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1. **Introduction and Summary of Achievements**

This report contains data collected from the rosters and end-semester grades from the pre-foundational writing courses in CAS (3 sections of ENGL105S: Introduction to College Writing with Supplemental Instruction and 3 sections of ENGL105: Introduction to College Writing). Analysis of the data revealed the following achievements:

* ENGL105S and ENGL105 students demonstrated a consistent grasp of writing skills in their formal writing assignments over the semester, earning, on average, C and C+ scores on the final paper.
* There is evidence to indicate that the curricular changes made in the Spring 2013 semester have better prepared the students who passed ENGL105S and ENGL105 for ENGL 107.
* Retention of repeat students remains high, with 60% of ENGL105S and 51.4% of ENGL105 students re-enrolling in the subsequent semester.
* Longitudinal success in ENGL107 has increased slightly for ENGL105S students, moving from 73% in Fall 2012 to 78% in Spring 2013.
1. **Dashboard**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Fall 2012 | Spring 2013 | 2013-2014 (GOAL) |
| **ENGL105** | **ENGL105S** | **ENGL105** | **ENGL105S** | **ENGL105** | **ENGL105S** |
| **Original Roster Pass Rates**  | 72% | 38.3% | 35% | 31.9% | 50% | 50% |
| **Active Roster Pass Rates**  | 78.6% | 43.4% | 48% | 36.4% | 60% | 55% |
| **Completion Rates** (for students who completed the semester) | \* | 53.5% | 76% | 51.3% | 79% | 54% |
| **Longitudinal Success**(Pass rate of students advancing from ENGL105 & 105S to 107) | 62% | 73% | 61% | 78% |  |
| **Grammar Diagnostic Scores** for ENGL105S | **Pre-Test** | **Post-Test** | **Pre-Test** | **Post-Test** |  |
| 53.7 | 58.5 | 58.4 | 64.5 |

**KEY**

**Original Roster** – all students who registered for the course

**Active Roster** – all students on the roster after the withdrawal period

**Completion Rate** – students who completed the entire semester and did not abandon the course

\* — *The completion rate for ENGL105 for Fall 2012 could not be assessed due to a lack of data reported by adjunct professors who taught the majority of those courses.*

# Report on 2012-2013 Goals and Progress

***Goal 1:******To improve pass rates and retention for the ENGL105S and ENGL105 courses by helping students to master foundational skills in grammar, paragraph development, and essay writing.***

**Progress:** The pass rates for ENGL105S saw modest declines from Fall 2012 to Spring 2013; however, this decline was not surprising because 80 percent of the students enrolled in ENGL105S in the Spring were repeating the course from an earlier semester. The decline in original roster pass rates for ENGL105, from 72% in Fall 2012 to 35% in Spring 2013, may be attributed to a number of different factors: the high percentage of repeating students (42% of ENGL105 students), the high percentage of abandoning students (26% of ENGL105 students), and the high percentage of withdrawals during the Spring 2013 semester (26% of ENGL105 students).

In terms of retention, 60% of the students who failed ENGL105S in Fall 2012 re-enrolled for the course in Spring 2013. Of the 39 students who re-enrolled, 13 of them went on to pass the class. Similarly, 51.4% of the students who failed ENGL105 in Fall 2012 re-enrolled for the course in Spring 2013; of the 18 students who re-enrolled, two of them passed.

Although all categories of pass rates declined for ENGL105S, the pass rate for students who actually completed the course—that is, attended class until the end of the semester and submitted all assignments—held steady, declining only slightly from 53.5% in Fall 2012 to 51.3% in Spring 2013. Further, the students who completed ENGL105S showed progress in their writing by the semester’s end, as evidenced in their consistent grade progress on successive assignments. While the average grade on the first one-paragraph assignment was 70.2%, or a C-, the average paper grade on the final essay rose to 75.4%, or a solid C. Students also demonstrated measurable progress in grammar skills, with scores on the grammar diagnostic post-test rising 6.1 percentage points to 64.5 for ENGL105S.

Similarly, original and active roster pass rates declined for ENGL105; however, the completion rate (76%) remained consistent with the previous semester. (For Fall 2012, the completion rate could not be calculated exactly due to insufficient data. However, based on the active roster pass rate, the completion rate would have been 78.6% or higher.) The students who completed ENGL105 showed progress on their writing assignments by the semester’s end, as well. While the average grade on the first one-paragraph assignment was 73.1, or a C, the average paper grade on the final essay rose to 76.6%, or a solid C+. Students also showed progress in their grammar skills, with scores on the grammar diagnostic post-test rising 4.7 percentage points to 71.7 in ENGL105.

***Goal 2: To ensure that the ENGL105S/105 curriculum is preparing students for the research- and argument-driven content of ENGL 107 by providing students with a stronger foundation in responding to complex readings and avoiding plagiarism.***

**Progress:** The Writing Specialists made several changes to the curriculum for ENGL105S/105 in Spring 2013 to better prepare students for ENGL 107, including the following:

* Giving students greater practice writing argument essays by requiring three essay assignments. Two of these essays had students arguing two different perspectives on a single topic, thus ensuring that they knew all elements of a full argument by semester’s end.
* Reinforcing students’ skills in responding to readings by inviting them to integrate course readings into their essay assignments for three assignments. Although this was optional for two assignments, it was required for one of the essays.
* Helping students learn how to avoid plagiarism by teaching appropriate citation and requiring them to practice this skill in formal assignments.

The greater focus on writing argument essays yielded success, as evidenced by students’ final essay grades. For students who completed the course, the average final essay grade was 75.4% in ENGL105S and 76.6% in ENGL105. However, the average final essay grade for students who passed the course rose to 83.8% in ENGL105S and 77.1% in ENGL105. This shows a marked improvement for ENGL105S students who tend to struggle with combining all of the course concepts into their final essay. On the cause-effect essay, in which students were required to integrate the class reading into their support paragraphs, students who passed the course earned an average of 76.6% on the assignment in ENGL105S and 77.3 % in ENGL105. With the students who passed ENGL105S and 105 demonstrating stronger mastery of skills in essay writing and source integration, there is reason to believe they will be better prepared for the rigor of ENGL 107.

Although students currently have a high chance of passing ENGL 107 after completing ENGL105S, the Writing Specialists hope that these modifications to the course structure will only enhance this longitudinal success. In Spring 2013, 78% of students who took ENGL 107 after completing ENGL105S passed the class; in contrast, only 61% of students who took ENGL 107 after completing ENGL105 passed the class. This discrepancy will be discussed below under a key assessment, but it does seem that the ENGL105S/105 curriculum is supporting students as they advance in their General Education writing courses.

1. **Key Assessments**

**Assessment 1: Pass Rates**

***Target Topic: ENGL105S Pass Rates***

**Data:**

**Analysis:** Of the 49 students who were originally enrolled in ENGL105S, just 31.9% of them passed the course. However, looking at the students who completed the entire course paints a different picture. Of those students who completed the course—that is, submitted all assignments—51.3% passed the class. This significant increase in pass rate can be attributed to the high number of students who withdrew from or abandoned the course, which will be discussed in more detail later in the report.

***Target Topic: ENGL105 Pass Rates***

**Data:**

**Analysis:** Of the 46 students who were originally enrolled in ENGL105S, just 35% of them passed the course. However, looking at the students who completed the entire course paints a dramatically different picture. Of those students who completed the course—that is, submitted all assignments—76% passed the class.

***Target Topic: External Benchmarks***

**Data:** In order to make an accurate comparison of the data reported by the National Center for Developmental Education (NCDE) and local peer institutions, it was necessary to use a different calculation to arrive at the pass rate. Other reporting bodies do not assess pass rates for individual developmental courses; rather than publish the individual course pass rate as the measure of success, they publish the pass rate for the entire program which often includes several tiers of remediation.

The following table shows how Trinity’s pre-foundational writing program measures against local and national external benchmarks:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reporting Body** | **Pass Rate** |
| NCDE | 73% (2004-5) |
| Virginia Community College System | 68% (2007) |
| Trinity Washington University | 64% (Spring 2013) |

**Analysis:** Currently, the NCDE is using the same calculation as Trinity to deduce the completion rate for the pre-foundational writing programs being assessed. It is unclear how VCCS is determining its pass rate, so this may not necessarily be analogous data. Since the completion rate calculations of other institutions and reporting bodies are not easily simplified, a comparison of pass rates may not be the most useful data point for evaluating Trinity’s outcomes. A more exhaustive explanation of the vast differences in pre-foundational program structures and student skill levels at various institutions can be found in Appendix 1, where these reports are cited in full.

***Target Topic: Reading Scores***

**Data:**

|  |
| --- |
| **ENGL105S Accuplacer Reading Scores vs. Pass Rate** |
| **Reading Score** | **0-39** | **40-49** | **50-59** | **60 or above** |
| Fall 2011 | *# of Students* | 23 | 13 | 17 | 40 |
| Passing Rate | 43% | 61% | 47% | 70% |
| Fall 2012 | *# of Students* | 26 | 21 | 14 | 19 |
| Passing Rate | 15% | 14% | 57% | 53% |
| Spring 2013 | *# of Students* | 13 | 11 | 5 | 11 |
| Passing Rate | 23% | 27% | 20% | 55% |

**Analysis:** Continuing with an examination of reading placement scores, it remains consistent that students with lower reading skills pass ENGL105S at lower rates. This underscores a growing deficiency in students’ ability to read and comprehend writing concepts as well as to transfer those concepts into their own compositions. To be effective writers, students must be able to critically read model texts as well as their own and their classmates’ writing. As is extensively explained in Appendix 1 on External Benchmarks, one reason why the completion rate and pass rate for ENGL105S students continues to lag behind the national completion rates and pass rates for other institutions is that Trinity has a large proportion of students entering with severe reading deficiencies.

***Target Topic: Grammar Diagnostics***

**Data:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Diagnostic Grammar Test Results for ENGL105 and ENGL105S** |
| **Course & Test** | **Average Score Part 1** | **Average Score Part 2** | **Average Score Part 3** | **Overall Average Score** |
| **ENGL105S**Pre-Test Scores | 58.8 | 53 | 63.5 | 58.4 |
| Post-Test Scores | 66.7 | 60.7 | 66 | 64.5 |
| **ENGL105**Pre-Test Scores | 71.7 | 61.6 | 67.7 | 67 |
| Post-Test Scores | 75.6 | 70.1 | 70.7 | 71.7 |

**Analysis:** Students in ENGL105S/105 exhibited growth in their grasp of grammatical concepts. In ENGL105S, students’ grammar diagnostic scores rose by 6.1 percentage points, while the scores for students in ENGL105 rose by 4.7 percentage points. It is not surprising to see slightly higher growth for ENGL105S students, since they receive sustained, regular instruction on grammar and sentence-level issues; however, this growth still places ENGL105S students at a D-level mastery of grammatical concepts.

It is interesting to compare the pre- and post-test scores for ENGL105S between the Fall 2012 and Spring 2013 semesters. While students scored an average of 58.5 percent on the grammar diagnostic post-test in Fall 2012, they scored an average of 58.4 on the grammar diagnostic pre-test in Spring 2013. This suggests that students held steady on the gains they made in the Fall semester, even though these gains were modest. The rise in diagnostic scores both semesters—of 4.8 percentage points in Fall 2012 and 6.1 percentage points in Spring 2013—also remained consistent.

The different parts of the diagnostic grammar test measured from the simplest grammar concepts to the most difficult. For example, Part 1 measured concepts including spelling, capitalization, quotation marks, and homonyms; Part 2 measured concepts including verb forms, subject-verb agreement, and pronoun errors; Part 3 measured more difficult sentence-level issues including run-ons, sentence types, fragments, and modifiers. Students in ENGL105S/105 saw the most growth in Part 2, while they saw the least growth in Part 3. It is surprising that students at the ENGL105S level enter the class with such severe deficiencies in some of the most basic concepts, and only make gains that bring them up to a D-level.

***Target Topic: Grade Progress***

**Data:**

**Analysis:** The above tables illustrate the grade progress for all students who completed ENGL105S/105. The data suggests that the students who attempted all of the assignments maintained a consistent level of performance even as they moved into more complex essays and into argumentation, which is required of them in the next sequential course. In ENGL105S, students moved from a 70.2, or a C-, average on the first assignment to a 75.4, or C, on the final essay. In ENGL105, students moved from a 73.2, or a C, on the first assignment to a 76.6, or a C+, on the final essay. This grade progress was even higher among students who passed the course. This will be discussed in more depth in the longitudinal assessment below.

**Assessment 2: Longitudinal Data**

***Target Topic: Longitudinal success of students who passed ENGL105/ENGL105S in Fall 2012***

**Data:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Success Rates in ENGL107 for ENGL105 & ENGL105S Students** |
|  | % Passing withA-D | % Passing withA-C | % Withdrawn from Course | % Failing Course |
| ENGL105 Students | 61% | 51% | 9% | 29% |
| ENGL105S Students | 78% | 65% | 17% | 4% |

**Analysis:** Overall, the pre-foundational English courses are preparing students well for success in the next sequential course. It remains consistent that students coming out of ENGL105S pass ENGL107 at a higher rate than students coming out of ENGL105. Typically, students enrolled in ENGL105 in the Fall semester are taught primarily by adjunct faculty, while those ENGL105S sections are taught by full-time instructors. In Fall 2012, 78.6% of ENGL105 students passed the class; nevertheless, only 61% of those students passed ENGL107 in the subsequent semester. In contrast, ENGL105S students, though they pass at lower rates, continue to see much higher success in ENGL107 with a longitudinal pass rate of 78% in Spring 2013.

This data suggests that the full-time writing instructors are maintaining a rigorous standard by grading student compositions more stringently. The full-time writing instructors collaborate regularly to standardize assignments, norm grades (evaluate consistency in grading across sections), and develop pedagogical practices to address student deficiencies. Currently, adjuncts do not participate in any of this curricular design, although their participation in these activities might improve ENGL105 students’ longitudinal success. To increase collaboration with adjuncts, the Writing Specialists could lead professional development workshops that English adjuncts would be required to attend.

***Target Topic: Spring 2013 ENGL105/ENGL105S students’ preparedness for ENGL107***

**Data:**

**Analysis:** After making structural changes to the course scaffold between Fall 2012 and Spring 2013, the data for students who passed the course revealed a more consistent mastery of course concepts even as assignments got longer and more complex. This syllabus was more rigorous in that students had to write three essays rather than two and were often invited to include specific source material in their compositions. In fact, students were required to engage with one source in the Cause/Effect Essay and demonstrated C+-level proficiency, on average. Additionally, ENGL105S students who passed the class exhibited a substantial amount of growth in their final argument essay this semester, earning a B-average overall. In previous semesters, students in ENGL105S usually showed slight declines on the final paper while ENGL105 students maintained a consistent level of performance. This improvement in the performance of ENGL105S students’ final papers further indicates that the curricular changes are having the desired effect for students who complete the course.

**Assessment 3: Retention and Course Abandonment**

***Target Topic: Retention and Course Abandonment of Students in ENGL105S***

**Data:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Retention Rate for ENGL105S** |
| **Students from Fall 2012****who failed** | **Students who re-enrolled****SPR 2013** | **% Students Retained** |
| 65 | 39 | 60% |

|  |
| --- |
| **Pass Rate for Repeaters in ENGL105S** |
| **Number and Percent of Class** | **Abandoned** | **Withdrew** | **Completed & Failed** | **Passed** |
| Total number of repeaters = 38\* | 9 | 5 | 11 | 13 |
| 78% of ENGL105S students | 23.70% | 13.20% | 28.90% | 34.20% |

\*The discrepancy between the number of students who re-enrolled and the number of repeaters is due to one student being removed from the roster for medical reasons.

|  |
| --- |
| **Pass Rate for New Freshmen in ENGL105S** |
| **Number and Percent of Class** | **Abandoned** | **Withdrew** | **Completed & Failed** | **Passed** |
| Total number of new students = 11 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 3 |
| 22% of ENGL105S students | 27.3% | 9.1% | 36.4% | 27.3% |

**Analysis:** According to the data, the ENGL105S program is doing a good job of retaining students who do not initially pass the course, with 60% re-enrolling in the subsequent semester. Of repeat students, slightly more than one-third passed from the original roster. However, of repeaters who actually completed the course, 54.2% passed. New students pass ENGL105S at a slightly lower rate with 27% of the original roster passing the course. Of the new students who completed the course, 42.9% passed.

Given the high rate of repeaters, course abandonment is a particular concern. The Writing Specialists implemented several strategies this semester to counteract abandonment, such as conferencing with all students during the first week of school, maintaining portfolios of student work to more closely track progress, and reaching out to all students who missed two classes in a row. Despite these efforts, student abandonment persisted. The specialists continue to explore ways to deter students from abandoning the course, especially since the primary reason for course abandonment could not always be linked to poor course performance (i.e. even some students who were earning grades high enough to pass the course abandoned).

***Target Topic: Retention and Course Abandonment of Students in ENGL105***

**Data:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Retention Rate for ENGL105** |
| **Students from Fall 2012****who failed** | **Students who re-enrolled****SPR 2013** | **% Students Retained** |
| 35 | 18 | 51.40% |

|  |
| --- |
| **Pass Rate for Repeaters in ENGL105** |
| **Number and Percent of Class** | **Abandoned** | **Withdrew** | **Completed & Failed** | **Passed** |
| Total number of repeaters = 18 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 2 |
| 42% of ENGL105 students | 33.3% | 33.3% | 22.2% | 11.1% |

|  |
| --- |
| **Pass Rate for New Freshmen in ENGL105** |
| **Number and Percent of Class** | **Abandoned** | **Withdrew** | **Completed & Failed** | **Passed** |
| Total number of new students = 25 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 13 |
| 58% of ENGL105 students | 20% | 20% | 8% | 52% |

**Analysis:** According to the data, this course seems to be less successful at retaining students, with only half of students who failed re-enrolling in the subsequent semester. It seems that new students pass at a much higher rate than repeaters in ENGL105. While this trend has not been tracked or explored in previous semesters, it needs to be followed in coming semesters to better understand why repeat students with higher skills are passing at a lower rate. Of the students who completed ENGL105, new students passed at a rate of 86.7% while repeaters passed at a rate of 33.3%. Similar to ENGL105S, abandonment in this course is high and merits greater attention and exploration.

1. **Recommendations for 2013-2014**
* To establish a more seamless first-year writing program, the role of the Writing Specialists should be re-examined. Currently, the Writing Specialists develop and manage the ENGL105S curriculum only. However, this structure—of isolating specialists to one course—is not typical in pre-foundational and first-year writing programs. Students do not tend to remediate writing in only one semester and need a consistent, standardized structure in place for several semesters to lay a solid foundation for quality writing. Further, the Writing Specialists need to interact with students at multiple points in their General Education writing courses to evaluate whether Trinity’s writing program is achieving the desired outcomes. Research suggests that separating developmental instructors from instructors of credit-bearing courses only inhibits a coordinated curriculum and students’ seamless progression through their writing courses.
* Despite extremely high pass rates of ENGL105 students in the Fall 2012 semester, the longitudinal pass rate for students taking ENGL107 remains lower for those who passed ENGL105 than for those who passed ENGL105S. Since adjuncts primarily teach ENGL105 in fall semesters and ENGL107 in spring semesters, the data suggests that more management of adjuncts across courses is warranted. Unfortunately, adjuncts often miss the opportunity to participate in pedagogical collaboration. Moreover, this lost opportunity translates into a loss for students who may not be exposed to the same resources, held to the same standards, and introduced to the same composition and rhetorical concepts—at both the ENGL105 and ENGL107 level. Therefore, the Writing Specialists recommend greater adjunct management in the form of required year-long professional development workshops and grade mentoring. Further, a more standardized curriculum for adjuncts in ENGL107, as currently exists for ENGL 105, would help ensure that the goals for ENGL107 are being met in all sections of the course. This recommendation bolsters the previous recommendation that the Writing Specialists’ role should be reconsidered to better support the full writing program.
* In the interest of developing a stronger writing culture for Trinity students, the Writing Specialists recommend restructuring the Writing Lab schedule as follows: Rather than running close to 10 different grammar labs, all full-time instructors (the two Writing Specialists and the Writing Center Director) should teach one instructional hour, which would be open to any ENGL105S student. This would give students variety in teaching style and flexibility in their Friday schedule. In addition to the instructional hour, the Writing Specialists would offer a one-hour open Writing Lab for all pre-foundational writing students. This would give the Writing Specialists an opportunity to interact with all pre-foundational writing students, rather than just the ones enrolled in their courses. Since adjuncts would not be teaching the Friday grammar lab, this would also ensure quality control over grammar instruction.
* Since course abandonment continues to be an issue for ENGL105S/105 students, more research is needed to understand why the problem is so widespread for first-year students. In Spring 2013, the Writing Specialists developed particular methods to address the problem but saw little change in outcomes. A more thorough examination should be undertaken through the First Year Experience to identify variables for abandonment and develop a mechanism that FYE can use to provide greater resources for at-risk students. A form could be developed to provide a basic reporting system for instructors to submit when a student stops attending/abandons a class; then, follow up services could be provided. Such a system could help determine if students are abandoning certain classes, all classes, or classes at specific times in the semester.
* Students entering ENGL105S with Accuplacer reading scores below 50 have a significantly lower chance of passing the class—close to 75% in Spring 2013. Moreover, peer institutions with developmental writing programs offer multiple tiers of remediation; thus, students entering with severely low reading scores would not test into a course that provides only a single semester of writing remediation. Some institutions, such as the Baltimore City Community College, will not even allow students to enter the pre-foundational writing program with a reading score below 49. (See Appendix 1 for an explanation of these data points.) Taking this into account, it may be the appropriate time to revisit how Trinity’s pre-foundational writing program is structured to better serve students with lower skills since they are such a large portion of the entering student body. However, before making specific recommendations for implementing a lower-level class, more research is needed given the poor outcomes of previous attempts at a lower-level course such as ENGL103. Any change to the existing pre-foundational writing program should be approved by the English faculty and created to enhance student progression through the full General Education writing program.
* It is imperative that the Writing Specialists receive more specialized professional development in developmental education before making changes to the existing pre-foundational writing program structure. This should include a budget for attending conferences, such as the local Annual Conference on Acceleration in Developmental Learning, as well as workshops through the National Center for Developmental Education. Participation in national conferences on composition pedagogy, such as the Conference on College Composition and Communication, would also be beneficial in allowing the Writing Specialists to incorporate new strategies to enhance Trinity’s full first-year writing program.

**Appendix 1**

**External Benchmarks: Pass Rates in Context**

 While it is important to evaluate how the outcomes of Trinity’s pre-foundational writing curriculum compare to models at similar institutions, such a comparison must not rest simply on pass rates. Looking at this single assessment tool will not provide an accurate picture of how Trinity’s writing program differs in size and structure from other programs, nor how our students differ in risk factors and skill level from students at other institutions. Further, pass rates reported even within the last five years often reflect outdated models of remedial education at community colleges, which have typically placed students into mandatory two- or three-semester tiers of developmental coursework before students could take credit-bearing English classes.

Consider these reported pass rates reflecting national and local trends:

* The National Center for Developmental Education published its “National Study of Developmental Education II: Baseline Data for Community Colleges” in 2007, reflecting data collected at 29 community colleges from Spring 2004 to Winter 2005. This report indicates that 83% of writing students remained in developmental classes until the end of the semester. Of the students who remained in class for the duration of the term, 73% of writing students earned a C or better.[[1]](#footnote-1) This category of students would be similar to Trinity’s reported “completion rate” because, as the NCDE report acknowledges, “students who withdrew from a given class voluntarily or administratively were not counted in the calculations” (2). While this number is higher than Trinity’s reported pass rates for ENGL105S, it is important to note that this study examines community colleges that typically have multiple tiers of developmental writing classes. As such, the 73% pass rate cannot be correlated to any individual level of remedial writing class but rather reflects an overall program’s success. To put this in context for Trinity, the overall pass rate for the remedial writing curriculum—averaging pass rates for both ENGL105S and ENGL105—is 64%. Meanwhile, the pass rate for ENGL105 is actually above the national average at 76% for Spring 2013.
* The Virginia Community College System reported in its 2012 “Developmental Education Annual Report: Tracking the Fall 2007 Cohort and Five-Year Historical Trends” that 68% of students passed their developmental writing courses on the first attempt.[[2]](#footnote-2) However, in the program on which this study reported (which has since been restructured, as will be explained below), students enrolled in a three-semester sequence of remedial writing courses, including English 1, English 3, and English 9. Again, it becomes difficult to compare these outcomes to Trinity’s developmental program, which is structured quite differently. Further, the population of students served in the VCCS is vastly different than that served at Trinity.
* In the Maryland Higher Education Commission’s January 2011 report on “The Costs of Developmental Education,” the Commission lamented the lack of state-wide data collection on “DE completion rates, enrollment or completion rates in credit-bearing courses, or retention and/or graduation rates for students who required developmental education” (20).[[3]](#footnote-3) Therefore, it is difficult to assess the outcomes of developmental education in Maryland’s community colleges and universities and to make any meaningful comparisons to Trinity’s pre-foundational curriculum.

**National and Local trends: Redesigning Developmental English**

In light of recent calls by such organizations as Complete College America, the Lumina Foundation, and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation to restructure remedial education to improve outcomes and move students more quickly into college-level coursework, community colleges in both Virginia and Maryland have been redesigning their developmental curriculum. The Virginia Community College System recently undertook a comprehensive reform that establishes three different tracks of remedial coursework that students can be placed into depending on skill level. This new program limits remediation to one year and combines the reading and writing curriculum. The new curriculum was launched in Spring 2013, so no outcomes have yet been reported.[[4]](#footnote-4)

In Maryland, a remedial English redesign has not been implemented state-wide but has instead been led by community colleges in and around Baltimore. At Baltimore City Community College, the previous developmental curriculum required three mandatory remedial writing courses, along with two remedial reading courses, before students could enroll in their first college-level English class. In 2011 BCCC restructured this program to bridge the reading and writing curriculum and to move students toward college readiness more quickly. The resulting redesign includes two five-credit remedial courses (English 81 and English 82) that combine developmental reading and writing. It is important to note, however, that students with an Accuplacer score below 49 in Reading and Writing cannot even enter the first level of BCCC’s English remediation; instead, these students enter foundation courses that provide 45 hours of direct instruction to help students attain the mandatory minimum Accuplacer score to place into ENGL 81.[[5]](#footnote-5)

Offering another redesign model, the Community College of Baltimore County (CCBC) has become a national leader in its Accelerated Learning Project, which co-enrolls students who place into the highest level of developmental writing with a credit-bearing English 101 course. Since this program’s launch in 2007, CCBC has reported pass rates among students who enrolled in ALP from Fall 2007 to Spring 2009 of 77 percent for the developmental course (compared to 59 percent in Fall 2006 in the previous iteration of the developmental writing course).[[6]](#footnote-6)

**Implications for Trinity**

Trinity’s pre-foundational writing curriculum is already ahead of the recent calls to move students through English remediation and into credit-bearing courses more quickly. In fact, Trinity’s developmental writing and reading programs move students through remediation quite quickly by national standards—after only one semester of remediation in ENGL 105 or 105S and CRS 100S. Although Trinity’s curriculum does not combine writing and reading into a single class, Trinity’s two four-credit courses (ENGL105S and CRS100S) address the same student learning outcomes as the lowest level of VCCC’s redesigned remedial English: an 8-credit class addressing outcomes in both writing and reading. In fact, Trinity’s pre-foundational courses in writing and reading are already aligned to reinforce core concepts in reading and rhetorical analysis.

Nevertheless, since Trinity’s program is structured as only one semester of remediation—rather than one full year as is typically the case at similar institutions—it is important to consider the entering skill level for students enrolling in Trinity’s remedial English program. As reported above, students at BCCC cannot even enter the first of two levels of English remediation if they score below 49 on the Accuplacer assessment for reading and writing. To put that number in context, in the Fall 2012 semester, 59% of ENGL 105S students who reported Accuplacer scores fell below 50 on their reading assessment; in Spring 2013, 60% of ENGL105S students who reported Accuplacer scores fell below 50 on the reading assessment. At BCCC, these students would have been required to take foundational courses before they could even enter the lowest level of developmental English.

Given the low skill level of many students entering Trinity’s pre-foundational writing curriculum, it may be worth exploring whether the program should be restructured to include multiple tiers of remediation. However, major changes to the existing pre-foundational curriculum should only be undertaken in tandem with a larger assessment of the full first-year writing program. More research is needed to explore what model would work best to address the needs of Trinity’s student population and to best prepare them for the college-level writing they will encounter in the General Education curriculum and beyond. Any possible changes to the pre-foundational structure should also be considered for how they will impact ENGL107, the first college-level writing course Trinity students take. Accelerated learning models could be considered to support students between ENGL105S/105 and ENGL107.

**Appendix 2**



**College of Arts and Sciences**

**Spring 2013**

**English 105S: Introduction to College Writing with Supplemental Instruction**

4 credits

**English 105: Introduction to College Writing**

3 credits

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Professor: | Writing Specialists |
| Office: | Main Hall  |
| E-mail:Phone: | RiversJ@trinitydc.edu / DAngeloK@trinitydc.eduExt. 9291 Ext. 9290 |
| Office Hours: | Monday & Wednesday 11:00 am – noonTuesday & Thursday 11:00 am – noonOther times, by appointment/drop-in |

**Course Description**

This course is designed to increase fluency in college-level written communication with an emphasis on organizational skills and language structure. Students will have the opportunity to develop and/or improve the ability to analyze and critique texts in order to write about them.

 **Course Goals**

* To develop skills in academic writing.
* To give students a set of concepts to help structure their thinking and work toward writing clear, persuasive, and stylish prose. This will be achieved by engaging various rhetorical strategies in response to a variety of interactions between writer, reader, text, topic, and moment.

**Objectives for Student Learning**

* Upon successful completion of this course, students will be able to:
* incorporate a variety of tactics for generating ideas about a topic;
* use systematic patterns of topic development and organization;
* meet the usage standards and sophistication level of the audience being addressed;
* integrate techniques for making writing more cohesive and coherent;
* develop strategies for revision that will carry into other classes and contexts;
* use the academic conventions of incorporating and citing the words and ideas of others;
* develop the habit of thinking critically both about ideas and about sources of information; and
* edit writing for correct word choice, grammar usage, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling.

**Required Texts and Materials**

Cooley, Thomas. *The Norton Sampler: Short Essays for Composition*. 7th ed. New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 2010. Print.

Hacker, Diana and Nancy Sommers. *Rules for Writers. 7th Edition (plus CompClass).* New York: Bedford/St. Martin’s, 2012. Print.

Reading packet (distributed in class and available as a PDF on the Moodle classroom space)

Regular access to a computer, printer, and the internet

##### **Grading Scale**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **A** | 93-100% | **A-** | 90-92% |
| **B+** | 87-89% | **B** | 83-86% | **B-** | 80-82% |
| **C+** | 77-79% | **C** | 72-76% | **F** | 71% and below |
| ***\*\*\**** *Students must earn at least a C in ENGL 105S in order to proceed to ENGL 107* ***\*\*\**** |

##### **Final Grade Breakdown**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Assignment** | **% of Final Grade** |
| **Classwork**Response WritingsReading QuizzesGrammar/Editing QuizzesDiagnostic Pre and Post-Tests | **20%** |
| **Two 1-Paragraph Assignments**Descriptive Narration \*Illustration\* | **10%** |
| **Two 2-Paragraph Assignments**Comparison and Contrast\*Timed Writing Test *[In-Class Writings]* | **20%** |
| **One 4-Paragraph Essay**Cause and Effect\* | **15%** |
| **One 4-Paragraph Other Side Argument Essay** | **15%** |
| **One 5- to 6-Paragraph Final Argument Essay**\* | **20%** |
| **Total:** | **100%** |
| *\* Each of these 7 formal assignments* ***must*** *be submitted in order to pass the course.* |

**Assignment Policies**

Unless otherwise directed, you must turn in all assignments in typed, hard copy format at the beginning of class on their respective due dates. Should you find yourself unable to do so, your earned grade will decline by 10 points (one full letter grade) for each day the assignment is late. Emailing your completed assignment to me stops the “late clock,” but you must submit a hard copy of the assignment for it to be graded.

***Important reminder:*** You must complete all 7 formal paragraph and essay assignments in order to pass the course. That is, even if late penalties will result in a failing score for a paragraph or essay assignment, you are still obligated to submit it in order to receive credit for the course. Additionally, you must complete the Diagnostic Pre-test to begin receiving grades in the course, and you must complete the Diagnostic Post-test and show some level of improvement before your final Argument Essay is due. The Argument Essay will not be graded until your Diagnostic Post-Test is taken.

As every student has different strengths and weaknesses, I may designate additional reading, writing, or presentation assignments throughout the semester to individual students. These assignments will be required and graded as they are meant to inspire, challenge, and help you to become a better writer.

**CompClass**

As part of our weekly grammar lab, we will be using CompClass, an online resource that provides access to the e-book version of *Rules for Writers,* along with numerous practice exercises and quizzes. Our grammar instruction will follow this general schedule:

* **As preparation for Friday’s lab**, you will **read the assigned pages** in the handbook.
* **In Friday’s class**, I will go over the concept you read about and explain any aspects you did not understand from the readings.
* **After Friday’s class**, you will have until **Wednesday of the following week** (at midnight) to complete practice exercises assigned through CompClass. You will log into CompClass (at **YourCompClass.com**), go under the assignments tab, and complete all of the exercises assigned for the week. The syllabus states clearly how many exercises are due each week. Many of these assignments will be through the LearningCurve program on CompClass. When it comes to this homework, you will get participation credit—that is, you will get credit for completing all of the assigned work.
* Finally, you will have a **weekly quiz on the grammar content** you learned the previous week. **These quizzes must be completed by Thursday night at midnight** in order to earn credit. Unlike the homework, which will be graded based on completion, the quizzes will be graded based on your performance. These grades will reflect the number of questions you actually got correct on each quiz.

**\*\*\*Please note:** Because you have access to CompClass outside of class, you will be expected to complete these assignments regardless of whether you are in class. If you miss the deadline for any CompClass assignment, you will **not** be able to make up the work. Therefore, if you are absent from class for any reason, you must be sure to log into CompClass and complete the assigned homework and quizzes. I will not send reminders; it is your responsibility to keep up with the grammar work for the class. Keep in mind, however, that you can complete the work at any point between Friday’s lab and the Wednesday/Thursday deadlines. In fact, you could have all of your grammar homework for the week completed well in advance of the due dates.

**Attendance Policy**

Attendance is *MANDATORY.* In order to be eligible to pass this class, students must be present and participatory (see explanation below) in at least 2/3 of class meetings this semester.  The student that misses an excessive number of classes could automatically fail the course.  There are absolutely no excused absences.  Students are responsible for turning in and completing all work as well as obtaining lecture notes and materials for any missed class period. On-time and regular attendance facilitates academic success in the course. Students with a serious illness or other serious emergency should register with the Triage Program.

“**Present**” means more than just being physically in the room during class meetings: it means coming to class on time, being prepared to discuss any assigned homework, and being fully attentive to and engaged in the class’s work during each meeting. Students who arrive more than 15 minutes late or who leave before the class ends will be marked absent.

“**Participatory**” behavior includes listening to lectures and discussions carefully and respectfully, asking as well as answering questions, engaging in class discussions in a constructive way, and responding thoughtfully to in-class assignments.

**Technology Policies**

Cell phones are to be silenced or turned off and put away for the duration of all class periods. Under-the-desk texters will be required to leave the class and marked absent for the class period.

No laptops are to be used in class unless specific permission for their use has been granted.

##### Statement of Academic Integrity

Academic dishonesty is a serious offense and will be prosecuted. The penalties for plagiarism and other forms of cheating range from course failure to dismissal from the University.

From the Trinity College Course Catalog:

Trinity is devoted to the highest standards of academic honesty and intellectual integrity. As an institution of higher education founded in the Catholic intellectual tradition and rooted in liberal learning, Trinity challenges students to develop sound moral and ethical practices in their study, research, writing and presentations; in their examinations and portfolios; and in all of their relationships and actions as members of the academic community.

The values that are central to the Trinity experience animate the Honor System that has been a part of the Trinity College community since 1913. All members of the Trinity community, students, faculty, and staff, are expected to uphold a way of life that embraces personal integrity and responsibility, the foundation of the Honor System. The Honor System reflects a personal commitment on the part of all members of the community to individual integrity and shared trust; hence it also reflects a community commitment to abide by University policies, rules, and regulations. Upon joining the Trinity community, each student, faculty member, and staff member agrees to adhere to the following honor pledge:

*I realize the responsibility involved in membership in the Trinity community. I agree to abide by the rules and regulations of this community. I also affirm my intention to live according to the standards of honor, to which lying, stealing, and cheating are opposed. I will help others to maintain this responsibility in all matters essential to the common good of the community.*

In this class, plagiarism—the use of other people’s ideas, work, or words without giving them credit—will be handled according to Trinity’s student judicial guidelines. In general, for non-senior students, the first infraction results in automatic failure of the course while further infractions lead to suspension and then expulsion from the university.

You should not need to consult any outside sources for your work in this course as you should be creating your own, original work. This course will cover how to use MLA style to integrate quotations, paraphrases, and summarized ideas from class readings into in-class writing assignments. However, you will be responsible for following standard citation requirements should you decide to use outside sources in your writing assignments for this course.

**Academic Services Center**

The [Academic Services Center](http://www.trinitydc.edu/academic-services/) (ASC) offers assistance with topics such as scholarly writing and time management. Please feel free to make an appointment with Scott Swinney in the [**Writing Center**](http://www.trinitydc.edu/writing/) or with someone at ASC for [**tutoring assistance**](http://www.trinitydc.edu/academic-services/tutoring/)—appointments are most easily made through the ASC page on Trinity’s website. As it can take 24-48 hours to schedule a session, please plan in advance!

Because it always helps to have an extra pair of eyes looking at anything we write, do not be surprised if you are referred to ASC at some point during the semester.

ASC is also the home of [**Disability Student Services**](http://www.trinitydc.edu/disability/) (DSS). DSS is committed to facilitating the development and attainment of educational goals for Trinity students with disabilities by ensuring equal access to University programs and services as well as promoting student self-advocacy and campus-wide disability awareness. As a matter of policy and practice, Trinity’s DSS complies with the requirements of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

If you are a student with a psychological, cognitive, and/or physical disability, DSS is here to ensure that you receive support services that will equalize your access for your courses and campus activities. In contrast to high school, where students with disabilities are entitled to certain services, in college, you must become approved or eligible for services based on the guidelines set forth by your college. At Trinity, this means that you must first register with DSS before you can request support services.

If you have DSS accommodations, you are required to share this information with your professor within the first two weeks of class.

**Course Schedule**

\*See course schedule on the following pages. The schedule is subject to change at the instructor’s discretion. Students are responsible for keeping up with any changes made to due dates, assignments, deadlines, and readings.\*

**Note that for the “Readings Due,” the textbooks are referred to by the following abbreviations:**

 ***N***: *Norton Sampler* **RP**: Reading Packet (distributed) ***RW*:** *Rules for Writers* **CC***:* CompClass

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Week** | **Day/Date** | **Topics Covered** | **Homework/Readings Due** | **Assignment(s) Due** |
|  | Thu. 1/17 | In-Class Writing SampleSyllabusThe Writing Process |  |  |
| Fri. 1/18 | Diagnostic Grammar Pre-Test(Mandatory) | Read the SyllabusLog onto Moodle***N*:** Ch. 1, p19-36 | CLASS HELD IN COMPUTER LAB**\*\*\*Bring *Rules for Writers* to class\*\*\*** |
| 2 | Tue. 1/22 | Responding to Reading;The Writing Process:Reading, Critical Thinking as a Starting Point for Writing;Paragraph Patterns | ***RP*:** “For Poor, Leap to College Often Ends in a Hard Fall”***N***: Ch. 1, p36-40***RW***: p50-68 |  |
| Thu. 1/24 | Responding to ReadingResponse Writing #1 | ***RP***: President McGuire’s blog response to NYT article |  |
| Fri. 1/25 | **Grammar Lab:** Parts of Speech, Sentence Patterns | ***RW***: p.367-388 |  |
| 3 | Tue. 1/29 | MLA CitationParagraph StructureDescription as Paragraph Pattern | ***N*:** Appendix, p491-497; AND Ch. 2, p41-50 |  |
| ***Monday, Jan. 28: Last day for schedule adjustments (Add/Drop deadline)*** |
| 3 (cont.) | Wed. 1/30 |  |  | **LearningCurve**:**3** Exercises DUE: 1.“Verbs, Adjectives, and Adverbs”2.“Nouns and Pronouns”3.“Prepositions and Conjunctions”  |
| Thur. 1/31 | In-Class Writing: Description (30 minutes)Narrative as Paragraph Pattern | ***N****:* Ch. 3, p84-91 | \*\***Diagnostic Quiz #1,** due on CC by midnight: “All Parts of Speech” |
| Fri. 2/1 | **Grammar Lab:** Verbs: Verb tense and form, subject-verb agreement | ***RW***: p. 232-250, and p196-206 |  |
| 4 | Tue. 2/5 | Descriptive Narratives;Introduce Narrative Assignment**Response Writing #2** | ***RP*:** “Learning to Read and Write,” Douglass |  |
| Wed. 2/6 |  |  | **LearningCurve**: 2 Exercises Due: 1. Verbs
2. Subject-Verb Agreement
 |
| Thur. 2/7 | Narrative Draft Workshop | \*Bring typed Narrative draft | **\*\*Diagnostic Quiz #2 & #3**, due on CC by midnight: **2 Quizzes** on “Standard English Verb Forms” and “Subject-Verb Agreement” |
| Fri. 2/8 | **Grammar Lab:** Combining Sentences/ Types of Sentences | **RW**: p. 398-400 |  |
| 5 | Tue. 2/12 | Illustration as Paragraph PatternIntroduce Illustration Paper | ***N*:** Ch 4, p129-137***RP****:* Review “For Poor, the Leap to College…” | **\*Narrative Paper due** |
| Wed. 2/13 |  |  | **no LearningCurve exercises**  |
| Thur. 2/14 | Draft Workshop: Illustration | \*Bring typed Illustration draft | \*\***Diagnostic Quiz #4**, due on CC by midnight: “Sentence Types” |
| Fri. 2/15 | **Grammar Lab:** Run-Ons and Fragments | ***RW***: p. 180-195 |  |
| 6 | Tue. 2/19 | Comparison/Contrast as Paragraph Pattern | ***N:*** Ch. 7, p246-253***RP***: “Why Mothers Should Stay Home,” Fallows |  |
| Wed. 2/20 |  |  | **\*Illustration Paper Due****LearningCurve**:2 Exercises due:1. Run-On Sentences
2. Fragments
 |
| Thur. 2/21 | More on Comparison/Contrast;Outlining for C/C Essay | **Response Writing #3** | \*\***Diagnostic Quiz #5 & #6**, **2 quizzes** due on CC by midnight:“Run-on Sentences” and “Fragments” |
| Fri. 2/22 | **Grammar Lab:** Pronouns, Pronoun Reference, Pronoun-Antecedent Matching | **RW:** p207-225 |  |
| 7 | Tue. 2/26 | Developing Main Idea and Supporting Points; TransitionsDraft Workshop: Comparison/Contrast (30 minutes) | \*Bring typed Comparison/Contrast Draft  |  |
| Wed. 2/27 |  |  | **Learning Curve:**1 Exercise Due: Pronoun Agreement and Pronoun Reference |
| Thur. 2/28 | **Timed Writing Review** (of modes and paragraph structure) |  | \*\***Diagnostic Quiz #7 & #8**, **2 Quizzes** due on CC by midnight: “Pronoun Reference” and “Pronoun-Antecedent Agreement” |
| Fri. 3/1 | **TIMED WRITING TEST (2-paragraph structure)** |  | **\*Comparison/Contrast Paper due** |
|  ***Monday, March 4-Friday, March 8: Spring Break (No Class)*** |
| 8 | Tue. 3/12 | Cause & Effect as Paragraph Pattern | ***N****:* Ch. 9, p339-347***RP***: Review “Learning to Read and Write” and “Why Mothers Should Stay Home” |  |
| Wed. 3/13 |  |  | **No Learning Curve exercises** |
| Thur. 3/14 | Cause & Effect cont.**Response Writing #4**Introduce Cause & Effect Assignment | ***RP*:** from “The End of Education,” Postman | No Grammar Quiz this week |
| Fri. 3/15 | **Grammar Lab:** Parallelism | **RW**: p116-126 |  |
| 9 | Tue. 3/19 | Introductions and ConclusionsThesis Workshop: Cause & Effect | Bring typed thesis for Cause-Effect Essay |  |
| Wed. 3/20 |  |  | **Learning Curve:** Parallelism |
| Thur. 3/21 | Cause & Effect Mini-Workshop: Body ParagraphsIntroduce Argument as Mode of Writing | ***N*:** Ch. 10, 376-388 | \*\***Diagnostic Quiz #9**, 1 Exercise due on CC by midnight: “Parallelism” |
| Fri. 3/22 | **Grammar Lab**: Modifiers | ***RW***: p127-134 | **\*Cause & Effect Essay due** |
| 10 | Tue. 3/26 | **Class Cancelled:** Mandatory Conferences | Conferences held in Main 226 |  |
| Wed. 3/27 |  |  | **2 Practice Quizzes:** Misplaced Modifiers and Dangling Modifiers |
| Thur. 3/28 | **Class Cancelled:** Mandatory Conferences | Conferences held in Main 226 | \*\***Diagnostic Quiz #10 & #11**, 2 quizzes due on CC by midnight: “Misplaced Modifiers” and “Dangling Modifiers” |
| ***Fri. 3/29: Good Friday (No Class)*** |
| ***Tuesday, April 2: Withdrawal Deadline (last day to drop the class with a “W”)*** |
| 11 | Tue. 4/2 | ArgumentChoosing a Topic | ***RP*:** “Dumbing Down,” Marantz Henig  |  |
| Wed. 4/3 |  |  | **No Learning Curve exercises** |
| Thur. 4/4 | Argument as Debate;Brainstorming Multiple Points of View**Response Writing #5** | ***RP*:** “Blowing Up the Tracks,” Kean | NO GRAMMAR QUIZ |
| Fri. 4/5 | **Grammar Lab:** Punctuation Review: Commas, Colons, Semicolons, Apostrophes, Quotation Marks | ***RW***: p291-335 |  |
| 12 | Tue. 4/9 | Audience AppealsUnderstanding the DebateCommon Topics | ***RW***: Constructing Reasonable Arguments, p84-100 |  |
| Wed. 4/10 |  |  | **Learning Curve:** 2 exercises due on:1. Apostrophes
2. Commas
 |
| Thur. 4/11 | Thesis Workshop: Other Side EssayBuilding OutlinesEvidenceLogical Fallacies | Bring typed thesis for Other Side Essay***RW***: Evaluating Arguments 7a, 7b, 7c, p102-110 | **\*\*Diagnostic Quiz #12 & #13, 2 quizzes** due on CC by midnight: “All Uses of the Comma” and “The Colon, the Semicolon, and the Comma”  |
| Fri. 4/12 | **Grammar Lab:** Eliminating Wordiness and “to be” Verbs, Passive vs. Active Voice | ***RW***: p112- 115, 156-161 |  |
| 13 | Tue. 4/16 | Responding to Opposing ViewsDraft Workshop: Other Side Essay | Bring typed (complete) Other Side Essay to Class |  |
| Wed. 4/17 |   |  | **\*Other Side Argument Essay due****LearningCurve:**“Active and Passive Voice” |
| Thur. 4/18 | Thesis Workshop: Final Argument Essay;Outlining/Parts of a Full Argument | Bring typed thesis for Final Argument Essay***RP:*** Review “The End of Education,” Postman | \*\***Diagnostic Quiz #14 & #15**, 2 quizzes due on CC by midnight: “Active vs. Passive Voice” and “Wordy Sentences”  |
| Fri. 4/19 | **Diagnostic Post-Test** |  | CLASS HELD IN COMPUTER LAB |
| 14 | Tue. 4/23 | Workshopping | Bring typed Argument Essay draft  |  |
| Thur. 4/25 | Workshopping(Proofreading and Style) | Bring typed Argument Essay draft  |  |
| Fri. 4/26 | **In-Class Diagnostic Essay** |  |  |
|  ***Tuesday, April 30: Final Argument Essay due (bring to Main 226 by 3 p.m.)***  |
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