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ACADEMIC LITERACY CURRICULUM
CURRICULAR PATHWAYS

**ELWR satisfied or AWPE score 8+**
- Fall 2018: COLLEGE 1 → Winter, Spring, or Fall 2019: WRITING 2

**AWPE score 2-6 or AWPE-MLS score 6**
- Fall 2018: COLLEGE 1 → Winter or Spring 2019: WRITING 1 → Spring or Fall 2019: WRITING 2

**AWPE-MLS score 3-4**
- Fall 2018: COLLEGE 1 + WRITING 26 → Winter or Spring 2019: WRITING 1 → Spring or Fall 2019: WRITING 2

**AWPE-MLS score 2-3**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>College 1</th>
<th>Writing 25 &amp; 26</th>
<th>Writing 1</th>
<th>Writing 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RHETORICAL KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and employ rhetorical concepts (i.e., audience, purpose, context, genre)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITICAL READING &amp; CRITICAL THINKING</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpret, analyze, critique, and draw connections between texts and perspectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION LITERACY</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support ideas using relevant, credible, appropriately cited sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRITING (RESEARCH)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze &amp; synthesize sources to sustain meaningful inquiry in a research project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRITING PROCESS</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise writing, follow genre &amp; disciplinary conventions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METACOGNITION</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflect critically on processes for writing and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMPOSITION 1 (Core) 
Colleges Nine/Ten
- 6 faculty committee
- n = 129 students (13%)

CROWN 80A
- 8 faculty committee
- n = 82 students (38%)

WRITING 2
- 5 faculty committee + librarians
- n = 66 students (38%)

WRITING 20
- 5 faculty committee
- n = 66 students (38%)

WRITING 25/26, WRITING 1, & WRITING 2
- 70 faculty (88%)
- n = 2845 students (76%)

ASSESSMENT OF WRITING COURSES 2014-2019

UCSC Writing Program Assessment Team, Graphic: Priscilla Sung, IRAPS
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Writing Program
Rate your skills in evaluating the credibility of sources at the START of the course, then at the END of the course.

What types of support did you use for research-based writing during the term?

**DIRECT EVIDENCE**

- Instructors evaluate student learning
  - Course-specific criterion-based rubrics
  - Developed by faculty, through teaching experience & committee work
  - Given to students as assignment

**INDIRECT EVIDENCE**

- Students reflect on their learning
  - Course-specific online survey
  - Evaluate skills at start and end of course
  - Comment on learning experiences

- NOT a teacher evaluation or satisfaction survey!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion 1</th>
<th>Did not meet expectations</th>
<th>Nearly met expectations</th>
<th>Met expectations</th>
<th>Exceeded expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rate your skills in evaluating the credibility of sources at the START of the course, then at the END of the course.**

**What types of support did you use for research-based writing during the term?**

**Institutional Research adds student background characteristics for equity analysis**
Writing 25: Writing about Place
Writing 26: Writing about Language
Writing 27: Writing about Genre
Writing 25: Writing about Place

Writing 26: Writing about Language
Writing 25 & 26: Content-based & Project-based Learning, Final Project Samples
## Differences in Student Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WRITING 25 (N = 30)</th>
<th>WRITING 26 (N = 262)</th>
<th>WRITING 1 (N = 1122)</th>
<th>WRITING 2 (N = 3721)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-generation students</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International students (46%, US high school)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilingual students</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWPE scores</td>
<td>100% 2-3</td>
<td>12% 2-3</td>
<td>36% 2-5</td>
<td>12% 2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88% 4-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>64% 6</td>
<td>21% 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66% 8-12 or ELWR-satisfied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences in student demographics highlight first-generation students, international students (46%, US high school), multilingual students, and AWPE scores across different writing programs.
83-93% met or exceeded all criteria except for Criteria 5, “Language”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First draft quality</th>
<th>Does not meet</th>
<th>Meets</th>
<th>Exceeds</th>
<th>Meets/exceeds</th>
<th>Total N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr1: Understanding ethnographic research</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr2: Use of primary and secondary evidence</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr3: Use of citation style and incorporation of quotes, paraphrases, and summary</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr4: Structure</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr5: Language use (mechanics and grammar)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr6: Thinking about thinking</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr7: Writing process</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
83-93% met or exceeded all criteria except for Criteria 5, “Language”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>First draft quality</th>
<th>Does not meet</th>
<th>Meets</th>
<th>Exceeds</th>
<th>Meets/exceeds</th>
<th>Total N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr1: Understanding ethnographic research</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr2: Use of primary and secondary evidence</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr3: Use of citation style and incorporation of quotes, paraphrases, and summary</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr4: Structure</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr5: Language use (mechanics and grammar)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr6: Thinking about thinking</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr7: Writing process</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Writing 26 Student Proficiencies; Fall 2018 (n=202), Winter 2019 (n=37)

80-90% met/exceeded
Writing 26 Student Proficiencies; Fall 2018 (n=202), Winter 2019 (n=37)

Fig. 1. Proportions of Writing 26 students who met or exceeded expectations, AWPE 2E-3E vs. 4E-5E

Cr1: Understanding social science research
Cr2: Use of primary and secondary evidence
Cr3: Use of citation style and incorporation of quotes, paraphrases, and summary
Cr4: Structure
Cr5: Language use (mechanics about thinking and grammar)
Cr6: Thinking writing process
Cr7: The writing process

80-90% met/exceeded

* Significant at p≤.05, † Significant at p=.09
MLC Study: Implications

- Language acquisition is a developmental process;
- Evidence that rigorous content-based instruction is working; However,
- Elimination of Writing 27 unfortunate
Writing 1: Introduction to Composition

Sarah Michals
Writing Program Lecturer
ELWR Coordinator
Outcome 6: Reflect cognitively and metacognitively on processes for writing and analysis, building on strengths and addressing weaknesses

What does this outcome mean?
Reflecting **cognitively** = Thinking about something

Reflecting **metacognitively** = Thinking about thinking in order to grow
Why this outcome?

**SCHEMA**
Students enter a privileged discourse community with incomplete or inapplicable background knowledge.

**METACOGNITION**
Students learn an analytical framework that allows them to organize their knowledge into contexts of application.

**TRANSFER**
Students draw on that framework to as they move between contexts, making appropriate choices.

Source: Robertson, Taczac, and Yancey (2012)  
Visual representation S. Michals
The Project

The Assignment:

● 7 questions
  ○ 1 foundation question (not assessed)
  ○ 6 assessed questions
    ■ Each of the 6 assessed questions were designed to track onto a single criterion:
      1. Process Awareness & Articulation (cognition)
      2. Process Awareness & Problem-Solving (metacognition)
      3. Strengths Awareness
      4. Strengths Plan
      5. Weaknesses Awareness
      6. Weaknesses Plan

The Rubric:

● Student responses were scored by their instructors via Canvas
  ■ Writer with Advanced Reflective Skills
  ■ Writer with Developing Reflective Skills
  ■ Writer with Emerging Reflective Skills
  ■ Writer with Novice Reflective Skills
Overall Results
Most students demonstrate metacognitive proficiency

Writing 1 Students’ Metacognitive Abilities, By Curricular Pathway and Language Status
(Percentage demonstrating advanced/developing skills)

UCSC Writing Program Assessment Team
Graphic: Priscilla Sung, IRAPS
Notice: Larger and Smaller Gaps by Criterion

- **Students who started in the MLC** were most successful in Cr. 2 (Problem-Solving) and Cr. 6 (Weaknesses Plan)
  - These are **metacognitive** skills

- **Students placed directly into WRIT 1** were most successful in Cr. 1 (Process Awareness & Articulation) and Cr. 5 (Weaknesses Awareness)
  - These are **cognitive** skills
Race/Ethnicity
Results by Race/Ethnicity: No significant difference

Writing 1 Students’ Metacognitive Abilities
(Percentage demonstrating advanced/developing skills)

UCSC Writing Program Assessment Team,
Graphic: Priscilla Sung, IRAPS

*Significant at p < .05
Race/Ethnicity + Multilingualism and/or 1st Generation Status
The majority (71-85%) of students of color who were multilingual, first-generation or both demonstrated advanced/developing skills across all 6 criteria.
# White Students at Intersections

## Table 3. Metacognition proficiencies of Writing 1 students, by intersectional identities* (Percentage demonstrating advanced/developing skills)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Monolingual, continuing-gen White, non-Hispanic students (n = 112)</th>
<th>Multilingual first-gen students of color (n = 272)</th>
<th>Monolingual, first-gen students of color (n = 93)</th>
<th>Multilingual, continuing gen. students of color (n = 140)</th>
<th>Monolingual, continuing-gen, students of color (n = 138)</th>
<th>Multilingual and/or first-gen White, non-Hispanic students (n = 49)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cr1: Process Awareness &amp; Articulation (cognition)</strong></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cr2: Process Awareness &amp; Problem-Solving (metacognition)</strong></td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cr3: Strengths Awareness</strong></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cr4: Strengths Plan</strong></td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cr5: Weaknesses Awareness</strong></td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cr6: Weaknesses Plan</strong></td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Color spectrum indicates student proficiency levels within each criterion: green indicates higher, red indicates lower.
Gender
Our Most Consistent Finding: Gender Differences

Women as a group demonstrated significantly stronger reflective skills than men across all six criteria.

Writing 1 Students’ Metacognitive Abilities
(Percentage demonstrating advanced/developing skills)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Women (%)</th>
<th>Men (%)</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cr1: Process Awareness &amp; Articulation (cognition)</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr2: Process Awareness &amp; Problem-Solving (metacognition)</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr3: Strengths Awareness</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr4: Strengths Plan</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr5: Weaknesses Awareness</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr6: Weaknesses Plan</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at p < .05  
**Significant at p < .01  
***Significant at p < .001
Takeaways

Overall, the ALC is serving its diverse student group well with most students demonstrating metacognitive proficiency.

Student groups demonstrating relatively lower metacognitive proficiency:

- Male
- Multilingual (including those initially placed into WRIT 1, but especially those initially placed into the MLC)
- White + First-generation
Takeaways, cont.

Questions we can ask ourselves:

- What about the ALC is working to reduce preparation gaps in metacognition?
  - Rigor?
  - Inclusive teaching?
  - Other?

- How can we explain the remaining gaps?
  - Preparation?
  - Cultural influence?
  - Assessment tool?
  - Other?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College 1</th>
<th>Writing 1</th>
<th>Writing 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[no explicit IL outcome]</td>
<td>Support their ideas through the use of examples, personal experience, observations, and/or appropriately cited source material.</td>
<td>Locate relevant source material, evaluate its credibility, and cite it appropriately.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MLC (WRIT 25/26)**

- Understanding social science research and its genre conventions
- Use of primary and secondary evidence to support writer's ideas
- Use of citation style and effective incorporation of quotes, paraphrases, and summary into the text

**ALC Critical Reading and Information Literacy Outcomes**
Direct Rubric-Based Assessment Criteria

Cr1. Meeting assignment expectations for number of source materials

Cr2. Meeting assignment expectations for type(s) of source materials

Cr3. Using relevant source material

Cr4. Using credible source material

Cr5. Attributing source material appropriately

Cr6. Citing source material appropriately
### Comprehensive Results

#### Table 1. Writing 2 students’ proficiencies, Winter, Spring, & Fall quarters combined, 2019 (n=1956)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Didn't participate*</th>
<th>No attempt to meet expectations</th>
<th>Approaches expectations</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds expectations</th>
<th>Meets/Exceeds expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1: Meets assignment expectations for NUMBER of source materials</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2: Meets assignment expectations for TYPE(S) of source materials</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3: Contains RELEVANT source material</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4: Contains CREDIBLE source material</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5: Appropriately ATTRIBUTES source material</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6: Appropriately CITES source material</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Students who enrolled in the assessed sections but did not submit their assignment because they were already failing the course or for some other reason.*
Figure 1. Writing 2 students’ self-reported final proficiencies in information literacy and digital resources (Percentage reporting “Excellent”/“Very good” skills)

- Locate relevant sources: 73%
- Integrate sources into writing: 73%
- Include appropriate type(s) of sources: 71%
- Cite sources appropriately: 71%
- Include appropriate number of sources: 70%
- Evaluate credibility of sources: 69%
- Integrate sources as direct quotations: 66%
- Locate sources using external search engines: 66%
- Integrate sources into writing by summarizing main points: 63%
- Integrate sources into writing by paraphrasing key passages: 62%
- Format citations and references: 61%
- Locate sources using UCSC’s “Library Search”: 58%
- Locate sources using Google Scholar: 57%
- Locate sources using scholarly databases: 55%
Comparison of ALC v. non-ALC students

Figure 3. Writing 2 students’ proficiencies in critical reading and information literacy, ALC students vs. non-ALC students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NON-ALC STUDENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds expectations</td>
<td>Meets expectations</td>
<td>Approaches expectations</td>
<td>No attempt/Didn't participate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALC STUDENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds expectations</td>
<td>Meets expectations</td>
<td>Approaches expectations</td>
<td>No attempt/Didn't participate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at p < .05
ELWR v. non-ELWR Students

*Significant at $p < .05$
Figure 2. Writing 2 students’ use of resources, by curricular pathway (Percentage reporting use at least once a week)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>MLC students</th>
<th>Students who took Writing 1 before Writing 2</th>
<th>Students who took only Writing 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Google Search</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor-created resources</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal (not assigned) feedback/advice from other students in the course</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from other students in the course</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback/advice from friends, family, roommates</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online tutoring</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online writing guides and resources</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Takeaways for Writing 2

- Information literacy instruction in Writing 2 is effective for most students, with ELWR-satisfied students demonstrating the highest proficiencies.
- ELWR-unsatisfied students, even after 1-3 additional courses, do not catch up with their ELWR-satisfied peers in Writing 2, although the differences are not enormous.
- Cr5 “Appropriately Attributing” and Cr6 “Appropriately Citing” Source Material are the criteria where students across the board demonstrate lower proficiencies
- Students desire more instruction in digital literacy skills
- Students desire more clarity and access for resources and assistance for all writing and research tasks
Curricular Interventions for Writing 2

- Place more emphasis on intellectual property, attribution, and citation as key components of information literacy

- Place more emphasis on digital literacy skills, particularly on database searching and navigating library digital resources

- Make information literacy and other writing resources easier for students to access

- Target former ELWR students in Writing 2 for additional resources (e.g. tutoring, workshops) particularly around information literacy.
Implications for the ALC

- Results show that College 1 has a positive impact on information literacy skills proficiency.

- However, MLC and Writing 1 students (ELWR) are not reaching the same proficiencies as their peers who took Writing 2 only (non-ELWR).
Curricular Interventions for the ALC

- Scaffold information literacy skills, particularly around databases and digital literacy throughout the ALC, in a more explicit way.

- Scaffold intellectual property and ethical source attribution and citation throughout the ALC, in a more explicit way.

- Introduce students to library resources and tutoring options earlier in their academic career.

- Train tutors differently in information literacy and source attribution.
Writing Program Study 2019-2020

Tonya Ritola, Assessment Lead

Maggie Amis, Assessment Associate

Kim Helmer, MLC Chair

Sarah Michals, ELWR Chair

Phil Longo, Composition Chair

With invaluable institutional assistance from

Anna Sher and Priscilla Sung Institutional Research and Public Policy (IRAPS)

Jennifer Quynn Center for Innovations in Teaching and Learning (CITL)

CITL’S ITS staff

Leslie Kern Canvas Program Manager