

# **General Education Writing Artifacts Assessment Committee Report Summer 2010**

## **Committee Members**

Brenton Phillips

Cathy Castle

Tim Warkentin

The artifact assessment committee read and evaluated one hundred student writing artifacts. The following pages contain the committee's findings.

**Communication Goal: Students will be able to communicate effectively orally and in writing.**

**Intended Outcomes for Writing (Comp. I and Comp. II)**

The student will write a clear, well-organized paper, using documentation when appropriate. The paper will be evaluated using the following criteria:

1. Main Idea – The paper stays on topic, is unified, clear, and meets the requirements of the topic. (defines terms)
2. Organization – The paper includes the effective use of modes, has an introduction and conclusion, and uses transitions.
3. Content contains specific details, full support, and development of ideas.
4. Mechanics includes usage, sentence construction, spelling, punctuation, and capitalization.

**Rubric for Outcome - Writing**

5 = Superior	The paper executes all the elements excellently. The paper has style and personality; it has a clear main idea, logical organization, relevant and detailed content, and full command of all mechanics.
4 = Good	The paper is good in all elements. The main idea is clear, its organization logical, its content, although detailed and relevant, may not have the impact of an exceptional paper; the mechanics are very good, but not excellent.
3 = Acceptable	The paper communicates clearly. Its execution might be average on the whole, but there might be flaws in the idea, organization, content or mechanics. There might be an outstanding element present.
2 = Below	The paper is below average. The main idea might be somewhat vague; organization skewed, content might not be sufficiently relevant or detailed; or mechanics might be flawed. The paper lacks one or two elements. There may be an outstanding element present.
1 = Substandard	The paper does not meet standards. The main idea is vague, organization is not apparent, content is irrelevant or lacks detail, and mechanics are highly flawed.
0 =	Artifact cannot be evaluated because of appearance or content.

**Outcomes Standards For Writing: 85% of the student papers examined will achieve a 3 or higher.**

### **Findings of Assessment Committee**

Number of artifacts receiving a 5 rating – 15  
Number of artifacts receiving a 4 rating – 30  
Number of artifacts receiving a 3 rating – 33  
Number of artifacts receiving a 2 rating – 17  
Number of artifacts receiving a 1 rating – 4  
Number of artifacts receiving a 0 rating – 1\*

**\*Artifact was missing.**

**Results: 78% of student artifacts received a 3 or higher rating. Therefore, the 85 % goal set by the rubric was not met.**

## **Recommendations for Writing Artifacts**

Compiled June 2010

- It is easier to grade the artifacts if the reader knows what the purpose of the assignment is. Only about 25% of the papers had this type of indication.
- The artifact often didn't indicate the type of writing the artifact demonstrates. This can be deduced, usually, from reading and evaluating the artifact, but it would be useful to have this at the top of the artifact somewhere.
- Essays often didn't include a meaningful title. Some essays did not have a title at all.
- Often didn't include proper formatting and citing of references.
- Students overused quotations or relied too heavily on quoted material.
- Students commonly misused words such as *two/to/too*, *their/there/they're*, *effect/affect*, and others. Students might need to look up the meaning of words and to use the correct word for similar or identical sounding words such as *sight/cite*, *dramatic/traumatic*.
- Students seemed not to understand that the first word that comes up in the spell check may not be the word they actually want in the sentence.
- Students showed poor usage of verb tense - past, present, future - and the importance of being consistent within a sentence and using the correct tense of the verb.
- Some students failed to use correct and consistent person (first, second, third) when telling a story.
- Students misused pronouns: *he/him/himself/his*, *my/myself/I* ... and even in one paper, *i* (lower case throughout).

- Students failed to develop transitions between ideas and often switched topics.
- Students often failed to fully develop their ideas. Some students appear to be rushing through their essays and not fully explaining or developing the ideas contained within them.
- In some cases an outline may have helped the student progress logically through the paper as opposed to rambling and being repetitive.
- Some students had problems with fragments and run-on sentences, misplaced modifiers, and improper punctuation.