

WAC Longitudinal Assessment Study Report: Years 3 & 4
December 2019
Alusow Hart

We initially planned to continue to read as many reflective artifacts for the WID and capstone years of the original fifty students in the cohort as we could locate in the subsequent two years of collecting artifacts, using the original rubric. We were able to gather eleven WID artifacts and ten capstones, not an unusual outcome for a longitudinal study. More disappointing was that few of the artifacts we received had any reflective components in them, despite the inclusion of the reflection outcome expected in General Education courses indicated as Vertical Writing Curriculum courses. Our recommendations will reflect these facts.

Since the original rubric would not work in any meaningful way for Years 3 and 4, we revised them and created a more holistic reading guide that might give us some information we could use. The overriding question we wanted to answer was, "To what degree did each student adopt the persona of their chosen major?" These qualities might be discerned by their use of disciplinary norms and practices. (See the attached rubric for further definition of what these might entail.)

Student artifacts were read by six readers, three for each one, and roughly scored on a three-point scale: Accomplished, Satisfactory, and Needs Improvement. These indicators were accompanied by extensive comments by each reader on each artifact. The scores are as follows:

WIDs	<i>Strong=3</i>		<i>Adequate=2</i>		<i>Needs Improvement=1</i>			
	Reader 1	(Ave.)	Reader 2	(Ave.)	Reader 3	(Ave.)	Total	(Ave.)
	20	1.81	17	1.54	20	1.81	57	5.18
CAPs	<i>Strong=3</i>		<i>Adequate=2</i>		<i>Needs Improvement=1</i>			
	25	2.5	14	1.4	22	2.2	60	6
Value								
+/-		0.69	-0.14		0.39		0.82	

We were happy to see some improvement between the WID artifacts and the capstones in terms of disciplinary practices. We can surmise that continued writing instruction in the practices of a discipline pays off, based on this small sample. These changes give us no insight in our focus on reflection, however. We recommend that WID and capstone faculty would benefit from workshops and consultations about the

well-documented benefits of reflection, for students' increased understanding of content (writing to learn) as well as self-evaluation and self-positioning in their majors.

WAC Program: Longitudinal Study, Years 3 and 4 Rubric (December 2019)

Since the materials we have to evaluate are artifacts from diverse fields, many of which do not claim reflection as their purpose, we have determined that a reading should be guided by questions that might offer a narrative response as to the qualities of a student's entrance into their chosen discourse community. Consider to what degree the artifact indicates a distinction between WID-level and capstone-level awareness. For this reason, you will be asked to evaluate a mix of WID and capstone artifacts.

Overall prompt: What evidence do you see that the student is adopting the persona of this profession?

How well does the student use the language and style of the field?

Does the student employ its accepted evidence and reasoning?

Is the student aware of disciplinary perspectives? Do they demonstrate them?

Does the student demonstrate awareness of their position within their professional community?

Does the student identify their personal challenges?

Does the student show initiative in overcoming those?

Does the student suggest ways to improve their understanding of the field?

Does the student identify the field's shortcomings and suggest ways to improve?

Does the student identify further avenues of research they might pursue?

Your narrative should be holistic, but you may still have reservations about the answers to some of these questions, which you should note. In some respect, you are actually writing a reflection about the student's progress in his course of study using the artifacts as evidence for your conclusions.

(I suggest that next term we offer these students an opportunity in focus groups to respond to these questions which would make our efforts even more meaningful.)

To structure your evaluation, you might begin by rating each question **Accomplished/Satisfactory/Needs improvement** (or some other comparable three-point category) then offer a narration of your findings.

Each artifact has been labeled with the student's number from the previous assessments. These are all contained in a file that has been sent to you. Be sure your evaluation indicates this number and your own alphabetic code.

