in order to allow for as many participants as possible. At least one session would be devoted to “norming,” one on classroom dynamics, one on organization of a course, and one on theoretical issues that emerge from the teaching of writing (e.g., how much “content” should be incorporated? How should grammar be taught? How can we aspire toward “genuine intellectual engagement”? How do we teach “critical thinking”?). Faculty (both adjunct and fulltime) will be recruited to lead portions of each workshop.

### B. College-wide Outreach

All faculty members should perceive themselves as responsible for teaching writing and effective communication. The significance of writing as a necessary and crucial skill must be emphasized in a way that can both be identified and reinforced throughout the college. Opportunities should be created for English faculty to share with colleagues from other departments efficient ways of creating, presenting, and responding to written assignments. For example, members of the English Department could participate in the new faculty orientation sessions and present some methods of grading writing and responding to written work.

- i. A grading rubric should be circulated college-wide. In this manner, every instructor requiring written work can attend to at least some of the items on the rubric. By so doing, teachers will be able to provide consistent and understandable feedback regarding the same points throughout a student’s career. Ideally, such consistent messages will help students to improve their writing in a few of the areas mentioned in the rubric. (For the rubric currently in use in the English Department, which is a modification of that developed by the Zicklin Learning Assurance Committee, see Appendix 6.)
- ii. The Composition Committee should develop at least three clear, measurable outcomes that will help instructors assigning writing to assess their progress teaching writing skills. For example, instructors might require students to re-write some portions of assignments and track progress in that manner.
- iii. The “best practices” of writing instructors should be shared across the entire faculty. This could encourage non-English instructors to incorporate some exercises intended to improve their students’ written communication skills. It is likely that faculty will use some of these exercises since students’ faculty

evaluation forms ask whether the course improved the student's communication skills.

***Time-table***

At the end of the Spring 2008 semester, the Task Force made its recommendations to the English Department's Composition Committee. With that committee's approval, several sections of ENG 2100 (Writing I) and 2150 (Writing II) will be taught in accordance with these recommendations in Fall 2008. In Spring 2009, the Composition Committee will evaluate the success of these changes and present for approval revised course descriptions and sample syllabi to the English Department. During this same semester, several sections of ENG 2100T will be taught in accordance with the proposed changes appropriate for these sections. All of these changes will then be presented to the Curriculum Committee of the Weissman School of Arts and Sciences to complete the process in time for across-the-board changes in the freshman English composition sequence to take effect in Fall 2009.

Goals for 2008-2009

- Follow up with Composition Committee on Fall 2008 sections taught in accordance with Taskforce recommendations
- Coordinate with the Writing Center (see Appendix 7)
- Coordinate with the Newman Library Instructional Faculty about reorganization of workshops so that students in both ENG 2100 and ENG 2150 benefit from carefully calibrated presentations of research methods
- Organize a conference on writing for Spring 2009
- Organize faculty development in late Summer 2009 for all faculty teaching sections in accordance with Taskforce recommendations for Fall 2009
- Prepare looseleaf notebooks for distribution at the first faculty development meetings in Fall 2009
- Hold regularly scheduled writing faculty meetings/development sessions throughout Fall 2009 to monitor faculty and student progress

30 July 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Paula Berggren (2007-08)  
 Ellen Block (2007-08)  
 Suresh Canagarajah (Spring 2007)  
 Frank Cioffi (Fall 2007-2008)  
 Gerard Dalgish (Fall 2007-08)  
 Micki Eisenman (2007-08)  
 Mikhail Gershovich (2007-08)  
 Maria Jerskey (Fall 2007-08)  
 Yukiko Koizumi (2007-08)  
 Jessica Lang (2007-08)  
 William McClellan (2007-08)  
 Cheryl Smith (Spring 2007)  
 Jeff Weiss (Spring 2007)

## Appendix 1

### Writing Programs Research

This is a short summary of findings from research into select Writing Programs nationwide (9 non-CUNY and 2 CUNY schools).<sup>1</sup> The main purpose of this Writing Programs research is to learn from what has been attempted in other Programs and examine whether some of these successful approaches and “best practices” could be incorporated into Baruch’s First-Year Composition course sequence. What is given below is a very brief summary and it is strongly recommended that readers visit the websites for more information on specific Programs.

#### A. Review of Approaches Taken in non-CUNY Writing Programs

##### Non-CUNY Institutions Researched:

Harvard University (<http://www.fas.harvard.edu/~expos/>)  
 University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill (<http://english.unc.edu/comp/index.html>)  
 University of Pennsylvania ([http://www.writing.upenn.edu/critical/WAP\\_overview.html](http://www.writing.upenn.edu/critical/WAP_overview.html))  
 University of California, Davis (<http://writingprogram.ucdavis.edu/>)  
 New York University (<http://www.nyu.edu/cas/ewp/index.html>)  
 Brandeis University (<http://www.brandeis.edu/programs/writing/>)  
 Purdue University (<http://icap.english.purdue.edu/>)  
 University of Pittsburgh (<http://www.english.pitt.edu/undergraduate/composition/.html>)  
 Temple University (<http://www.temple.edu/english/fywp/>)

#### A Brief Report of Primary Research Questions and Answers

##### 1. *Undergraduate writing requirements*

Typically, a sequence of at least two writing courses is required for (non-transferring) undergraduates. Some schools require only one course (Purdue, Harvard), and other schools allow students to test-out some or all of the requirements (UNC, Pittsburgh, Temple).

##### 2. *Freshman writing course sequence and content; Relations between freshman writing and the WAC or WID efforts*

Whereas the traditional “freshman composition” courses are offered in some schools, the “Writing Seminar” approach is taken in many other schools. The seminars can be discipline-based (Penn); genre/topic-based (Harvard) or inquiry-based (Brandeis). NYU offers genre-based essay writing courses. Purdue offers a mixture of traditional, genre-based and theme-based “syllabus approaches,” each of which is coordinated by a leader. Instructors teaching with the same syllabus approach collaborate with each other.

---

<sup>1</sup> The research was conducted mainly online and the findings are largely based on what is explicit on the Writing Program websites, with the exception of CUNY schools (personal contacts [John Jay] and a talk at the CUNY GenEd conference (City College)).

Some programs have courses in coordination with their WAC/WID requirements. For example, the University of Pittsburgh's freshman composition sequence is incorporated into their extensive WAC Program and their composition seminar counts as fulfilling one of the three W(riting Intensive) courses required for undergraduates. UC Davis offers their lower division writing courses from a few disciplines (in the Writing Program, English, Comparative Literature or Native American Studies). Some of the upper division courses in UC Davis and advanced courses in UNC are also WID courses, each offered in coordination with another course in the corresponding discipline.

### *3. Institutional status and Staffing*

Many of the Programs researched are housed in the English department (UNC; Purdue; Brandeis; Pittsburgh), whereas there are others that are independent of the English department. UPenn's Program is part of the Center for Programs in Contemporary Writing (together with the Creative Writing Program), Harvard's Expos has a long tradition as a free-standing program, and UC Davis recently re-organized their Writing Program as an entity separate from the English department. Many Programs staff their composition courses with full-time and part-time staff, partially graduate students.

### *4. Instruction and guidance available for students who need additional training in writing (e.g. lower-level and ESL students)*

Preparatory courses that serve as prerequisites for the freshman writing course sequence (based on the placement test results, etc.) are offered in all of the programs. Brandeis's Seminars in Humanistic Inquiries has an optional fourth hour of writing (+W) taught by trained graduate students (similar to the "T" section?). Temple University has ESL equivalents of the first-year composition sequence. The ESL equivalents carry equal credits and weight in the curriculum with the non-ESL sections, but have smaller class sizes and mandate two additional individual conferences. Also, in the ESL sections, texts and class discussions emphasize cross-cultural implications of what it means to do academic work. Oral participation is emphasized to promote fluency and comfort with participating in an American academic environment. The second course of the writing sequence (for ESL) discusses international issues and the United States' relationships with the world from inside and outside of the country.

### *5. Professional development and incorporating technology in the teaching practice*

Many schools have handbooks and manuals for instructors teaching freshman writing. Here is a good sample Instructors' Handbook, available online.

*Temple University's Handbook for First-Year Writing Instructors:*  
<http://www.temple.edu/english/FYWP/handbook/documents/Handbook2008-2009finalversion.pdf>

It is now common for instructors' handbooks to include statements on incorporating technology in writing instructions. UNC's instructor manual offers ideas and mentoring to incorporate technology in the classroom (teaching in a wireless environment, using Blackboard, designing assignment sequences with multimedia composition). UC Davis offers supervising of the computer-aided instruction program and mentoring for instructors. Purdue has concrete guidelines to incorporate technology (e.g. obtaining a Purdue e-mail account and allowing for paper submission by e-mail), required for all writing instructors.

## **B. Review of Approaches Taken within CUNY**

John Jay College of Criminal Justice and City College of New York has recently re-designed its freshman writing program significantly. The Task Force reviewed the program contents as examples within the CUNY system.

In John Jay College, the first of the freshman composition sequence is a theme-based course that prepares students for inquiry-based academic work throughout college, where instructors choose a theme and organize the readings and assignments around the theme. In the second portion of the sequence, students work on rhetorical characteristics of cross-disciplinary writing styles. Instructors choose a theme and organize the readings and writing assignments from a variety of disciplines, which address the differing literacy conventions and processes of diverse fields. Whereas this approach is interesting, to have a course focused on a limited range of themes (which works for schools such as John Jay, where the student populations are less diverse) may not suit the interests and needs of the Baruch population.

With the new General Education Requirement, City College recently re-designed and finished piloting their freshman writing sequence (Freshman Writing Inquiry Seminar (FIQWS)). This 6-credit seminar is organized around a specific topic. The first half of this 6-hour seminar is discipline-based, taught by a full-time faculty member exploring on the topic. The second half, an intensive writing component using, is taught by an instructor in the graduate writing program (training to be a professional writer and teaching as an adjunct). The two instructors work in coordination on the topic.

## APPENDIX 2

### Preliminary Review of the Performance of Students in English 2100T

Although the consensus of English faculty teaching both the 2100 and 2100T sections was that the new sequence was successful, we wondered if that success was reflected in student performance beyond 2100T, that is in subsequent required English courses and in general academic performance. Thus, the academic performance of students who were enrolled in English 2100T in Fall 2005 and in Fall 2006 was evaluated. Preliminary data reveal:

Fall 2005		
Students enrolled in English 2100T	91	
Students still enrolled at Baruch	79	87%
Students no longer enrolled	12	[3 graduated]
Grade point averages		
3.0 – 4.0	46	50%
2.0 – 2.99	35	38%
1.0 – 1.99	5	5%
0 -- 0.99	4	4%
Students who attended Summer Immersion 05	61	67%

Fall 2006		
Students enrolled in English 2100T	171	
Students still enrolled at Baruch	155	90%
Students no longer enrolled	16	
Grade point averages		
3.0 – 4.0	90	53%
2.0 – 2.99	60	34%
1.0 – 1.99	16	9%
0 -- 0.99	4	3%
Students who attended Summer Immersion 06	40	24%

These figures reveal that the students who took English 2100T are doing very well. More than 50% of each group has a grade point average of B or better and almost have g.p.a.s above C.

While these data suggest that the program is successful, many questions remain. The most important is how the performance of these students compares with that of students in English 2100. These results will be reviewed in greater detail with the help of Institutional Research. We also plan to interview a sampling of these students in order to discuss the results in greater detail.

### Appendix 3a

ENG 2100 assessment

Fall 2007

#### Description of Work Assessed

Several instructors of ENG 2100 agreed to assign a common topic based on, but not requiring study of, the Freshman Year Text, Tracy Kidder's *Mountains Beyond Mountains*. Students in each of their sections wrote for approximately 50 minutes on the prompt reproduced below in the first and final weeks of class. A group of normed readers evaluated the papers and then samples of individual students' early and late responses to the prompt were compared to see if any meaningful improvement could be gauged.

This is the prompt that was used:

In Tracy Kidder's book *Mountains Beyond Mountains*, Paul, Jim, and Ophelia "spent a lot of time defining themselves, rather often by defining what they weren't. WL's [White Liberals] were forever saying, 'Things aren't that black and white.' But some things were plenty black and white, they told each other--'areas of moral clarity,' which they called AMC's. These were situations, rare in the world, where what ought to be done seemed perfectly clear. But the doing was always complicated, always difficult" (101)

Do you agree that there are AMC's? If so, identify one and argue why it is an area of moral clarity. If you don't believe that there are any AMC's, argue for the impossibility of their existence.

Attached is a summary of this evaluation prepared by John Choonoo, Institutional Research. In his judgment, "The results of this analysis indicate that students' performance improved in each category of evaluation. This improvement was only found to be significant ( $\alpha < .05$ ) in the thesis/focus and language/creativity components. The absence of significant findings in the other categories may be due to the small sample size; further exploration is necessary."

## APPENDIX 3B

### English 2150 and 2150T Assessment Summary

For this assessment, students' papers were scored by two readers in five domains. These domains included: thesis, support, organization, grammar, and creativity. English 2150/2150T has four learning goals. Of these four, two are measured with the five domains of this assessment. The first learning goal assessed is the "ability to develop and support written arguments based on the analysis of literary texts," demonstrated in the support domain. The second is the "ability to observe the conventions of standard English grammar and usage," demonstrated in the grammar domain.

Fifty-eight students were measured in 2150 and 36 were measured in 2150T. The scores for the two readers were averaged for each domain and also added together to create an overall score for each student. Each domain score could range from .5 to 3, creating an overall range of 2.5 to 15. Students' overall scores ranged from 6.75 to 15.

Overall scores were broken down into three categories: below expectations (less than 9), meets expectations (between 9 and 12.5), and exceeds expectations (greater than 12.5). The breakdown of student scores in these categories is displayed in the tables below.

	Overall							Domains				
	Below Expectations		Meets Expectations		Exceeds Expectations		Total	Thesis	Support	Organization	Grammar	Creativity
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>Average</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Average</i>
English 2150	12	21	27	46	19	33	11.2	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.2	2
English 2150T	16	44	20	56	0	0	8.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.6	1.7

## APPENDIX 4

### Information on Online Writing Labs and Online Resources

#### 1. CUNY WriteSite (<http://writeseite.cuny.edu/introduction/>)

Parts of the site (especially the glossary of grammatical terms) are online links to various websites (of other schools, online services, etc.). Some parts contain 'interactive' features; however, they are not truly 'interactive'. No matter what you type, they return the same response; participants are not able to receive feedback on their answers.

E-tutoring, forums, etc. (inactive)

YK Comment: CUNY WriteSite, as it stands, seems outdated and its features are not sophisticated enough for student use. Instructors may refer to WriteSite for finding specific information on grammar, citation guidelines, etc.). It is not clear, however, if one may find information that is not already provided in the little brown handbook.

#### 2. Purdue OWL (<http://owl.english.purdue.edu/>)

- A resourceful online writing lab, open to Purdue and non-Purdue writing instructors and students (also widely recommended by many colleges' writing websites)
- Articles in the form of texts or PowerPoint presentations are organized by categories and topics, available for download.
- Easy-to-navigate features for Help, downloading the resource for printing, copy request, link request, reporting errors, and general feedback.
- Contributions are also solicited.

For Non-Purdue College Level Instructors and Students  
(<http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/679/01/>)

- A summary of resources links for non-Purdue instructors and students, organized by topic categories

YK Comment: Though not 'interactive', it is extremely resourceful, well-organized and easy to navigate. Recommended for Instructors, especially those who are new to teaching freshman writing. Instructors can recommend certain articles for students, supplementing the course materials.

Given below is a list of other online resources, entirely or partially free to all users. Instructors can find information for their teaching, or recommend some of them to the students.

3. University of Wisconsin Madison, Online Writing Center (Writer's Handbook)  
<http://www.wisc.edu/writing/Handbook/index.html>
  
4. Research and Documentation Online (Diana Hacker)  
<http://www.dianahacker.com/resdoc/>
  
5. Monash University (Australia), Language and Learning Online  
<http://www.monash.edu.au/lis/lionline/index.xml>
  
6. Metropolitan State University  
<http://www.metrostate.edu/writingcenter/online.html>
  
7. English Study Materials  
Online materials of various types for (primarily) ESL/EFL learners, but some of the resources are for general writing skills.  
<http://englishstudymaterials.blogspot.com/>
  
8. Carnegie Mellon University  
A collection of advice about how to do research and how to communicate effectively (primarily for computer scientists).  
<http://www-2.cs.cmu.edu/afs/cs.cmu.edu/user/mleone/web/how-to.html>
  
9. English Usage, Style and Composition (full-text searchable resources)  
<http://bartleby.com/usage>
  
10. Paradigm Online Writing Assistant (free trials)  
<http://www.powa.org>
  
11. The Internet Grammar of English (free trials)  
<http://www.ucl.ac.uk/internet-grammar/>
  
12. Capital Community College Foundation, Guide to Grammar and Writing  
<http://grammar.ccc.commnet.edu/grammar/>
  
13. The Blue Book of Grammar and Punctuation (free and subscription contents)  
<http://www.grammarbook.com>

**APPENDIX 5**  
**LEARNING GOALS FOR ENG 2100-2150 (2004-2008)**

**KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS TO BE ACQUIRED BY STUDENTS**  
**IN ENGLISH 2100**

- Ability to read a variety of articles and essays, identify their key points, and subject them to logical analysis
- Ability to understand writing as a process requiring the outlining of ideas, multiple drafting and revision of complete essays, include a researched paper
- Ability to write a cogent thesis and to develop an argument in unified and coherent paragraphs
- Ability to observe sentence boundaries, to use correct punctuation, and to use a variety of sentence structures

**KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS TO BE ACQUIRED BY STUDENTS**  
**IN ENGLISH 2150**

- Ability to recognize different literary genres and to develop some facility in interpreting what one has read by paying close attention to language and style
- Ability to develop and support written arguments based on the analysis of literary texts
- Ability to imagine the needs of one's reader when writing in different rhetorical modes and social contexts
- Ability to observe the conventions of standard English grammar and usage

**Written Communication Assessment Sheet**

Paper # \_\_\_\_\_ Scorer \_\_\_\_\_

Criteria	3: Exceeded Expectations	2: Met Expectations	1: Below Expectations	SCORE*
<b>Thesis/Focus</b>	(a) Clearly states purpose, focus, or thesis in the introduction. (b) The focus of the piece effectively responds to the assignment. (c) Identifies and addresses the audience appropriately. (d) Effectively engages, persuades, and/or informs the reader.	(a) Requires some effort to discern purpose, focus, or thesis. (b) The focus meets assignment objectives.  (c) Makes an effort to identify and address the audience although not consistently. (d) Makes an effort to persuade, engage and/or inform the reader	(a) Purpose, focus, or thesis is unclear.  (b) The piece only marginally responds to the assignment. (c) Does not identify and addresses the audience or does so inappropriately. (d) makes no real effort to persuade, engage, inform.	
<b>Support</b>	(a) Integrates accurate, appropriate and compelling evidence. (b) Effectively demonstrates how all the evidence supports and advances claims of the thesis. (c) Incorporates and supports solutions and recommendations. (d) All sources are cited appropriately. Makes proper use of footnotes, endnotes, works cited, and/or in-text citations.	(a) Most points are supported appropriately and effectively with specific evidence. (b) Purpose of evidence is generally clear, though some points need further articulation. (c) Cites sources appropriately with only a few exceptions.	(a) Many points are unsupported (b) Presents insufficient or inappropriate evidence in support of thesis and individual arguments. (c) Does not cite sources appropriately.  (d) Makes little or inappropriate use of footnotes, in-text citations, etc.	
<b>Organization</b>	(a) Creates a logical structure that shows the development of evidence and ideas. (b) Produces focused sections or paragraphs.  (c) Ends with a clear conclusion that offers a summary, possible larger implications, and/or recommendations.	(a) The structure of the piece is generally effective though may not be logical at all times. (b) Piece has general sense of direction, though ordering of ideas may seem arbitrary or inconsistent in a few instances. (c) Conclusion is effective though may require some additional development.	(a) The structure of the piece is less than logical.  (b) Ideas are presented in seemingly arbitrary order and do not form a coherent argument.  (c) Conclusion does not present a summary of the argument and is generally ineffective.	
<b>Grammar/Mech.</b>	(a) Demonstrates consistently correct grammar, punctuation and spelling. (b) Uses formatting and language that demonstrate a sophisticated understanding of the conventions of the discipline and the nature of the assignment.	(a) Grammar, punctuation, usage and spelling are generally correct. (b) While there are a few errors, they are not frequent enough to be distracting.  (c) Formatting and language use is generally appropriate to the assignment and discipline.	(a) Errors in spelling, punctuation, grammar and usage are frequent, wide ranging and distracting. (b) Vocabulary is rudimentary or inappropriate to the discipline and assignment.  (c) Formatting is inappropriate to the discipline or assignment.	
<b>Creativity</b>	(a) Demonstrates imagination in interpreting texts: understands and makes relevant reference to literary devices like metaphor, tone, symbol (b) Shows originality of perspective by going beyond the generally accepted perspectives (or widely known interpretations) on the text (c) Writes in a lively and expressive manner	(a) Refers to literary devices in interpreting texts  (b) Shows understanding of points generally made (or widely known) in relation to that text  (c) Writes with some stylistic felicity	(a) Ignores significance of literary devices in effort to interpret texts  (b) Fails to understand significance of points generally made (or widely known) in relation to that text  (c) Writes with little variety or vivacity	
<b>Total</b>				
<b>Comments</b>	*Mark N/A if not applicable			

## APPENDIX 7

### Coordination between the Writing Center and English Department Faculty

Approximately half of the one-to-one sessions in the Writing Center are with students enrolled in ENG 2100 and ENG 2150. The Writing Center has a special perspective on the needs of student writers. Students may feel freer to articulate their sense of bewilderment in the face of writing assignments with consultants than they are with their classroom instructors. Collaboration between the English writing faculty and the Writing Center can promote a shared culture and language so that students experience more consistency as they practice incorporating into their writing the recommendations of their instructors and of Writing Center consultants.

#### A. Shared Curriculum

Members of the First Year Writing faculty and the Writing Center should collaborate to create a schematic shared curriculum to prepare students to develop independence in approaching the many writing tasks they will engage in during college and beyond.

#### B. Complementary support

Over the past four years, the Writing Center and English Department have collaborated on and refined pilot programs aimed to support students in the first-year writing sequence. During the spring 2008 semester, students from the ENG 2150T sections were paired and worked bi-weekly with writing consultants in the Writing Center. In addition, each student had three dedicated individual one-to-one sessions with his/her consultant. These sessions provided first-year writers with the opportunity to give and receive peer feedback, to gain individualized support and feedback on their written communication, and to better prepare them for the work of college writing. This provides a good model for expanded complementary support that the Writing Center could provide to all students in the First Year Writing Program: students in ENG 2100/2150 courses who might benefit from additional support could sign up for regular, dedicated bi-weekly sessions.

#### C. Supplementary instruction

The Writing Center offers small group workshops based on common issues that first year writing students have most often come to address. They include Critical Reading for Better Writing, Getting Started, Analyzing and Arguing, Organization, Juggling Sources, APA and MLA Style Citation, Maximizing Revision, Grammar and Advanced Stylists: Imitating Master Writers. Greater coherence in the First-Year Writing Program and collaboration between the First-Year Writing Program and the Writing Center will allow the Writing Center to align the workshops more closely with the goals and objectives of the Writing Program.