

CSUN TNE LITERACY RESEARCH PROJECT
Report on Year One
Elizabeth Adams, Ian Barnard, and Beverly Cabello
July 2007

Researchers:

Elizabeth Adams
Ian Barnard
Tina Bertacchi-Love
Pamela Bourgeois
Beverly Cabello
Sandra Chong
Irene Clark
Theresa Montaña
Kathleen Dudden Rowlands
Renee Ziolkowska

Overview of Project: This project was designed to answer the following research questions:

1. **Are writing expectations the same across subject matter and education?**
2. **Are all Liberal Studies pathways equal in success in candidates' ability to write?**
3. **What pieces of the Liberal Studies curriculum are most helpful in improving students' writing abilities?**

Purpose and Rationale: One criticism often heard in reference to Liberal Studies students is that they "cannot write." This study allows us to critically examine where our writing instruction is succeeding and falling short. I should help prompt examination of what we can do better to add value to writing skills and to teach how to teach writing. It also allows us to examine where our expectations of writing vary across the disciplines.

Timeline:

- August-September 2006: Development of scoring rubrics
- October 2006-January 2007: Collection of student papers and development of scoring protocol
- February 2007-May 2007: Scoring of student papers
- June-July 2007: Statistical analysis and writing of report

Selection of Data: The students in the project were, for the most part, selected at random from the Fall 2006 census report of Liberal Studies majors.

We selected 75 First Time Freshmen enrolled in various Departments' versions of 097, 098 and 155. We also selected 75 students in the Liberal Studies Gateway course who were in their junior years. Half of them arrived as first time freshmen and half were transfer students. In addition, the ITEP-Freshman Option 04 cohort was compared to the non-ITEP-Freshman Option groups. We ended up with a total student N (in all populations) of 101.

We collected two papers from each student. One was a timed assignment and the other was an assignment they were allowed to rewrite.

Methodology:

(a) Development of Scoring Rubrics

Kathy Rowlands, in consultation with various professional education constituencies, developed a five point scoring rubric designed to reflect the priorities and pedagogical dispositions of college Education faculty, as well as of K-12 teachers and administrators (Rubric A--see Appendix 1). Ian Barnard, in consultation with other college composition specialists (Bourgeois, Clark, and Montaña), developed a six point scoring rubric designed to reflect the priorities and pedagogical dispositions of college compositionists (see Appendix 2). This rubric was subsequently reworked as a five point rubric in order to allow for efficient comparison of the two rubrics and of scoring student writing samples across both rubrics (Rubric B--see Appendix 3).

While the scoring criteria in Rubrics A and B are quite similar, the emphasis on nuanced scoring in Rubric A versus holistic scoring in Rubric B marks a significant philosophical distinction between the two rubrics that also implies several consequences for the scoring of student writing samples (for instance, most of the scorers agreed that scoring papers following Rubric A is more arduous and time-consuming than scoring papers following Rubric B), and possibly for the scores assigned as well (for instance, in Rubric A a paper's score relating to its use of grammatical conventions carries equal weight with the score assigned for the paper's presentation of its main ideas, while in Rubric B the former category is clearly subordinated to the latter category).

(b) Scoring of Student Papers

In addition to the writing samples from English 305 students and LRS 300 students, we requested writing samples from a total of 76 students enrolled in CSUN developmental and first year composition courses. Ian personally contacted and/or wrote to the CSUN faculty identified as teaching these students, requesting that they provide appropriate writing samples (see letter, Appendix 4). We ultimately received writing samples of 26 students in this group (some faculty did not respond; in some cases the students identified were no longer enrolled in the applicable course) Of the writing samples we did receive, not all could be

used in the study, as some had missing pages. The researchers are most grateful to the students whose work forms the focus of this study, and to the CSUN faculty members who gave of their time and energy to provide the student papers: Professors Miller, Gold, Schaeffer, Cross, Marsh, Battaglia, Shannon, Smartt, Kellenberger, Ifagboyede, Taylor, Meisel, Sayles, Tripp, Hunter, Dimakos, Slobod, Riccomini, Rock, Damiani, Kogan, Nard, Wehmeyer, Bertacchi-Love, Lerner, Noonan, Von Mayrhauser.

Once all the student writing samples had been gathered and catalogued, the scorers (Barnard, Bourgeois, Chong, Clark, Bertacchi-Love, Montaña, Rowlands, Ziolkowska) met together six times, for approximately three hours per session, to score 236 writing samples following the Scoring Protocol (see Appendix 5). In addition, the beginning portions of the first and second scoring sessions were devoted to discussion of the rubrics and scoring protocol, and to the training and norming of scorers using practice student papers. During “live” scoring, each paper was scored by at least two different trained readers, each using both scoring guides. Each first or second reader assigned papers a Rubric A score out of 25 and a rubric B score out of 5; in cases of discrepancies, an experienced third reader determined a paper’s final score. Each paper received a total Rubric A score out of 50 and a total Rubric B score out of 10. The final Rubric A score for each paper was divided by 5 (and rounded off to the nearest whole number) to facilitate the comparison between Rubric A and Rubric B scores.

The scorers agreed that the process of scoring the student papers using the two rubrics raised many important issues about the teaching of writing, the preparation of teachers, and instruction of English Language Learners in particular, and are planning--in collaboration with Harry Hellenbrand and Elizabeth Adams--to give presentations on the literacy project at several scholarly conferences in the coming year (see panel proposal for Conference on College Composition and Communication--Appendix 6).

Results: (for the full report, see Appendix 7)

Research Questions queried of data:

1. Are there significant differences in the scores yielded by all sample students scores on the timed and untimed rubrics A and B?
2. Are there significant score differences between timed and untimed rubrics on the following status categories: Freshman v Junior status, First Time Freshman v First Time Transfer, ITEP Freshman Option v non- ITEP FO, juniors who are FTF v juniors who are FTT, students who are ELL v those who are not?

3. Are there significant score differences between timed and untimed rubrics for students who have taken the following courses: EN 097, EN 098, EN155, EN155SI, EN305, GATE 300, PAS 097?
4. Do either the status factors and/or courses predict medium to high scores on either rubric?
5. Considering the results for questions 1 – 4 above, are timed and untimed rubrics A and B equivalent?

Method:

Comparisons between Scores of Timed and Untimed (Revised) Rubrics were conducted in several ways. First, raw scores for all students regardless of status (junior v freshman, ITEP option, ELL, first time Freshman v First Time Transfer) were compared using T tests. This analysis is more rigorous in that it is a parametric statistic and assumes the existence of a distribution among scores.

In a second set of analyses, scores were sorted into four categories ranging from low to high, and these sorted scores were analyzed using Chi Square. The sorted score analysis examines whether there are any variations by score level. Because it is a non-parametric statistic (does not assume a normal distribution exists), it is not as rigorous as the T test. It does, however, show differences by score level in a more comprehensible manner than does the T test.

In all cases, the following comparisons were made:

- a. Comparison of Rubrics A & B Timed for all groups
- b. Comparison of Rubrics A & B Untimed for all groups
- c. Comparison of the Four Timed and Untimed Writing Scores for all groups
- d. Comparison of Timed and Untimed Writing Scores by student category, where warranted by the first three analyses (a-b).
- e. Comparison of Timed and Untimed Writing Scores by course, where warranted by the first three analyses.

Conclusions:

Here is a summary of the findings. Tables and a full report of the findings are also attached.

Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences in the scores yielded by all sample students scores on the timed and untimed rubrics A and B.

The tables show that there were significant differences in the scores yielded by all four rubrics. Students yielded the highest scores on the revised rubrics.

Hypothesis 2: There no significant score differences between timed and untimed rubrics on the following status categories: Freshman v Junior status, First Time Freshman v First Time Transfer, ITEP Freshman Option v non- ITEP FO, juniors who are FTF v juniors who are FTT, students who are ELL v those who are not.

Significant differences were found for ITEP Freshman v those who are not and for English Language Learners and those who are not ELL. Differences between Freshmen and Juniors were found only for one rubric. No differences were found for First Time Freshmen v First Time Transfers.

ITEP Freshmen v Non-ITEP

The tables show that there are significant differences in the scores yielded by ITEP Freshman Option and non-ITEP option students on all four rubrics (within and between). In all cases the ITEP FO students yielded a higher mean than did non-ITEP students. Consonant with hypothesis 1 findings above, higher scores were yielded by both groups on the revised scores. Levene's test for equality of variances shows that there were no significant differences in the variances of the groups, hence they are comparable.

English Language Learners (ELL) v Non-ELL

The tables show that there are significant differences in the scores yielded by ELL and non-ELL students on all four rubrics (within and between). In all cases the Non-ELL students yielded a higher mean than did ELL students. Consonant with hypothesis 1 findings above, higher scores were yielded by both groups on the revised scores. Levene's test for equality of variances shows that there were significant differences in the variances of the groups, only for Rubric A timed, but not for the rest of the rubrics. This means that the variances between ELL and non-ELL for rubric B Timed, and Rubrics A and B untimed are comparable, whereas they are different for Rubric A timed. However, there are significant differences between ELL and non-ELL scores whether the equal variances are or are not assumed. Consonant with the results of the previous hypothesis, scores were higher for the untimed, revised rubrics than for the timed rubrics.

Freshman v Junior Status

Significant differences between Freshmen and Juniors were found only for one rubric, B timed. In this case the Junior scores were significantly higher than Freshmen scores.

Hypothesis 3. There are no significant score differences between timed and untimed rubrics for students who have taken the following courses: EN 097, EN 098, EN155, EN155SI, EN305, GATE 300, PAS 097.

Significant score differences related to course grades were found only in two instances, one for EN 155, the other for EN 302.

The only other significant relationship found between course grade and Writing scores occurred with EN 302 and ELL students. There were significant differences between the scores of ELL (n=22) and non-ELL (n=38) students who took EN 302 on the Timed rubric B (F 2.487, $p < .046$). ELL students' mean scores were significantly lower than those of the non-ELL students.

Hypothesis 4: Neither the status factors nor courses predict medium to high scores on either rubric

In addition to considering the results presented for hypotheses 1 to 3 above, a regression analysis was conducted to determine status and course predictors for Writing scores.

The most consistent factors to surface are that B Timed is the best predictor of A Timed Writing scores (R .891 R Square .793, F 113.99 $p < .000$). None of the Status or Course factors were predictors for the A or B timed score.

The best predictor of A Revised Writing scores is the B Revised score (R .871, R Square .759 F 362.646, $p < .000$). The best Status predictors for A revised are ELL (F -2.62, $p < .01$) and ITEPFO (-2.66, $p < .009$) resulting in an R of .375, R Square .141, F4.55, $p < .002$). Clearly the Status predictors are not nearly as significant as is the B revised score.

In order to fully examine the potential impact of the specified course grades, these were recalculated into a grade point average, then correlated with scores on the four tests.

The correlations between the English GPA and the Writing Scores were moderate. When regression analyses were conducted, the English GPA was not a strong predictor for any of the Writing Scores.

Hypothesis 5: Timed and untimed rubrics A and B are not equivalent.

Timed and untimed rubrics A and B are clearly not equivalent. The correlation matrix below shows that the timed rubrics are strongly correlated to each other and only moderately correlated to the untimed rubrics. The untimed (revised) rubrics are strongly correlated with each other. In addition, timed rubric B often

surfaces as being different even from timed rubric A, apparently being more difficult for ELL students as well as students in general (see Table 2b).

Synthesis

Even though the 4 rubrics (timed A and B, untimed A and B) are correlated with each other, the differences in the correlations between timed and untimed are sufficient enough to suggest that the timed and untimed are not sufficiently equivalent. In addition, the fact that status factors ELL, ITEPFO and EN 302 course grade influence these rubrics differentially also suggests that the timed and untimed rubric are not equivalent. Whether timed and untimed assessment instruments are equivalent, however, may depend more on the very fact that they are timed, rather than on the structure of the rubrics themselves. There is ample research showing the negative effects of timed tests on performance (add references here).

The lack of saliency of the English course grade point average on writing performance also needs to be explored. For example, to what extent is each of the courses designed to enhance students' writing performance in regard to the constructs measured by the rubrics? If there are no stated instructional objectives in the courses that directly relate to the measurement construct, then it is not surprising that there is such a weak relationship. The lack of relationship between some of the student status indicators (e.g. first time freshman v first time transfer) may be more indicative of how these constructs are measured than of the constructs themselves. For example, is there some other way of distinguishing First Time Freshmen or Transfers (i.e. a combination of the label and their GPA)?

The larger questions posed by this study have begun to emerge. Some answers are to be expected. That ITEP-Freshman Option students performed better than the average CSUN student is hardly surprising. Students in that program must be ready for ENGL 155 upon entering as FTF and are highly motivated students willing to complete an undergraduate degree and credential in four years.

On the other hand, one of the more surprising aspects of this study was the lack of correlation between ENGL 155 or ENGL 305 grades and performance on the rubric. Since those courses are explicitly aimed at writing, it must be posited that grades in those courses should be a predictor of writing performance, and yet they were not.

It's clear that the beginnings achieved here open more questions than they've answered. More work needs to be done on what our cross-disciplinary expectations of writing are; what impact our composition and grammar courses have on our students' ability to write; what impact our composition and methods courses have on our students' ability to teach writing; and how all of these factors translate into pupil performance in K-5 (and K-12) classrooms.

Appendix 1

Teacher Candidate Writing Rubric (A)

SKILL AREA	5/5E Responses at this level:	4/4E Responses at this level:	3/3E Responses at this level:	2/2E Responses at this level:	1/1E Responses at this level:	COMMENTS
Content: the extent and manner in which the writing presents its key idea(s).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • present material in a critical, creative or unusual way while demonstrating an in-depth understanding of topic, audience, and purpose • offer well-developed and significant analysis and explanation in support of the topic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • convey an accurate and complete understanding of topic, audience, and purpose • offer clear and explicit analysis and explanation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • convey an accurate, although limited, understanding of topic, audience, and purpose • offer partial analysis and explanation in support of the topic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • convey a partial understanding of topic, audience, and purpose • offer limited analysis or superficial explanations that only partially support the topic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • convey a confused or largely inaccurate understanding of topic, audience, and purpose • offer unclear analysis or unwarranted explanations that fail to support the topic 	
Development: the extent to which ideas are elaborated using specific and relevant details and/or evidence.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • develop ideas clearly and fully, effectively integrating and elaborating on specific evidence or examples from a variety of sources • purposefully discriminate between relevant and irrelevant information and between fact and opinion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • develop ideas clearly and consistently, incorporating and explaining specific evidence or examples from several sources • discriminate between relevant and irrelevant information and between fact and opinion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • develop some ideas more fully than others, using relevant evidence or examples from several sources • attempt to discriminate between relevant and irrelevant information and between fact and opinion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • develop ideas briefly or partially, using some evidence or examples but without much elaboration or from limited sources • may contain a mix of relevant and irrelevant information and/or confuse the difference between fact and opinion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • attempt to offer some development of ideas, but evidence or examples are vague, repetitive, or unjustified • contain irrelevant and/or inaccurate information and/or confuse the difference between fact and opinion 	
Organization: the extent to which the writing establishes a clear topic or thesis and maintains direction, focus, and coherence.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • skillfully establish and maintain consistent focus on a clear thesis or central idea • exhibit logical and coherent structure with claims, evidence and interpretations that convincingly and purposefully support the thesis or develop the central idea • make skillful use of transition words and phrases 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • effectively establish and maintain consistent focus on a clear thesis or central idea • exhibit a logical sequence of claims, evidence, and interpretations to support or develop the thesis or central idea • make effective use of transition words and phrases 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • establish and maintain focus on a clear thesis or central idea • exhibit a logical sequence of claims, evidence, and interpretations but ideas within paragraphs may be inconsistently organized • use transition words and phrases inconsistently 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • establish but fail to consistently maintain focus on a basic thesis or central idea • exhibit a basic structure but lack the coherence of consistent claims, evidence, and interpretations • use transition words or phrases inconsistently and ineffectively 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • establish a confused or irrelevant thesis or central idea and fail to maintain focus • exhibit an attempt to organize ideas into a beginning, middle, and end, but lack coherence • use few transition words or phrases 	
Language: the extent to which the writing reveals an awareness of audience and purpose through word choice and sentence variety.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • are stylistically sophisticated, using language that is original, precise, and engaging, with a notable sense of voice and awareness of audience and purpose • effectively incorporate a range of varied sentence patterns to reveal syntactic fluency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use language that is fluent and appropriate, and that demonstrates awareness of audience and purpose • incorporate varied sentence patterns that reveal an awareness of different syntactic structures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use appropriate language, with some awareness of audience and purpose • make some attempt to include different sentence patterns but with awkward or uneven success 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • rely on vague or imprecise vocabulary, with little awareness of audience or purpose • reveal a limited awareness of various sentence patterns and rely on a limited range of syntactic structures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use language that is imprecise or unsuitable for the audience or purpose • reveal a confused understanding of how to write in complete sentences and little or no ability to vary sentence patterns 	
Conventions: the extent to which the writing exhibits conventional formatting, spelling, punctuation, capitalization, grammar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstrate control of the conventions with essentially no errors, even with sophisticated language 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstrate control of the conventions, exhibiting occasional errors only when using sophisticated language (e.g., punctuation of complex sentences) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstrate partial control, exhibiting occasional errors that do not hinder comprehension 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstrate emerging control, exhibiting frequent errors that somewhat hinder comprehension (e.g., agreement of pronouns and antecedents; spelling of basic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstrate lack of control, exhibiting frequent errors that make comprehension difficult (e.g., subject verb agreement; use of slang) 	

as well as appropriate documentation of sources.				words)		
--	--	--	--	--------	--	--

Appendix 2

**TNE LITERACY PROJECT
“COMPOSTION” RUBRIC**

Papers scored in each category do not necessarily exhibit all characteristics listed for the category. Even papers scored 4, 5, and 6 may have some flaws. In each category, items appear in order of importance.

E = possible ELL markers

6/6E

A superior paper has a critical voice behind it.

This paper

- a) Is clearly focused in terms of purpose and audience
- b) Is insightfully organized: has unified and coherent paragraphs
- c) Is well developed: incorporates specific and appropriate detail to illustrate its points
- d) Exhibits mature prose style: skilful use of transitions, varied sentence structure, appropriate diction
- e) Observes the conventions of written English

5/5E

A good paper has a thoughtful voice behind it.

This paper

- a) Demonstrates an awareness of purpose and audience
- b) Is well organized: logically develops ideas in ordered paragraphs
- c) Is developed with appropriate details
- d) Exhibits fluent prose style: varies sentence structure but may lack stylistic flair; keeps diction appropriate but may have inconsistencies
- e) Observes the conventions of written English

4/4E

An adequate paper that may have a generic voice behind it

This paper

- a) Demonstrates an inconsistent or perfunctory awareness of purpose and audience
- b) Organization, while generally apparent, may be repetitive, disjointed, or illogical in places
- c) Uses general examples or names but often fails to develop appropriate examples
- d) Exhibits adequate use of sentence structure and vocabulary
- e) Generally observes the conventions of written English

3/3E

An inadequate paper that fails to address the issue in a satisfactory way

This paper

- a) Demonstrates little understanding of purpose and audience
- b) Organization not apparent; exhibits problems with logic
- c) Lacks specific support for assertions and fails to develop generalizations

d) Generally fails to observe the conventions of written English. Its prose is usually characterized by at least one of the following: frequently imprecise word choice; little sentence variety; occasional major errors in grammar and usage, or frequent minor errors.

2/2E

A poor paper shows serious weaknesses ordinarily of several kinds

This paper

- a) Demonstrates no understanding of purpose and audience
- b) Discusses topic generally but does not follow a reasonable or appropriate pattern of organization
- c) Has little development with explanations, specifics, or examples
- d) Uses inconsistent diction and contains an accumulation of errors which detract from communication

1/1E

A very poor paper

- a) Doesn't directly respond to the topic (may go on a tangent based on a couple of words in the topic)
- b) Lacks coherence; may ramble
- c) Shows no development and uses no specifics
- d) Contains major errors in grammar, spelling, and punctuation

0/0E

Off topic or no responses

Appendix 3

TNE LITERACY PROJECT
“COMPOSITION” RUBRIC FOR HOLISTIC SCORING (B)

Papers scored in each category do not necessarily exhibit all characteristics listed for the category. Even papers scored 4 and 5 may have some flaws. In each category, items appear in order of importance.

E = possible ELL markers

5/5E

A superior paper has a critical voice behind it.

- a) Is clearly focused in terms of purpose and audience
- b) Is insightfully organized: has unified and coherent paragraphs
- c) Is well developed: incorporates specific and appropriate detail to illustrate its points
- d) Exhibits mature prose style: skilful use of transitions, varied sentence structure, appropriate diction
- e) Observes the conventions of written English

4/4E

A good paper has a thoughtful voice behind it.

- a) Demonstrates an awareness of purpose and audience
- b) Is well organized: logically develops ideas in ordered paragraphs
- c) Is developed with appropriate details
- d) Exhibits fluent prose style: varies sentence structure but may lack stylistic flair; keeps diction appropriate but may have inconsistencies
- e) Observes the conventions of written English

3/3E

An adequate paper may have a generic voice behind it

- a) Demonstrates an inconsistent or perfunctory awareness of purpose and audience
- b) Organization, while generally apparent, may be repetitive, disjointed, or illogical in places
- c) Uses general examples or names specific examples but often fails to develop them
- d) Exhibits adequate use of sentence structure and vocabulary
- e) Generally observes the conventions of written English

2/2E

An inadequate paper fails to address the issue in a satisfactory way

- a) Demonstrates little understanding of purpose and audience
- b) Organization not apparent; exhibits problems with logic
- c) Lacks specific support for assertions and fails to develop generalizations
- d) Prose is usually characterized by imprecise word choice and little sentence variety
- e) Generally fails to observe the conventions of written English. Occasional major errors in grammar and usage, or frequent minor errors.

1/1E

A poor paper shows serious weaknesses, ordinarily of several kinds

- a) Demonstrates no understanding of purpose and audience or may not directly respond to the topic (may go on a tangent based on a couple of words in the topic)
- b) Discusses topic generally but does not follow a reasonable or appropriate pattern of organization
- c) Has no development with explanations, specifics, or examples
- d) Uses inconsistent diction; may ramble
- e) Contains major errors in grammar, spelling, and punctuation and/or contains an accumulation of errors which detract from communication

Appendix 4

Dear,

I am writing to ask you to participate in a Literacy Research Project sponsored by the Teachers for a New Era Initiative at CSUN. This project will follow the writing of selected CSUN students who plan on teaching Elementary School. We'll look at writing samples from first-year students, juniors, and seniors. And eventually we'd like to follow these students into their own classrooms to observe how they teach writing.

If you agree to participate, I will ask that you give me copies of two assignments written for your class by your students : an in-class essay and a paper written at home and revised. Because we will be tracking specific students over time, the papers need to have the students' names or ID numbers on them, but they do not need to have instructors' names on them. It would also be helpful if you could give me copies of your prompts with the student papers, though this isn't essential. The Provost has informed me that we don't need student permissions, since this is an internal project; of course, you are welcome to discuss the project with your students if you wish.

Please send me an email either way, indicating whether or not you can participate in this project. Later in the semester a group of faculty (and others) will be scoring all the student papers we've collected, and I hope you'll consider joining the scoring team (though submitting your students' papers does not obligate you to do the scoring!). I'd be happy to answer any questions you might have about this project.

Thanks so much,

Ian Barnard
For the CSUN Teachers for a New Era Initiative

Appendix 5

**CSUN TNE Literacy Project
Protocol for Scoring Student Papers
February 2007**

FIRST READER:

- 1) Please take about 10 papers from the box labeled “awaiting first reading.”
- 2) Write each paper number on the corresponding cover sheet.
- 3) First score all the papers using Rubric B; then score all the papers using Rubric A. Band-aid all scores and write your initials next to the band-aids.
- 4) If you designated a paper “E” (English Language Learner), place the paper in the box labeled “E.” Place all other papers in the box labeled “awaiting second reading.”

SECOND READER:

- 1) Please take about 10 papers from the box labeled “awaiting second reading.” Check the initials next to the band-aids to make sure you haven’t read the papers already.
- 2) First score all the papers using Rubric B; then score all the papers using Rubric A. Write your initials next to each score. Band-aid your scores for Rubric B as you score each paper; do not band-aid your scores for Rubric A.
- 3) If you designated a paper “E” (English Language Learner), place the paper in the box labeled “E.” Place all other papers in the box labeled “second reading complete.”

DESIGNATED ELL SPECIALIST:

- 1) Please take a paper from the box labeled “E.” Check the initials next to the band-aids to make sure you haven’t scored the paper already.
- 2) If you are the second reader, score the paper twice (using Rubric B and Rubric A). Write your initials next to the scores. Do not band-aid your scores. Place the paper in the box labeled “second reading complete.”
- 3) If you are the third reader, read the paper and write “E” in the “final score” boxes if you feel the paper needs an ELL designation. Write your initials next to these boxes. Do not write scores in these boxes. If you do not believe the paper warrants an “E” designation, cross out the “E” designation from the second reader’s score and write your initials next to the line-out. Place the paper in the box labeled “second reading complete.”

THIRD READER

- 1) Please take a paper from the box labeled “second reading complete.” Remove the band-aids.

- 2) First look at Rubric A scores:
 - (a) If the difference between the two scores is 5 points or less, add the two scores together. This is the final score. If the second score has an “E” designation, or if “E” already appears in the “final score” box, the final score should have an “E” designation. Write the final score in the “final score” box; write your initials next to the box.
 - (b) If the difference between the two scores is more than 5 points, read the paper again to determine the final score (out of a possible total of 50 points). If the second score has an “E” designation, or if “E” already appears in the “final score” box, the final score should have an “E” designation. Write the final score in the “final score” box; write your initials next to the box.

- 3) Then look at Rubric B scores:
 - (a) If the difference between the two scores is 1 point or less, add the two scores together to find the final score. If the second score has an “E” designation, or if “E” already appears in the “final score” box, the final score should have an “E” designation. Write the final score in the “final score” box; write your initials next to the box.
 - (b) If the difference between the two scores is more than 1 point, read the paper again to determine the final score (out of a possible total of 10 points). If the second score has an “E” designation, or if “E” already appears in the “final score” box, the final score should have an “E” designation. Write the final score in the “final score” box; write your initials next to the box.

- 4) Place the paper in the box labeled “Done.”

Appendix 6

Title:

Writing Realities Among Future Elementary School Teachers

One Sentence Description:

Participants will present and analyze initial results from a major longitudinal literacy research project undertaken at California State University, Northridge under the auspices of the Carnegie Corporation's innovative Teachers for a New Era initiative.

Proposal:

Participants will analyze results from the first year of a long-term major literacy research project undertaken at California State University, Northridge (CSUN), under the auspices of the Carnegie Corporation's innovative Teachers for a New Era initiative. Precipitated by local elementary school principals' complaints that teachers prepared at CSUN "can't write," CSUN composition instructors' rejoinder that their students were writing quite well, and an interrogation of the phrase "can't write," researchers developed two rubrics to address the writing proficiency expectations of the two constituencies. They used both rubrics to assess over 200 samples of timed and revised writing produced by over 100 CSUN students across academic ranks who self-identified as future elementary school teachers.

Representing multiple disciplines at CSUN, the participants will briefly describe the project's rationale, design, and implementation. Participants will then discuss the project's initial findings and what they might suggest about 1) the teaching and practice of teacher candidate writing across the university, and about the writing instruction that English Language Learners, in particular, do or do not receive; 2) expectations of student writing, and writing in general, from university composition instructors compared to those of education faculty and professionals; 3) how these expectations impact the assessment of student writing, and the writing of English Language Learners, in particular; 4) how timed writing assignments compare with at-home revised work, and the significance of this distinction for English Language Learners, in particular, and for students increasingly subjected to standardized writing tests; and 5) what changes, if any, could and/or should be made in the preparation of elementary (and other) teachers in order to develop their proficiency as writers and future teachers of writing.

The presentation will include an interactive component in which audience members will be invited to score a short sample student paper using the two rubrics in order to illustrate some of the challenges the researchers faced, and to initiate a dialogue about the initial results of the research project and about writing assessment in general. Audience members will be encouraged to discuss their experience scoring the student paper and to respond to the participants' presentations.

Appendix 7

Full report of statistical findings, prepared by Beverly Cabello

Analyses Conducted for Writing Rubrics Comparison Study

Introduction

DESCRIBE PURPOSE OF STUDY HERE AS WELL AS DEVELOPMENT AND NATURE OF RUBRICS

Research Questions

6. Are there significant differences in the scores yielded by all sample students scores on the timed and untimed rubrics A and B?
7. Are there significant score differences between timed and untimed rubrics on the following status categories: Freshman v Junior status, First Time Freshman v First Time Transfer, ITEP Freshman Option v non- ITEP FO, juniors who are FTF v juniors who are FTT, students who are ELL v those who are not?
8. Are there significant score differences between timed and untimed rubrics for students who have taken the following courses: EN 097, EN 098, EN155, EN155SI, EN305, GATE 300, PAS 097?
9. Do either the status factors and/or courses predict medium to high scores on either rubric?
10. Considering the results for questions 1 – 4 above, are timed and untimed rubrics A and B equivalent?

Method

Comparisons between Scores of Timed and Untimed (Revised) Rubrics were conducted in several ways. First, raw scores for all students regardless of status (junior v freshman, ITEP option, ELL, first time Freshman v First Time Transfer) were compared using T tests. This analysis is more rigorous in that it is a parametric statistic and assumes the existence of a distribution among scores.

In a second set of analyses, scores were sorted into four categories ranging from low to high, and these sorted scores were analyzed using Chi Square. The sorted score analysis examines whether there are any variations by score level. Because it is a non-parametric statistic (does not assume a normal distribution exists), it is not as rigorous as the T test. It does,

however, show differences by score level in a more comprehensible manner than does the T test.

In all cases, the following comparisons were made:

- f. Comparison of Rubrics A & B Timed for all groups
- g. Comparison of Rubrics A & B Untimed for all groups
- h. Comparison of the Four Timed and Untimed Writing Scores for all groups
- i. Comparison of Timed and Untimed Writing Scores by student category, where warranted by the first three analyses (a-b).
- j. Comparison of Timed and Untimed Writing Scores by course, where warranted by the first three analyses.

Results

Each of the research questions above have an attendant null hypothesis below. Results are presented in light of the hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences in the scores yielded by all sample students scores on the timed and untimed rubrics A and B.

The tables below show that there were significant differences in the scores yielded by all four rubrics. Students yielded the highest scores on the revised rubrics.

Table 1a: Means on Writing scores for all students

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Rubric A	101	5.74	1.474	.147
Rubric B	101	5.85	1.590	.158
Rubric A	117	6.52	1.590	.147
Rubric B	117	6.66	1.723	.159

Table 1b: T test of means on Writing scores for all students

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 0					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Rubric A (timed)	39.150	100	.000	5.743	5.45	6.03
Rubric B (timed)	36.988	100	.000	5.851	5.54	6.17
Rubric A (revised)	44.369	116	.000	6.521	6.23	6.81
Rubric B (revised)	41.801	116	.000	6.658	6.34	6.97

Hypothesis 2: There no significant score differences between timed and untimed rubrics on the following status categories: Freshman v Junior status, First Time Freshman v First Time Transfer, ITEP Freshman Option v non- ITEP FO, juniors who are FTF v juniors who are FTT, students who are ELL v those who are not.

Significant differences were found for ITEP Freshman v those who are not and for English Language Learners and those who are not ELL. Differences between Freshmen and Juniors were found only for one rubric. No differences were found for First Time Freshmen v First Time Transfers.

ITEP Freshmen v Non-ITEP

The tables below show that there are significant differences in the scores yielded by ITEP Freshman Option and non-ITEP option students on all four rubrics (within and between). In all cases the ITEP FO students yielded a higher mean than did non-ITEP students. Consonant with hypothesis 1 findings above, higher scores were yielded by both groups on the revised scores. Levene's test for equality of variances shows that there were no significant differences in the variances of the groups, hence they are comparable.

Table 2a: Comparison of Writing score means of ITEP Freshmen v Non ITEP

ITEP Freshman		N	Mea	Std.	Std. Mea
Rubric A	Yes	12	6.92	1.084	.313
	No	89	5.58	1.452	.154
Rubric B	Yes	12	7.00	1.128	.326
	No	89	5.70	1.584	.168
Rubric A	Yes	22	7.32	1.427	.304
	No	94	6.32	1.574	.162
Rubric B	Yes	22	7.55	1.471	.314
	No	94	6.44	1.720	.177

Table 2b: T test of Writing score means of ITEP Freshmen and Non-ITEP

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Rubric A (timed)	Equal variances assumed	1.783	.185	3.060	99	.003	1.332	.435	.468	2.196
	Equal variances not assumed			3.822	16.850	.001	1.332	.349	.596	2.068
Rubric B (timed)	Equal variances assumed	1.957	.165	2.752	99	.007	1.303	.474	.364	2.243
	Equal variances not assumed			3.557	17.471	.002	1.303	.366	.532	2.075
Rubric A (revised)	Equal variances assumed	.617	.434	2.725	114	.007	.999	.367	.273	1.725
	Equal variances not assumed			2.897	34.037	.007	.999	.345	.298	1.700
Rubric B (revised)	Equal variances assumed	.495	.483	2.793	114	.006	1.109	.397	.323	1.896
	Equal variances not assumed			3.078	35.757	.004	1.109	.360	.378	1.840

English Language Learners (ELL) v Non-ELL

The tables below show that there are significant differences in the scores yielded by ELL and non-ELL students on all four rubrics (within and between). In all cases the Non-ELL students yielded a higher mean than did ELL students. Consonant with hypothesis 1 findings above, higher scores were yielded by both groups on the revised scores. Levene's test for equality of variances shows that there were significant differences in the variances of the groups, only for Rubric A timed, but not for the rest of the rubrics. This means that the variances between ELL and non-ELL for rubric B Timed, and Rubrics A and B untimed are comparable, whereas they are different for Rubric A timed. However, there are significant differences between ELL and non-ELL scores whether the equal variances are or are not assumed. Consonant with the results of the previous hypothesis, scores were higher for the untimed, revised rubrics than for the timed rubrics.

Table 3a: Means on Writing scores for ELL and non-ELL students

		Group Statistics			
ELL		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Rubric A (timed)	English Speaker	67	6.16	1.483	.181
	English Language Learner	34	4.91	1.055	.181
Rubric B (timed)	English Speaker	67	6.28	1.535	.188
	English Language Learner	34	5.00	1.348	.231
Rubric A (revised)	English Speaker	83	6.82	1.466	.161
	English Language Learner	34	5.79	1.666	.286
Rubric B (revised)	English Speaker	83	6.98	1.623	.178
	English Language Learner	34	5.88	1.737	.298

Table 3b: T tests of Means on Writing scores for ELL and non-ELL students

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Rubric A (timed)	Equal variances assumed	4.032	.047	4.388	99	.000	1.252	.285	.686	1.819
	Equal variances not assumed			4.891	88.084	.000	1.252	.256	.744	1.761
Rubric B (timed)	Equal variances assumed	1.404	.239	4.131	99	.000	1.284	.311	.667	1.900
	Equal variances not assumed			4.311	74.575	.000	1.284	.298	.690	1.877
Rubric A (rev ised)	Equal variances assumed	1.219	.272	3.299	115	.001	1.025	.311	.410	1.641
	Equal variances not assumed			3.127	55.042	.003	1.025	.328	.368	1.682
Rubric B (rev ised)	Equal variances assumed	.096	.758	3.243	115	.002	1.094	.337	.426	1.762
	Equal variances not assumed			3.151	57.851	.003	1.094	.347	.399	1.788

Freshman v Junior Status

Significant differences between Freshmen and Juniors were found only for one rubric, B timed. In this case the Junior scores were significantly higher than Freshmen scores.

Table 4a: Freshmen and Junior Mean Writing Scores on Rubrics

	J or	N	Mea	Std.	Std. Mea
Rubric A	Freshma	23	5.35	1.191	.248
	Junio	78	5.86	1.535	.174
Rubric B	Freshma	23	5.26	1.389	.290
	Junio	78	6.03	1.611	.182
Rubric A	Freshma	29	6.48	1.353	.251
	Junio	87	6.52	1.670	.179
Rubric B	Freshma	29	6.38	1.498	.278
	Junio	87	6.74	1.794	.192

Table 4b: T test of Freshman and Junior Scores on Rubrics

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Rubric A (timed)	Equal variances assumed	1.478	.227	-1.470	99	.145	-.511	.348	-1.201	.179
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.686	45.691	.099	-.511	.303	-1.121	.099
Rubric B (timed)	Equal variances assumed	.476	.492	-2.060	99	.042	-.765	.371	-1.501	-.028
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.234	41.084	.031	-.765	.342	-1.456	-.074
Rubric A (revised)	Equal variances assumed	1.997	.160	-.101	114	.920	-.034	.343	-.713	.644
	Equal variances not assumed			-.112	58.722	.911	-.034	.308	-.652	.583
Rubric B (revised)	Equal variances assumed	1.686	.197	-.963	114	.338	-.356	.370	-1.090	.377
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.054	56.951	.297	-.356	.338	-1.034	.321

Hypothesis 3. There are no significant score differences between timed and untimed rubrics for students who have taken the following courses: EN 097, EN 098, EN155, EN155SI, EN305, GATE 300, PAS 097.

Significant score differences related to course grades were found only in two instances, one for EN 155, the other for EN 302.

As the table below shows, when all student scores in the sample who took EN 155 were compared by rubric, there were significant differences only for the timed Rubric A and untimed rubrics A and B. There were no significant score differences on Timed rubric B.

Table 5: F Table showing relationship between EN 155 grade and Writing Scores

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	Rubric A (timed)	52.424 ^a	9	5.825	3.468	.001	.297
	Rubric B (timed)	31.133 ^b	9	3.459	1.512	.160	.155
	Rubric A (revised)	76.311 ^c	9	8.479	5.393	.000	.396
	Rubric B (revised)	87.985 ^d	9	9.776	4.999	.000	.378
Intercept	Rubric A (timed)	1000.387	1	1000.387	595.667	.000	.889
	Rubric B (timed)	1036.768	1	1036.768	453.208	.000	.860
	Rubric A (revised)	1272.521	1	1272.521	809.302	.000	.916
	Rubric B (revised)	1303.111	1	1303.111	666.336	.000	.900
@155Grade	Rubric A (timed)	52.424	9	5.825	3.468	.001	.297
	Rubric B (timed)	31.133	9	3.459	1.512	.160	.155
	Rubric A (revised)	76.311	9	8.479	5.393	.000	.396
	Rubric B (revised)	87.985	9	9.776	4.999	.000	.378
Error	Rubric A (timed)	124.278	74	1.679			
	Rubric B (timed)	169.284	74	2.288			
	Rubric A (revised)	116.355	74	1.572			
	Rubric B (revised)	144.717	74	1.956			
Total	Rubric A (timed)	2977.000	84				
	Rubric B (timed)	3141.000	84				
	Rubric A (revised)	3562.000	84				
	Rubric B (revised)	3717.000	84				
Corrected Total	Rubric A (timed)	176.702	83				
	Rubric B (timed)	200.417	83				
	Rubric A (revised)	192.667	83				
	Rubric B (revised)	232.702	83				

a. R Squared = .297 (Adjusted R Squared = .211)

b. R Squared = .155 (Adjusted R Squared = .053)

c. R Squared = .396 (Adjusted R Squared = .323)

d. R Squared = .378 (Adjusted R Squared = .302)

The only other significant relationship found between course grade and Writing scores occurred with EN 302 and ELL students. There were significant differences between the scores of ELL (n=22) and non-ELL (n=38) students who took EN 302 on the Timed rubric B (F 2.487, p<.046). ELL students' mean scores were significantly lower than those of the non-ELL students.

Table 6: Writing Score Means of ELL and Non-ELL Students on Rubrics

2. ELL * 302 Grade

Dependent Variable	ELL	302 Grade	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Rubric A (timed)	English Speaker	0	4.000	1.389	1.198	6.802
		1	5.250	.695	3.849	6.651
		2	5.667	.802	4.049	7.284
		2	6.000	1.389	3.198	8.802
		3	5.000	.982	3.019	6.981
		3	6.700	.439	5.814	7.586
		3	6.000	1.389	3.198	8.802
		4	6.500	.982	4.519	8.481
		4	7.000	.463	6.066	7.934
		NT	6.667	.802	5.049	8.284
	IP	5.000	.982	3.019	6.981	
	English Language Learner	0	.a	.	.	.
		1	5.000	.982	3.019	6.981
		2	5.000	.802	3.382	6.618
		2	.a	.	.	.
		3	4.000	1.389	1.198	6.802
		3	4.286	.525	3.227	5.345
		3	.a	.	.	.
		4	.a	.	.	.
		4	5.125	.491	4.134	6.116
NT		7.000	1.389	4.198	9.802	
IP	.a	.	.	.		
Rubric B (timed)	English Speaker	0	4.000	1.413	1.150	6.850
		1	5.250	.707	3.825	6.675
		2	5.667	.816	4.021	7.312
		2	6.000	1.413	3.150	8.850
		3	5.000	.999	2.985	7.015
		3	7.200	.447	6.299	8.101
		3	8.000	1.413	5.150	10.850
		4	7.000	.999	4.985	9.015
		4	7.000	.471	6.050	7.950
		NT	6.333	.816	4.688	7.979
	IP	4.500	.999	2.485	6.515	
	English Language Learner	0	.a	.	.	.
		1	5.500	.999	3.485	7.515
		2	5.000	.816	3.354	6.646
		2	.a	.	.	.
		3	5.000	1.413	2.150	7.850
		3	4.571	.534	3.494	5.649
		3	.a	.	.	.
		4	.a	.	.	.
		4	5.250	.500	4.242	6.258
NT		9.000	1.413	6.150	11.850	
IP	.a	.	.	.		
Rubric A (revised)	English Speaker	0	4.000	1.397	1.182	6.818
		1	6.750	.699	5.341	8.159
		2	5.333	.807	3.707	6.960
		2	5.000	1.397	2.182	7.818
		3	7.000	.988	5.008	8.992
		3	7.000	.442	6.109	7.891
		3	7.000	1.397	4.182	9.818
		4	8.500	.988	6.508	10.492
		4	7.000	.466	6.061	7.939
		NT	6.000	.807	4.373	7.627
	IP	7.500	.988	5.508	9.492	
	English Language Learner	0	.a	.	.	.
		1	4.500	.988	2.508	6.492
		2	4.667	.807	3.040	6.293
		2	.a	.	.	.
		3	5.000	1.397	2.182	7.818
		3	5.143	.528	4.078	6.208
		3	.a	.	.	.
		4	.a	.	.	.
		4	5.250	.494	4.254	6.246
NT		8.000	1.397	5.182	10.818	
IP	.a	.	.	.		
Rubric B (revised)	English Speaker	0	5.000	1.501	1.972	8.028
		1	6.500	.751	4.986	8.014
		2	5.667	.867	3.919	7.415
		2	4.000	1.501	.972	7.028
		3	6.000	1.062	3.859	8.141
		3	7.500	.475	6.543	8.457
		3	8.000	1.501	4.972	11.028
		4	9.000	1.062	6.859	11.141
		4	7.333	.500	6.324	8.343
		NT	6.000	.867	4.252	7.748
	IP	8.000	1.062	5.859	10.141	
	English Language Learner	0	.a	.	.	.
		1	4.500	1.062	2.359	6.641
		2	4.333	.867	2.585	6.081
		2	.a	.	.	.
		3	5.000	1.501	1.972	8.028
		3	5.429	.567	4.284	6.573
		3	.a	.	.	.
		4	.a	.	.	.
		4	5.625	.531	4.555	6.695
NT		8.000	1.501	4.972	11.028	
IP	.a	.	.	.		

a. This level combination of factors is not observed, thus the corresponding population marginal mean is not estimable.

Hypothesis 4: Neither the status factors nor courses predict medium to high scores on either rubric

In addition to considering the results presented for hypotheses 1 to 3 above, a regression analysis was conducted to determine status and course predictors for Writing scores.

The most consistent factors to surface are that B Timed is the best predictor of A Timed Writing scores (R .891 R Square .793, F 113.99 $p < .000$). None of the Status or Course factors were predictors for the A or B timed score.

The best predictor of A Revised Writing scores is the B Revised score (R .871, R Square .759 F 362.646, $p < .000$). The best Status predictors for A revised are ELL (F -2.62, $p < .01$) and ITEPFO (-2.66, $p < .009$) resulting in an R of .375, R Square .141, F4.55, $p < .002$). Clearly the Status predictors are not nearly as significant as is the B revised score.

In order to fully examine the potential impact of the specified course grades, these were recalculated into a grade point average, then correlated with scores on the four tests.

The correlations between the English GPA and the Writing Scores were moderate. When regression analyses were conducted, the English GPA was not a strong predictor for any of the Writing Scores.

Table 7: Correlation of Grade Point Average on English Courses and Writing Score

Rubric A (timed)	Pearson Correlation	1	.888(**)	.386(**)	.379(**)	.420(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	101	101	93	93	66
Rubric B (timed)	Pearson Correlation	.888(**)	1	.309(**)	.336(**)	.339(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.003	.001	.005
	N	101	101	93	93	66
Rubric A (revised)	Pearson Correlation	.386(**)	.309(**)	1	.871(**)	.476(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.003		.000	.000
	N	93	93	117	117	78
Rubric B (revised)	Pearson Correlation	.379(**)	.336(**)	.871(**)	1	.514(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.001	.000		.000
	N	93	93	117	117	78
ENGPA	Pearson Correlation	.420(**)	.339(**)	.476(**)	.514(**)	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.005	.000	.000	
	N	66	66	78	78	81

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

In conclusion, only a few of the Status factors (ELL, ITEPFO) contribute minimally in predicting Writing scores and no courses significantly predicted scores.

Hypothesis 5: Timed and untimed rubrics A and B are not equivalent.

Timed and untimed rubrics A and B are clearly not equivalent. The correlation matrix below shows that the timed rubrics are strongly correlated to each other and only moderately correlated to the untimed rubrics. The untimed (revised) rubrics are strongly correlated with each other. In addition, timed rubric B often surfaces as being different even from timed rubric A, apparently being more difficult for ELL students as well as students in general (see Table 2b).

Synthesis

Even though the 4 rubrics (timed A and B, untimed A and B) are correlated with each other, the differences in the correlations between timed and untimed are sufficient enough to suggest that the timed and untimed are not sufficiently equivalent. In addition, the fact that status factors ELL, ITEPFO and EN 302 course grade influence these rubrics differentially also suggests that the timed and untimed rubric are not equivalent. Whether timed and untimed assessment instruments are equivalent, however, may depend more on the very fact that they are timed, rather than on the structure of the rubrics themselves. There is ample research showing the negative effects of timed tests on performance (add references here).

The lack of saliency of the English course grade point average on writing performance also needs to be explored. For example, to what extent is each of the courses designed to enhance students' writing performance in regard to the constructs measured by the rubrics? If there are no stated instructional objectives in the courses that directly relate to the measurement construct, then it is not surprising that there is such a weak relationship. The lack of relationship between some of the student status indicators (e.g. first time freshman v first time transfer) may be more indicative of how these constructs are measured than of the constructs themselves. For example, is there some other way of distinguishing First Time Freshmen or Transfers (i.e. a combination of the label and their GPA)?

An essential aspect to describe in the introduction of this report are the nature of the timed and untimed rubrics as well as the nature of A versus B rubrics in either timed or untimed. How were they developed, what do they purport to measure? How are these rubrics scored? What are the cut off scores? Another factor that needs to be clarified in this study is the purported relationship between the courses and the Writing scores. Why is it (or is it not) a relationship between course grades and Writing scores expected? The same applies to the status variables.

Regressions to determine status and course predictors of Writing scores

Correlations

			Rubric A (timed)	Rubric B (timed)	Rubric A (rev ised)	Rubric B (rev ised)
Spearman's rho	Rubric A (timed)	Correlation Coef ficient	1.000	.871**	.417**	.391**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000	.000
	N	101	101	93	93	
	Rubric B (timed)	Correlation Coef ficient	.871**	1.000	.325**	.363**
Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.	.001	.000	
N	101	101	93	93		
Rubric A (rev ised)	Correlation Coef ficient	.417**	.325**	1.000	.864**	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.001	.	.000	
N	93	93	117	117		
Rubric B (rev ised)	Correlation Coef ficient	.391**	.363**	.864**	1.000	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.	
N	93	93	117	117		

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Variables Entered/Removed^d

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Rubric B (revised), Rubric B (timed), Rubric A _a (revised)	.	Enter

- a. All requested variables entered.
b. Dependent Variable: Rubric A (timed)

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.891 ^a	.793	.787	.680

- a. Predictors: (Constant), Rubric B (revised), Rubric B (timed), Rubric A (revised)

ANOVA^b

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	158.152	3	52.717	113.991	.000 ^a
	Residual	41.160	89	.462		
	Total	199.312	92			

- a. Predictors: (Constant), Rubric B (revised), Rubric B (timed), Rubric A (revised)
b. Dependent Variable: Rubric A (timed)

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.434	.351		1.235	.220
	Rubric B (timed)	.779	.047	.847	16.548	.000
	Rubric A (revised)	.153	.089	.160	1.728	.087
	Rubric B (revised)	-.037	.082	-.042	-.451	.653

- a. Dependent Variable: Rubric A (timed)

Variables Entered/Removed^d

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	302 Grade, ELL, Rubric B (timed)	.	Enter

a. All requested variables entered.

b. Dependent Variable: Rubric A (timed)

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.892 ^a	.795	.785	.711

a. Predictors: (Constant), 302 Grade, ELL, Rubric B (timed)

ANOVA^b

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	121.338	3	40.446	80.043	.000 ^a
	Residual	31.329	62	.505		
	Total	152.667	65			

a. Predictors: (Constant), 302 Grade, ELL, Rubric B (timed)

b. Dependent Variable: Rubric A (timed)

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.011	.392		2.578	.012
	Rubric B (timed)	.810	.058	.861	13.884	.000
	ELL	-.287	.194	-.092	-1.478	.145
	302 Grade	.004	.005	.047	.792	.431

a. Dependent Variable: Rubric A (timed)

Variables Entered/Removed^d

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Rubric A (timed), 302 Grade, ELL	.	Enter

- a. All requested variables entered.
b. Dependent Variable: Rubric A (revised)

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.554 ^a	.307	.270	1.382

- a. Predictors: (Constant), Rubric A (timed), 302 Grade, ELL

ANOVA^b

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	47.355	3	15.785	8.263	.000 ^a
	Residual	106.979	56	1.910		
	Total	154.333	59			

- a. Predictors: (Constant), Rubric A (timed), 302 Grade, ELL
b. Dependent Variable: Rubric A (revised)

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	4.599	.856		5.373	.000
	ELL	-1.041	.418	-.313	-2.492	.016
	302 Grade	.013	.011	.145	1.275	.208
	Rubric A (timed)	.325	.130	.311	2.501	.015

- a. Dependent Variable: Rubric A (revised)

Variables Entered/Removed^a

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Rubric A (revised), Rubric B (timed), ELL, Rubric A (timed)	.	Enter

- a. All requested variables entered.
b. Dependent Variable: Rubric B (revised)

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.858 ^a	.737	.725	.887

- a. Predictors: (Constant), Rubric A (revised), Rubric B (timed), ELL, Rubric A (timed)

ANOVA^b

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	193.929	4	48.482	61.567	.000 ^a
	Residual	69.297	88	.787		
	Total	263.226	92			

- a. Predictors: (Constant), Rubric A (revised), Rubric B (timed), ELL, Rubric A (timed)
b. Dependent Variable: Rubric B (revised)

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.371	.553		.670	.504
	ELL	-.095	.221	-.027	-.431	.668
	Rubric A (timed)	-.070	.139	-.061	-.502	.617
	Rubric B (timed)	.129	.123	.122	1.047	.298
	Rubric A (revised)	.914	.067	.831	13.683	.000

- a. Dependent Variable: Rubric B (revised)

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.871 ^a	.759	.757	.849

a. Predictors: (Constant), Rubric A (revised)

ANOVA^b

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	261.424	1	261.424	362.646	.000 ^a
	Residual	82.901	115	.721		
	Total	344.325	116			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Rubric A (revised)

b. Dependent Variable: Rubric B (revised)

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.500	.333		1.503	.135
	Rubric A (revised)	.944	.050	.871	19.043	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Rubric B (revised)

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.871 ^a	.759	.757	.783

a. Predictors: (Constant), Rubric B (revised)

ANOVA^b

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	222.605	1	222.605	362.646	.000 ^a
	Residual	70.591	115	.614		
	Total	293.197	116			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Rubric B (revised)

b. Dependent Variable: Rubric A (revised)

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.168	.290		4.023	.000
	Rubric B (revised)	.804	.042	.871	19.043	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Rubric A (revised)

Correlations

		Rubric A (timed)	Rubric B (timed)	Rubric A (revised)	Rubric B (revised)	ENPGA
Rubric A (timed)	Pearson Correlation	1	.888(**)	.386(**)	.379(**)	.420(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	101	101	93	93	66
Rubric B (timed)	Pearson Correlation	.888(**)	1	.309(**)	.336(**)	.339(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.003	.001	.005
	N	101	101	93	93	66
Rubric A (revised)	Pearson Correlation	.386(**)	.309(**)	1	.871(**)	.476(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.003		.000	.000
	N	93	93	117	117	78
Rubric B (revised)	Pearson Correlation	.379(**)	.336(**)	.871(**)	1	.514(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.001	.000		.000
	N	93	93	117	117	78
ENPGA	Pearson Correlation	.420(**)	.339(**)	.476(**)	.514(**)	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.005	.000	.000	
	N	66	66	78	78	81

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).