# End of Year Assessment Report and Recommendations

Derek Sherman, Outgoing Assistant Director of Assessment

Kailyn Hall, Incoming Assessment Research Coordinator

ICaP Assessment Committee

# Table of Contents

# Thank You

The ICaP staff would like to thank all of our instructors who volunteered their time to rate portfolios at our four norm, read, and rate sessions in Spring 2020. We couldn't have accomplished such a feat without instructor support, and this support shows a dedication of our instructors to support student learning.

A special thank you goes out to instructors who also serve on the Assessment Committee. These instructors dedicated extra time to make sure ICaP followed through with its promise to be an instructor driven and focused assessment.

ICaP staff would also like to thank Joy Kane for her endless support of our assessment efforts and much of our work would be incomplete without her support. ICaP would also like to thank our student workers, Alekya Raghavan and Emily Maxwell, for their efforts in de-identifying portfolios for our norm, read, and rate sessions.

Derek would like to thank the ICaP staff who went above and beyond their responsibility to help with assessment—-Linda Haynes, Bradley Dilger, Libby Chernouski, and Dee McCormick.

# Executive Summary

The following report provides a summation of the assessment activities and results for the 2019-2020 academic year. Data from our norm, read, and rate sessions for Outcome 3 and Outcome 5 accompanies an analysis of its implications. Recommendations include the continued support of reflective pedagogy, professional development, and the development of resources to support the portfolio common assignment. Please direct your questions to Derek Sherman (sherma11@purdue.edu), outgoing Assistant Director of Assessment, or Bradley Dilger (dilger@purdue.edu), outgoing Director of ICaP.

# ICaP Assessment Committee Charge and Members

[The Assessment Committee](#) is a group of Purdue English graduate students and visiting clinical instructors for ICaP (see below) who have all volunteered their time to improve ICaP's assessment efforts. Committee members meet once every two weeks for one hour to discuss ICaP's assessment efforts and create materials for instructors. ICaP believes we must establish a culture of assessment through instructor involvement to create sustainable assessment efforts. The ICaP Assessment Committee approves decisions concerning assessment and the portfolio, thus granting instructors agency in assessment. The Assessment Committee follows the guidance set by the [Conference on College Composition and Communication](#).

In Spring 2019, the Assessment Committee adopted the following mission statement:

> The Assessment Committee is committed to creating visibility to scholarly-grounded assessment practices through instructor and website resources, norm, read, and rate sessions, and professional development opportunities. Additionally, the committee is dedicated to making sure assessment is data driven, collaborative, transparent, and influenced by current writing assessment and social justice scholarship.

This mission statement guided two major projects for the 2019-2020 academic year: 1) [an exit survey](#) for students in English 106/108; and 2) [a revised rubric](#) for the final reflective essay and portfolio. Unfortunately, the Covid-19 pandemic ceased the creation of additional resources for ICaP instructors (see [Moving Forward](#) for future projects).

## Committee Members

Derek Sherman, ICaP Assistant Director of Assessment ([sherma11@purdue.edu](mailto:sherma11@purdue.edu))

Libby Chernouski, ICaP Assistant Director of Professional Development ([lchernou@purdue.edu](mailto:lchernou@purdue.edu))

Allegra Smith, Assistant Director of Professional Writing ([smit2632@purdue.edu](mailto:smit2632@purdue.edu))

Joe Forte, Purdue OWL Coordinator ([jforte@purdue.edu](mailto:jforte@purdue.edu))

Parva Panahi, Assistant Mentor to the Writing Lab ([ppanahil@purdue.edu](mailto:ppanahil@purdue.edu))

Jessica Mercado, ICaP Visiting Clinical Instructor ([mercadj@purdue.edu](mailto:mercadj@purdue.edu))

Garrett Colón, ICaP Graduate Instructor ([colon15@purdue.edu](mailto:colon15@purdue.edu))

Maddie Gehling, ICaP Graduate Instructor ([mgehling@purdue.edu](mailto:mgehling@purdue.edu))

Erika Gotfredson, ICaP Graduate Instructor ([egotfred@purdue.edu](mailto:egotfred@purdue.edu))

Sadie Boone, ICaP Graduate Instructor ([boone39@purdue.edu](mailto:boone39@purdue.edu))

Victoria Braegger, ICaP Graduate Instructor ([vbraegge@purdue.edu](mailto:vbraegge@purdue.edu))

Kailyn Hall, ICaP Graduate Instructor ([hall554@purdue.edu](mailto:hall554@purdue.edu))

Na Rim Kim, ICaP Graduate Instructor ([kim2925@purdue.edu](mailto:kim2925@purdue.edu))

# Assessment in the 2019-2020 Academic Year

## Common Assignment Implementation

The 2019-2020 academic year saw ICaP's program-wide implementation of the common assignment: the portfolio. ICaP selected the portfolio common assignment from several piloted assignments (i.e., professional email, research-based essay, and rhetorical analysis) for the following reasons:
1. The portfolio assess all six ICaP outcomes wholesale or individually;
2. The portfolio assess our new syllabus themes with an assessment protocol in place;
3. The portfolio pushes students towards metacognition with the mini-reflections and final reflective essay (see Habits of Mind and Principles for Postsecondary Writing);
4. The portfolio grant instructors agency to teach diverse assignments;
5. The portfolio asks students to guide instructors through their learning/writing practices

To guide instructors and students through implementing the common assignment, Derek Sherman, Assistant Director of Assessment, composed the Instructor's Guide to the Portfolio and the Student's Guide to the Portfolio with the Assessment Committee in Spring 2019.  The major components to the portfolio include:
1. A reflective log of 3-4 small reflective prompts students compose after a major project;
2. A final reflective essay where students reflect on the development of their written communication skills; and
3. Course essays and supplemental materials (e.g., brainstorming, rough drafts, etc.)

The reflective materials grant students agency in their learning and provide ICaP with the ability to assess how well we meet our outcomes. Although we selected the portfolio as our common assignment, ICaP and the Assessment Committee will continue to revise the common assignment based on student and instructor feedback and assessments.

## 2019-2020 Assessment Events

First, Summer 2019 was the first semester for the portfolio and it was a success, although there were suggestions for changes. ICaP obtained commentary on the following questions from Summer 2019 instructors:
1. Describe what went well with the portfolio
2. Describe what could have gone better with the portfolio
3. What changes, if any, do you have for the portfolio
4. Please list any other suggestions you have below

You can find instructor comments here: Comments.

Second, ICaP introduced the common assignment to all new and returning instructors at Fall 2019 Convocation (see Slides). Many instructors expressed confidence in teaching the portfolio and others had questions (e.g., why is the portfolio worth only 10%?). ICaP staff and other instructors addressed questions. "Useful Reflection" was an assessment workshop and it proved beneficial in thinking through designing appropriate reflections.

Third, ICaP had its first norm, read, and rate session (NRR) in October 2019 with mentor groups for Summer 2019 portfolios. The Portfolio Rubric we used assessed all six outcomes at once, but we realized this led to lengthy NRR sessions and confusion. Questions arose as to the amount of reflective writing pieces included within a portfolio and whether this approach focused too much on writing about writing—-the Assessment Committee reaffirmed that ICaP's approach to reflective writing and its amount was appropriate, supported by current composition scholarship, and necessary for our context (see the Purpose of Reflection).

Fourth, ICaP added assessment to its website and included the following webpages: ICaP Assessment, The Common Assignment, Assessment Committee, History of ICaP Assessment, and The Purpose of Reflection. The addition of assessment to the website furthered ICaP's commitment to transparent assessment measures (see website). The website also reinforced ICaP's assessment practices.

Fifth, ICaP changed the rubric to focus on Outcomes 3 and 5 because assessing all six outcomes was labor intensive and time consuming:
- Outcome 3: Critically think about writing and rhetoric through reading, analysis, and reflection;
- Outcome 5: Perform research and evaluate sources to support claims

Some members of the ICaP staff—-Bradley Dilger, Linda Haynes, Kristyn Childres, Dee McCormick, Libby Chernouski, and Derek Sherman—-met during Fall 2019 finals week to further refine the rubric to fit Outcomes 3 and 5. The final rubric for Outcomes 3 and 5 split each outcome into two categories: reflection and compositions. This rubric used a scale of 4-12, with three ranking columns: fails, meets, and exceeds.

Sixth, ICaP collected feedback from instructors from the Fall 2019 portfolios, using the same questions as in event one. You can find Fall 2019 data here: Fall 2019 Instructor Commentary.

Seventh, ICaP had its second NRR session for all ICaP instructors during Spring 2019 Convocation. We used the rubric created during Fall 2019 finals week (see above). The ICaP Assessment Committee had volunteers help with the NRR session including Jessica Mercado, Joe Forte, Kailyn Hall, and Victoria Braegger. We spent the entire time norming, taking notes on the rubric, and assessing instructors' comments. Instructors suggested four columns for the rubric, especially one between the failing and meeting categories. While we understand the need to have more categories, we ultimately decided that three was enough as we are starting the assessment process and have a large turnover rate of instructors. This NRR session helped instructors in the following sessions.

Eighth, ICaP had four separate NRR sessions throughout the Spring 2020 semester, prior to Covid-19. ICaP required instructors to attend at least two sessions. Our goal with these sessions was to norm for Outcomes 3 and 5 and begin reading and rating. We normed, read, and rated all of Summer 2019 and approximately half of the Fall 2019 data (see Assessment Results).

Ninth, ICaP staff visited the Purdue Statistical Consulting Services for our assessment project. Our consultations provided ICaP with appropriate statistical methods on calculating inter-rater reliability using SPSS software. The Statistical Consulting Services proved valuable and provided us with important information.

Tenth, most ICaP staff—Bradley Dilger, Linda Haynes, Dee McCormick, Libby Chernouski, Derek Sherman, and Kailyn Hall—-finished rating Fall 2019 portfolios. Derek Sherman, Assistant Director of Assessment, sent out folders via Google Drive to each ICaP staff member along with a rubric, link to Qualtrics, and seven to ten portfolios. Derek divided portfolios that needed a third rating amongst ICaP staff.

# Assessment Results

## Foundational Outcomes

In Spring 2019, the Office of Institutional Research, Assessment and Effectiveness (OIRAE) asked ICaP to assess its courses according to the Informational Literacy and Written Communication outcomes established by Purdue University's Foundational Learning Outcomes. ICaP submitted two documents over the course of the Spring 2019 semester, including a report on ICaP's practices and the assessment data requested by OIRAE. The assessment data called for the submission of the following from each ICaP course:
- Syllabi from the submitted sections
- Copy of the assignment sheet
- Instructor description of the assignment
- Instructor description of when feedback was given before the withdrawal deadline
- An excellent, average, and poor sample
- Grade distributions for each section submitted

We are grateful for the instructors who contributed to this assessment and would like to give them a special thank you: Bryan Nakawaki, Kimberly Broughton, Vanessa Iacocca, Amanda Smith, Gabriel Lonsberry, Huai-Rhin Kim, Phuong Tran, Jessica Mercado, and Lauren Mallett.

ICaP received a score of 3 (i.e., excellent). Dr. Joel Ebarb sent ICaP its results in the following email: Ebarb Email Results. The Foundational Outcomes Committee provided little commentary on English 106/108 except for, "These courses exceed the listed criteria. The course is

approved for an additional 5 years for Written Communication. Congratulations, and thank you for your work to maintain the ongoing excellence of ENGL 106/108." These results illustrate that ICaP effectively teaches written communication and information literacy standards established by Purdue's Undergraduate Core Curriculum Committee.

The UCC asked ICaP for a sample of this assessment to be hosted on the UCC's website: Written Communication Sample. Derek Sherman and Bradley created the sample assessment.

## Summer 2019 Data

Data for the 2019-2020 academic year focused on ICaP outcomes 3 and 5:
- **Outcome 3:** Critically think about writing and rhetoric through reading, analysis, and reflection; and
- **Outcome 5:** Perform research and evaluate sources to support claims.

Raters achieved a Cronbach's Alpha inter-rater reliability of .81, or a good reliability, in rating 48 portfolios. ICaP calculated inter-rater reliability using SPSS software provided by Purdue, and we produced a PDF report of the data using Qualtrics, the survey software used to submit portfolio ratings. Below, Table 1 provides data on the portfolios as a whole. Table 2 includes a breakdown of each outcome's reflections and compositions categories and their mean and standard deviation. Table 3 shows a breakdown of the outcome's reflections and compositions and the percentage of portfolios rated in the fails, meets, and exceeds categories.

|  | Scale | Mean | Standard Deviation | Inter-rater Reliability |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 4-12 | 8.99 | 1.90 | .81 |

**Table 1:** Mean, standard deviation, and inter-rater reliability for Summer 2019 portfolios.

| Outcome Area | Scale | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Outcome 3: Reflections | 1-3 | 2.36 | .69 |
| Outcome 3: Compositions | 1-3 | 2.36 | .58 |
| Outcome 5: Reflections | 1-3 | 2.11 | .70 |
| Outcome 5: Compositions | 1-3 | 2.23 | .60 |

**Table 2:** Breakdown of outcome areas and their mean and standard deviation.

| Outcome Area | Fails | Meets | Exceeds |
|---|---|---|---|
| Outcome 3: Reflections | 12.40% | 39.53% | 48.06% |
| Outcome 3: Compositions | 5.43% | 52.71% | 41.86% |
| Outcome 5: Reflections | 19.69% | 49.61% | 30.71% |
| Outcome 5: Compositions | 9.45% | 58.27% | 32.28% |

**Table 3:** Percentage of portfolios in the fails, meets, and exceeds categories.

## Fall 2019 Data

Raters achieved a Cronbach's Alpha inter-rater reliability of .895, or a good reliability, in rating 69 portfolios. ICaP calculated inter-rater reliability using SPSS software and produced a PDF report of the data using Qualtrics. Below, Table 4 provides data on the portfolios as a whole. Table 5 shows a breakdown of each outcome's reflections and compositions categories and their mean and standard deviation. Table 6 includes a breakdown of the outcome's reflections and compositions and the percentage of portfolios rated in the fails, meets, and exceeds categories.

| | Scale | Mean | Standard Deviation | Inter-rater Reliability |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | 4-12 | 8.72 | 2.14 | .895 |

**Table 4:** Mean, standard deviation, and inter-rater reliability for Fall 2019 portfolios.

| Outcome Area | Scale | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Outcome 3: Reflections | 1-3 | 2.18 | .71 |
| Outcome 3: Compositions | 1-3 | 2.25 | .63 |
| Outcome 5: Reflections | 1-3 | 1.98 | .71 |
| Outcome 5: Compositions | 1-3 | 2.31 | .62 |

**Table 5:** Breakdown of Outcome areas and their mean and standard deviation.

| Outcome Area | Fails | Meets | Exceeds |
|---|---|---|---|
| Outcome 3: Reflections | 17.83% | 46.50% | 35.67% |
| Outcome 3: Compositions | 10.19% | 54.14% | 35.67% |
| Outcome 5: Reflections | 26.11% | 49.68% | 24.20% |
| Outcome 5: Compositions | 8.92% | 51.59% | 39.49% |

**Table 6:** Percentage of portfolios in the fails, meets, and exceeds categories for Fall 2019.

# Implications of Results

## Summer 2019 Data Implications

### Outcome 3

ICaP acknowledges that Summer 2019 portfolios are the product of a condensed eight-week course instead of the normal sixteen-week course. A majority (48.06%) of student portfolios fell into the exceeds category for reflections, which shows reflection pedagogy was successful. Although successful, we would like to see the majority move above 50% in the exceeds category and for the fails category to move below 10%. However, the portfolio is a new requirement and with more time this requirement should see growth.

The majority (52.7%) of students met expectations for compositions, but we would like to see the majority move towards the exceeds category. We were also happy that only 5.43% of compositions were in the fails category. Outcome 3, however, has many similarities with *Outcome 1: Demonstrate rhetorical awareness of diverse audiences, situations, and contexts*. Instructors in the Assessment Committee and in the NRR sessions mentioned the difficulty in differentiating between these two outcomes. This discussion elucidated good questions in how we differentiate these two outcomes in compositions: What assignments meet this outcome that couldn't meet Outcome 1? How do students show they have met this outcome? How does Outcome 3 and 1 differ, if they do? Outcome 3 is broad, so we may need to provide more guidance to instructors on how to meet this outcome.

Besides outcome similarities, ICaP should evaluate Outcome 3's student learning objectives:
- Read a diverse range of texts, attending especially to relationships between assertion and evidence, to patterns of organization, to the interplay between verbal and nonverbal elements, and to how these features function for different audiences;
- Analyze, synthesize, and evaluate ideas, information, situations, and texts; and
- Reflect on one's composing processes and rhetorical choices

A closer examination of these student learning objectives may help in differentiating between Outcomes 1 and 3. Questions include:

1. How do we assess reading?
2. What does ICaP mean by critical thought?
3. What does ICaP mean by verbal and nonverbal elements in writing?
4. What assignments best meet the objective of "analyze, synthesize, and evaluate ideas"?

With this outcome's broad nature, providing more guidance on Outcomes 1 and 3 and how they differ would be beneficial.

### Outcome 5

A majority of the research reflections (49.61%) met expectations, but again we would like to see this majority move towards the exceeds category. 19.69% of the research reflections fell into the fails category, so decreasing this category to 10% or lower should be a goal. Because Summer courses are condensed, ICaP should consider how the rapid nature of this course affects the research process and students' abilities to reflect on this process. Rater commentary during the norm, read, and rate sessions on research reflections suggest students talk about research practices but in a surface level discussion.

The majority of Outcome 5's compositions (58.27%) fell into the meets expectations category, and again we were happy that the fails category is below 10%. Research is a required component of all ICaP courses, regardless of syllabus theme, but we should question how instructors' values and educational background influence the rating of research. In NRR sessions, Assessment Committee meetings, and in ICaP staff meetings, instructors discussed the following questions:

1. What type(s) of research does or should ICaP value or should it value all research equally (i.e., primary vs. secondary)?
   a. How does instructors' area(s) of expertise influence the rating of research?
   b. How does the Purdue context dictate ICaP's research values?
2. What source material (e.g., scholarly vs. primary vs. popular) should ICaP emphasize?
   a. How does source material influence raters' expectations?
   b. What research does the Purdue context consider scholarly or appropriate?
   c. What responsibility does ICaP have to prepare students for research in their majors?
3. What genres are most effective at illustrating students' research skills?
   a. How do we support instructors' expertise and the genres in which students will write in their majors?
   b. Does the Academic Rhetorics syllabus theme prove more successful at research versus other syllabus themes?

## Fall 2019 Data Implications

### Outcome 3

Reflections for Fall 2019 illustrate that a majority (46.50%) of students fall into the meets expectations category. A majority (54.14%) of students' compositions also fall into the meets

expectations category. As with Summer 2019, ICaP would like to see the majority of these two categories move towards the exceeds category and for the fails category to fall below 10%. However, it is important to note that ICaP is meeting the expectations of our Outcomes, and students are achieving the outcomes established by Purdue's Undergraduate Core Curriculum. ICaP needs to further investigate Outcome 3 as suggested in Summer 2019 Outcome 3 Implications.

### Outcome 5

In terms of Outcome 5, a majority (49.68%) of students were in the meets expectations category for reflection. Concerning, however, is that 26.11% of students fell into the fails expectations category, so ICaP should work to get this percentage below 10%. Unfortunately, 20% of the submitted portfolios for Fall 2019 did not contain mini reflections, although they were a requirement of the portfolio. In terms of overall scores, instructors who used mini reflections scored on average .5-1.5 points higher than those who did not. ICaP should thus question how mini reflections that focus directly on research influence raters' scores in this category? Is it too difficult to see students' reflections on research in a final reflective essay only? Again, this is a newer requirement for instructors so with time and more direct support from ICaP, these numbers may move towards the meets and exceeds categories.

As far as compositions, a majority (51.59%) of student portfolios met expectations but we would like that majority to move into the exceeds category. 39.49% scored in the exceeds category, so ICaP more than meets the research needs of Purdue students, but we should work to refine students' research skills through metacognitive exercises. However, individual instructors' values in research may hold back this outcome from achieving a majority in the exceeds category. Therefore, ICaP should examine and study the research valued by instructors with different background knowledge and experiences (see Summer 2019 Outcome 5).

## Spring 2020 Data Implications

ICaP collected Spring 2020 portfolios and plans to assess them with our incoming Fall 2020 mentor groups. Kailyn Hall will coordinate this effort with the Mentors, Linda Haynes and Irwin Weiser, to introduce ICaP's assessment practices to the mentor groups. ICaP will use the Outcomes 3 and 5 rubric from AY19-20 to maintain consistency within the academic year. We will note the Spring 2020 portfolios as an outlier because of the Covid-19 pandemic and switch to online education.

## Summation of Results

Overall, two semesters' worth of data illustrate that ICaP meets the expectations of our course outcomes and those of the University. However, to further assess our effectiveness in these outcomes, ICaP should not make major changes to the portfolio before we collect more data. Keeping the portfolio consistent throughout the next academic year would be beneficial in

helping us change the curriculum—-instructors need more time to acquaint themselves with the portfolio components. ICaP should develop initiatives that support the current portfolio components.

# Pedagogy and Resource Suggestions

## Reflection Solutions

Outcome 3 has taught ICaP that we need to further increase our programmatic support for instructors in reflection. ICaP should not add or eliminate any reflective components at this point because the portfolio is a young common assignment. With scores from instructors using mini reflections scoring .5-1.5 points higher than those who did not, it is apparent that mini reflections serve as an important intervention in increasing ICaP's reflection scores. ICaP staff (i.e., those who read portfolios), for example, noted that it was clear when reflective pedagogy and mini reflections were a core element to the classroom. Students who composed mini reflections produced better final reflective essays, according to raters, because they used the feedback given by their instructors earlier in the semester.  As of now, 80% of the ICaP instructional staff use mini reflections while 20% do not. If we could achieve 100% use of the mini reflections, our scores may increase in the meets and exceeds categories.

The mini reflections provide benefits beyond increasing the overall scores of the portfolio. Mini reflections equip students with the opportunity to reflect on individual assignments without having to jam all their learning into one final reflective essay. For example, students can reflect directly on research, which our results show 26.11% of Fall 2019 portfolios fall into the fails category, or on multimodal composition. Practically, relying on only a final reflection is time consuming for instructors who have to provide feedback at the end of the semester when time is crucial. The progression of the mini reflections to the final reflective essay serves as an important scaffolding measure for students and its benefits showed up in student portfolios.

ICaP should further support mini reflections in the form of a bank of reflective prompts organized by ICaP outcomes and most commonly taught genres. The Assessment Committee can create this bank, a rubric, and a feedback guide. The bank will serve as a resource for instructors new to reflective pedagogy, but ICaP should still encourage instructors who want to use their own prompts and make them course specific. Such intervention provides direction for the mini reflections for instructors who need it. Although there is discussion to eliminate the mini-reflections from face-to-face courses, the assessment data, Assessment Committee, instructor comments, and composition scholarship strongly suggest ICaP keep these components across all sections of 106/108 to keep consistency within the program and assessment.

In terms of the final reflection, ICaP must simplify the final reflective essay. Spring 2020 saw the reduction in the number of outcomes that students needed to address, so ICaP could further refine it by creating a common prompt for all ICaP sections. A sample prompt could be as

simple as "How did you grow as a writer throughout your ICaP course? Please provide details and examples from individual assignments to illustrate your growth." The Assessment Committee should develop and/or peer review such a prompt, and volunteer instructors should pilot the prompt before program-wide implementation. Students must still compose the final reflective essay with the rhetorical moves suggested in the [Instructor's Guide to the Portfolio](#). Together, the mini reflections and final reflective essay address the CWPA's Consultant-Evaluator Service's suggestion for student portfolios to include "metacognitive reflections that address [various] types of learning." These various types of learning include knowledge of rhetorical concepts, metacognitive knowledge of writing, and knowledge of composing processes ([Gere, Pemberton, and Phelps, 2017, p. 11](#)).

To further support reflection, ICaP must create professional development opportunities for all instructors. Professional development opportunities such as scaffolding and course design may be effective in incorporating reflection into the 106 classroom, especially for face-to-face or hybrid sections. Providing exemplary course designs per syllabus theme could help instructors develop courses that scaffold students' learning and reflective opportunities. With a large turnover in instructors from year to year, a collection of reflective writing prompts and exemplary syllabi would be beneficial.

## Research Solutions

ICaP is a diverse program with instructors who come from many educational backgrounds and experiences. To further understand what research means for specific fields, the Assessment Committee and instructors can work towards understanding research values and expectations of various fields and how those values and expectations work with instructors' expertise. ICaP instructors must understand research values and expectations in the context and needs of Purdue students. Furthermore, ICaP should study the Purdue population to better grasp how we can make 106/108 writing skills more transferable to their future majors and disciplines.

To foster a deeper understanding and appreciation of research in all fields, the ICaP Assessment Committee should create professional development topics such as research methods (quantitative vs. qualitative vs. mixed methods), scaffolding research activities and assignment design, research genres and assignments, and research rubrics. ICaP's Assistant Director of Professional Development, Libby Chernouski, scheduled two research workshops for Spring 2020 but had to cancel them because of the Covid-19 pandemic. ICaP could resurrect these workshops as a start to discussing research. With the recent indexing of assignments and readings per syllabus theme, ICaP should advertise this resource. Please find the indexing sheet here: [Index of Syllabus Themes](#).

# Moving Forward: Future Projects

## Current Methods

### Portfolio creation

As of Spring 2020, students are asked to compile a single PDF or Word file for their portfolio. For the context, this method was the most feasible as we were in the middle of a transition between Blackboard and D2L, with no portfolio options existing within Purdue's version of Blackboard. Tech Mentors, Dee McCormikc and Kristyn Childres, created the [Making a PDF Portfolio Guide](#) to assist students in creating a single PDF or Word File.

### Portfolio submissions

ICaP employs a [Qualtrics submission protocol](#) that asks instructors to download four student portfolios from the University's LMS system. The assessment research coordinator uses a random number generator to determine the record numbers instructors submit—-these numbers correspond to a student in the instructor's roster. Each course type (i.e., English 106/108, English 106INTL, and English 106DIST) requires an original set of numbers to increase randomness of student samples and because of course caps. The submissions require instructors to submit the following information:

1. Course type
2. Syllabus Theme
3. Were mini reflections used in the course?
4. Portfolio assignment sheet
5. Four portfolios from each course taught
6. Reflection questions (vary per semester)

After instructors submit their portfolios, the assessment research coordinator collects the portfolios and survey data and stores them using ICaP's secure drive provided by CLA. Qualtrics provides downloadable reports for easy storage and anonymity. These methods assess instructor feedback and create professional development opportunities.

### De-identifying process

Once all portfolios are downloaded and stored in the ICaP secure drive, the assessment research coordinator and/or student workers begin the de-identifying process. An Excel or Google spreadsheet should be used to record the following information in this order:

1. Student Name
2. De-identified #
3. Score 1
4. Score 2
5. Score 3

6. Average Score
7. Rater 1
8. Rater 2
9. Rater 3
10. Instructor of record

Columns 3-9 will be blank until the rating process has begun. To de-identify, the assessment research coordinator and/or student workers remove all references to instructors and students. De-identifiers replace student names with their corresponding de-identified number. A cover sheet accompanies each portfolio and contains this de-identified # and three spots with a blank for rating 1, rating 2, and rating 3.

## Norm, read, and rate sessions

During the Fall semester, ICaP introduces mentor groups to the assessment process through a NRR session. At the very least, the assessment research coordinator should get through at least norming to familiarize mentees with the norming process, especially since many instructors are new to teaching and/or assessment. The event uses an internally developed rubric, and this event helps simplify this rubric so that new instructors can assess with only minor norming in the spring. Fall 2019, for example, provided key insight that rubrics need to focus on some, not all, of ICaP's outcomes because all outcomes overwhelm new instructors. In addition, the ICaP instructor turnover rate is high, so simple rubrics are crucial.

In the spring, ICaP uses Convocation to focus on assessment and our goals for the semester. For example, Convocation during Spring 2020 introduced a new internally developed rubric based on ICaP's outcomes. The goal with this session was to norm instructors for upcoming NRR sessions in the spring.

ICaP requires all instructors to attend at least two norming sessions during the Spring semester. The assessment research coordinator and the director of ICaP norm instructors on the developed rubric from Convocation using at least one portfolio. Once raters reach consensus, raters then read and rate portfolios. ICaP provides food and drink to compensate instructors for their work—-ideally, we would pay our instructors for their involvement.

## Data Analysis

Qualtrics stores all the data from ICaP's ratings, and the assessment research coordinator transfers the data over to an Excel or Google Spreadsheet (see De-identifying process for format). ICaP must rate each portfolio twice. If there is a discrepancy of more than two points, a third rating occurs. The third rating has to be someone who has not read the portfolio during ratings one or two. By chance, if the third rating does not clarify the scale in either direction (e.g., scores of 6, 9, and 12), a fourth rating occurs; the person rating for the fourth time cannot be one of the first three raters. The statistical consultants suggested a fourth rating to help with inter-rater reliability. The Excel sheet easily transfers into the SPSS software. The SPSS software then determines Inter-rater reliability.

# Suggestions for Future Assessments

## Portfolio creation

With Purdue's LMS change, Brightspace, or D2L, affords ICaP an opportunity to compose portfolios within the LMS. As of Summer 2020, the full functionality of the Brightspace portfolio tool is unknown as it is being updated and will not be fully functional until the Fall 2021 semester. However, the tool provides potential to include multimodal projects and other digital items that a PDF portfolio does not afford.

With the first full academic year of the portfolio common assignment complete, questions arise as to what are the most important materials to include within the portfolio. Instructors would welcome the minimizing of the portfolio's materials; however, we must consider the following questions:

1. What outcomes will ICaP assess?
    a. What portfolio materials fit that outcome (e.g., final drafts, cover memo, etc.)?
2. If we employ a student choice model, how does student choice fit in when we are assessing specific outcomes?
    a. What if students submit the wrong type of essay?
    b. How much instructor input should go into helping students?
    c. How much student choice is there with only 3-4 major assignments?
3. Could a genre approach to portfolio submission be more appropriate (e.g., research, narrative, multimodal)?
    a. Could the portfolio be the means to teach genre more efficiently?
    b. What genres do our outcomes afford?
    c. Could this be a way to standardize English 106 and match the curriculum in English 106DIST?
4. What about mini-assignments (e.g., annotated bibliographies or proposals) that supplement a bigger project?
    a. Should ICaP include scaffolded assignments?
    b. If included or excluded, how will this affect the rating?
    c. Can these assignments be effective in assessing reflection?
5. How does portfolio format affect all of the above (i.e., PDF vs. Brightspace portfolio)?

## Portfolio submission

The current submission protocol has been effective as it allows for instructor reflection and feedback. Our protocol is commonplace, but many instructors do forget to submit their portfolios at the end of the semester. As a result, ICaP should explore alternative submission methods that allow ICaP to collect portfolios from instructors' classes, especially with Brightspace's organization feature. If Brightspace portfolios are used, the question becomes, "Can instructors download the portfolios and submit them through our current submission protocol?"

## De-identifying process

With Brightspace's implementation, ICaP should explore ways to de-identify web-based or digital portfolios created through Brightspace. Not many instructors used web-based portfolios, but Brightspace's implementation may change that trend.

## Norm, read, and rate sessions

ICaP's current NRR investment is time consuming, expensive, and requires unpaid labor by our instructors. Often instructors cannot stay for the entire scheduled assessment time. Therefore, some instructors are assessing more frequently than others and it causes workload issues. Given these circumstances, ICaP cannot continue with these assessment methods every academic year. Future assessments should employ a program-wide assessment every other year to account for the labor and time constraints. Every other year should focus on at least two ICaP outcomes. We also suggest that instructors cancel conferences to attend NRR sessions.

In off years, ICaP should continue collecting assessment data and engage in formative assessments. Focus groups, student interviews, surveys, etc. engage ICaP instructors and students in assessment. These assessments should be small, frequent, widespread, and employ a pre/post assessment model. ICaP could make Foundational Assessment years an off-year for program-wide assessment. OIRAE has scheduled the next Foundational Assessment for the 2023-2024 academic year.

## Data Analysis

Data analysis should continue using the same methods as described above.

# Role of the Assessment Committee

The Assessment Committee should continue its mission in creating transparent assessment practices and following through with its mission statement. Future goals of the Assessment Committee could include the following:

- Hosting workshops on grading and evaluation (in-class assessment resources)
- Hosting workshops on teaching reflection (to supplement online resources)
- Creating resources for teaching reflection and portfolios
- Hosting the mentioned workshops in the [Pedagogy and Resource Suggestions](#) section

Members of the Assessment Committee should continue to be instructors from ICaP, graduate students and lecturers. The members should be involved in all ICaP assessment decisions such as the creation of assessment materials or the changing of portfolio components. These democratic practices honor ICaP's original intentions to make assessment instructor driven.

## Timeline for Future Assessments

| Academic Year | (Potential) Outcomes to Assess | Potential Portfolio Components | Required Labor |
|---|---|---|---|
| **2019-2020** | Outcomes 3 and 5 | Reflections and final drafts needed (rough drafts were submitted to gauge further reflective pieces) | Program-wide |
| **2020-2021** | Outcomes 3 and 5 for Spring 2020 data*; Outcome 2 | Reflections and final drafts (rough drafts for further reflection) for Spring 2020; Polished essays for Fall 2020 on. | Mentor groups for Outcomes 3 and 5; small group of instructors for outcome 2. |
| **2021-2022** | Outcomes 1 and 6 | Reflections, final drafts, and at least one digital/multimodal project | Program-wide |
| **2022-2023** | Outcome 4 | Reflections and final drafts **or** have instructors submit peer review activities used in the classroom along with a reflection | Mentor Groups |
| **2023-2024** | Foundational Outcomes | See requirements established by the Undergraduate Core Curriculum. This will assess all versions of ICaP courses. | 5+ instructors |

**\***Spring 2020 data should note the move to online instruction.